





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS





SOCINIANISM

THE

INEVITABLE RESULT OF THE MANCHESTER
AND SALFORD SCHEME

OF

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

BY THE REV. HENRY NEWLAND, M.A.

“Fais ce que dois arrive que pourra.”—*Cerenus de Cressy*.

“Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.”

“There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof is death.”

LONDON :

JOSEPH HENRY BATTY, 159, FLEET STREET.

1851.



NATIONAL EDUCATION, &c.

In reprinting from the columns of the *English Churchman* the following articles, the writer has had two objects in view—

1st. To show the reasons why no Churchman can accept or co-operate with the Manchester and Salford Education Bill as it stands at present,

And, 2ndly. To point out the alterations which it will be necessary to make in it before a Churchman is able to accept or co-operate with it.

Whether these alterations are possible, or whether they would entirely do away with the principle of the Bill, the author does not take upon himself to say. He sees the necessity of some provision for the education of the poor, and trusts that that now offered by the Manchester and Salford Committee may be made available. It is to assist in coming to a right conclusion on this point that he lays before them the following summary :—

He conceives—

1. That the State, having ceased to be the Church, any alliance between these two bodies for educational purposes has become extremely difficult, but not absolutely impossible.

2. That, considering the great advantages to both Church and State which would accrue from such an alliance, no proposition to that effect ought to be rejected on any ground short of incompatibility with our duties as Churchmen.

3. That the Manchester and Salford Bill is an attempt towards effecting such an alliance.

4. That it cannot be considered as merely local, but as the tentative of a scheme for the whole nation.

5. That, whenever the Voluntary and the Compulsory systems are brought into action together, the former will ultimately be absorbed in the latter; and that, therefore, the latter can only be taken into consideration as the normal or permanent state.

6. That any scheme which involves the suppression of the Creeds or Catechism must be rejected by the Ministers of Christ's Church, as involving a breach of their Ordination vow.

7. That any suppression of the distinctive doctrines of Christ's Church must be rejected, as tending to Unitarianism or Socinianism, which, by their Ordination vow, the Ministers of that Church are bound to oppose.

8. That no legal limitations of the Scriptures, and no special selection of portions of the Bible as fit for general teaching, while the remainder is reserved for a select class, after the manner now practised by the Roman Catholics, can possibly be admitted, inasmuch as they bring those who consent to such mutilations of Christ's laws under the curse denounced on all who diminish aught from the words of The Book.

9. That no association or alliance for educational or any other religious purposes between Christ's Church and religious bodies which refuse her communion, can be admitted, as being directly opposed to the Apostolic command—"Mark them which cause divisions contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them."

10. That, for the reasons above stated, the scheme of combined Church and State education, called the Manchester and Salford scheme, as at present constituted, is opposed to the mission of the Church of Christ, and therefore cannot be admitted by conscientious Churchmen.

11. That a plan for the combination of Church and State in the education of the people has been put forth by Archdeacon Denison, which plan Churchmen can conscientiously accept and work with.

12. That the Chairman of the Manchester and Salford Committee, in a letter addressed to Archdeacon Denison, has declared this plan to be nearly identical with his own, and that the points of difference are in no way material to the principle of the Manchester and Salford Bill.

13. That, such being the case, it is obviously the duty, as well as the interest of the Manchester and Salford Committee, to eliminate those points which by them are considered immaterial; but by Churchmen of vital importance; and thus to approximate their plan with that of Archdeacon Denison.

14. That, in the event of their doing this, it is equally the duty and the interest of Churchmen to waive those points which, though agreeable to their habits and feelings, cannot be considered of vital importance.

15. The two schemes being thus made identically one, that it is the duty as well as the interest of all parties alike to use their utmost endeavours to procure their establishment on a permanent basis under the protection of the Legislature of England.

These are the deductions which occur naturally to any one considering the necessities as well as the difficulties of the case, the principles of the Manchester and Salford Bill, and the conditions under which the Church is bound by the terms of her Divine Commission.



ARTICLE I.

WHEN all the circumstances round us are in an actual state of transition, it is very difficult to realize their respective bearings; we are continually applying to cases now present relations which might have existed at some antecedent time, but which, at the time in which we are considering them, are entirely altered.

All our ideas, all our associations, are formed upon the notion of "Church and State,"—that is to say, are drawn from those times when Church and State were identical, when the State was the civil form of the Church, and the Church the ecclesiastical form of the State. Ministers, themselves Churchmen, the servants of a King who was a Churchman, and representing a Parliament necessarily composed of Churchmen, might be considered the civil officers of the Church; and, when that was the case, it was no very great anomaly to consider Bishops as ecclesiastical officers of the State. In truth, they were so considered. It is a fact worthy to be noted that in all trust deeds, even of those schools which were exclusively under the control of the State, and supported by the State, Bishops were made the visitors and referees. There are no title deeds of twenty years' standing in which the Divine office of the Church with respect to education is unrecognized. This was not done out of any particular reverence for, or consideration of, the Church: but Bishops were *ex officio*, and of necessity, ministers of education, and the Premier, though very possibly possessing the power, would no more have dreamed of committing that task to other hands, than he would have required the First Lord of the Admiralty to review the troops, or the Commander-in-Chief to inspect the dockyards.

Things are now in a condition of change. The State is not the Church, but a much larger body, in which the Church resides; it contains other bodies of men who are not Churchmen at all, and not only contains them, but represents their interests. In reality, therefore, the conditions of its ancient state do not apply to it in its modern. The "indissoluble union" of Church and State is actually dissolved already—has been dissolved these twenty years or more. We have not felt the disruption, only because the machine has been at rest. The moment it is put into motion we feel it at once, though we cannot make out exactly what is the matter, or why things do not go on as smoothly as they did: and then we start to find that Church and State are, and for some time have been, two bodies, not one,—in alliance, it may be, just at present, but not, as they used to be, identical.

It is natural, however, that we should be slow to see this; it is natural that we should be continually applying to the present state of things that which is true only of those days which have passed away. We remember, perhaps exaggerate, the blessings of that past condition, when the State was the Church: and, continually disappointed in finding that something or other is somehow or other always going amiss, are wasting our time and energies in looking for a remedy for that which is irremediable.

We look always, therefore, with respect and admiration on men who are labouring to adapt the modern requirements of Government to the education of the Church. We view their efforts with interest—we examine their plans with a despairing hope of being able to adopt them,—and we abandon them one after the other with an increasing regret, but with an increasing conviction also that they are labouring at an impossibility.

Our Lord has committed the education of His Church to the Ministers and Stewards of His mysteries. "All power is committed unto Me; go ye *therefore* and teach." So long as the State was the Church, the

Government, as the laity of the Church, might not improperly take part in this teaching; when the State ceased to be the Church, it became *ipso facto* unable to do so. Not unwilling; on the contrary, it was both ready and anxious to attempt it; not unwilling, but unable, incapable—because it thenceforward represented, and it became its duty to represent, the interests of bodies alien to the Church—bodies whose functions with regard to school children are totally incompatible with those of the Church. In short, when the State ceased to be the laity of the Church, that moment the commission of Christ with respect to teaching ceased to apply to it in any sense whatever.

It is under this light that we must accustom ourselves to look upon all schemes for united Church and State education. They are simply impossible, as combining two utterly uncongenial elements. If, for its own purposes, and as a matter of preventive policy, the State thinks fit to enlarge the power of the Church in the education of its children, it has a full right to see that its money is not misapplied, but it has no right to interfere with the manner or matter of education: that is not its mission; that it gave up in ceasing to be the Church. The plan put forth by Archdeacon Denison, in his pamphlet on “the Church and the School,” is the only one which the State, by so doing, left itself to act upon.

Hence it is that the Manchester and Salford scheme, like all other schemes that have ever been propounded, is incompatible with Church education. It is so, not of its own will, but because it cannot help mixing with it an element essentially incongruous. We cannot regard this scheme as a mere local arrangement: it is a trial—it is the commencement of a plan for all England, and as such it must be regarded, and no merely local circumstances can be taken into consideration.

We say, then, that this plan is essentially incompatible with Church education: and we say it advisedly, and for this reason. The first clause enacts that the *Municipal Council* shall, out of their own members, annually elect a School Committee for the School Districts. Each District Committee may appoint a Secretary and other necessary officers—that is to say, School Inspectors, for these are the only officers necessary. And, indeed, this seems to be especially intended, for clause 5, section 3, says, no person shall be eligible for the appointment of Local Inspector without the concurrence of the District Committee—that is to say, ultimately of the Municipal Body.

The second clause provides that this District Committee may make by-laws and regulations subject to the approval, not of the Parson or of the Bishop, but of the Committee of Council. And, again, in clause 5, section 5, we find that the Local Inspector, appointed under the concurrence of the District Committee, as shewn by clause 5, section 3, is commissioned, not only to examine the schools, but the teachers also.

And, lastly, the sixth clause, section 4, forbids any school to be admitted into the Union without a certificate from the *Inspector* that a suitable teacher is appointed. And, lest any inconvenient title deeds already existing might interfere with these secular arrangements, the two following sections provide that in this case the title deeds may be altered.

Now, the remarkable part of all this is, that in schools which profess ostentatiously to be religious schools, and which repudiate as profane the idea of education merely secular, all reference to religious machinery is omitted in the case of Church Schools. The principle is allowed that a School can be a Church School without a Parson. There is not one allusion to the Parson of the parish: his very existence is ignored. Nothing is said of the Bishop. The directing power, the court of appeal, the appointment of inspectors, the examination of teachers, lies in the District Committee, who are themselves selections from the Municipal Council. And who and what are the Municipal Council? They may

every one of them be Dissenters ; in the case of Manchester almost all actually are. They not only may, but in the case of Manchester probably will, appoint an Inspector who is a Dissenter ; and the Dissenting Inspector, we will not say will, but most certainly may—for there is nothing to prevent him—appoint Dissenting Schoolmasters to Church Schools.

This is the *incongruous element*. We have other grounds of objection to the Manchester scheme which we may consider hereafter, but this is the first which strikes the eye, and this is, or ought to be, sufficient for Churchmen.

ARTICLE II.

WHEN people have their hobbies attacked, it is very natural that they should feel angry. Archdeacon Denison puts forth a direct challenge to the authors of the Manchester and Salford scheme of Education, in which he exposes pretty freely its defects. We cannot feel greatly surprised, therefore, that Mr. Entwisle, its parent, should feel a little sore, and write a little intemperately. But this, though very natural, is very much to be regretted. Mr. Entwisle is, to all appearance, a very earnest, painstaking, and withal, ingenious man : his plan, in many respects, is a very good plan,—in many parts, as he himself observes, in his letter to the *Manchester Guardian*, identical with that of the Archdeacon. For anything he can tell, it might be made so nearly identical with it that it would coincide, and that he might have the Archdeacon for his ally instead of his opponent. This, as Mr. Entwisle must needs be aware, would be more likely than any one thing that could happen to procure the reception of his plan ; for, somehow or other, the Archdeacon does lead with him the opinions of men. It is not to be regretted, therefore—we mean by himself and his friends—that Mr. Entwisle makes so inauspicious a beginning as to say that the statements of his present opponent and possible ally are “as little warranted by the facts of the case as they are dictated by the charity of a Christian Minister?” He concludes his letter with the recommendation of a verse to the Archdeacon’s especial consideration—“Judge not that ye be not judged.” Might we not also adopt another text, and ask—“Who made Mr. Entwisle a judge of Archdeacon Denison?”

When people shew anger, there is almost always an internal sense of weakness. By his very anger, Mr. Entwisle shews his secret consciousness that in his ingenious plan there is what is vulgarly called “a screw loose.” And he is quite right. A screw loose is just exactly the state of the case. His plan is very ingenious : it is not precisely “identical” with that of the Archdeacon, but it is quite near enough to be the basis of a treaty—*were it not for the loose screw*.

Mr. Entwisle proposes that a rate shall be raised to assist those schools which are at present supported by voluntary contributions, upon the general principle of not interfering with the doctrine taught in those schools. So does the Archdeacon in principle. He objects, indeed, to the actual rate as a mode of taxation certain to produce dissatisfaction, but the principle of applying public money to educational purposes he admits. So far, therefore, the plans may in some sense be called identical. Mr. Entwisle no doubt does not entirely act up to his own proposition when he comes to details, for under certain circumstances he does interfere very materially—he insists that the fundamental rules of Church schools, with respect to the Catechism, shall be forcible broken through. But as this is so totally opposed to the spirit of his own plan as to look absurd, and incongruous, in the midst of it, we suppose he would find no

difficulty in modifying it, or giving it up. We should anticipate no obstacle here. The "screw loose" is precisely his own particular clause about the provision for rate-built schools, which the Archdeacon, with his wonted perspicacity, has seized upon, and placed in capital letters, at the head of his pamphlet. "IN ALL SCHOOLS BUILT OUT OF THE RATES, THE SAME STIPULATION AS TO THE USE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, AS THAT ALREADY DESCRIBED, IS TO BE ENFORCED; BUT AS THEY WILL BE ENTIRELY DISCONNECTED WITH ANY RELIGIOUS BODY, CONGREGATION, OR SECT, IT IS EXPRESSLY DECLARED THAT NO CREED, CATECHISM, OR DISTINCTIVE RELIGIOUS FORMULARIES SHALL BE TAUGHT THEREIN,"

This, Mr. Entwisle says, is not at all a necessary part of his plan—"it might be altogether removed from the Bill without affecting any of the principles on which he has sought to secure public aid for the extension of religious education." If this really be the case, honestly and truly, why does he not remove it? for, whether the rest of his Bill be good or bad, admissible or inadmissible, this particular clause alone is a reason why no consistent Churchman could, under any consideration, co-operate with him. He says it is an accident of his Bill. We say it is THE PRINCIPLE.

Is Mr. Entwisle so ignorant of human nature, and the passion of avarice predominant in it, as to imagine for one moment that, if there existed at the same time a voluntary subscription, and a rate for the same purpose, the rate would not annihilate entirely the voluntary subscription? Is Mr. Entwisle so entirely unobservant of historical parallels as to forget the effect which resulted from the substitution of the compulsory poor-rate for voluntary charity? If he has any doubt about it, let him go round and collect alms for the poor widows of the parish in which he resides. Why! the whole set of provisions of the whole Bill would be but a simple providing for the present and transition state of the parish—we beg his pardon, the *district*, schools. The passage quoted by the Archdeacon would be the real Bill, and the normal state of those schools, the state into which they would subside, in a very few years indeed, is that of the rate-built school. Let Mr. Entwisle protest as he pleases: this is, whether he knows it or not, THE PRINCIPLE of his Bill; and "these ARE the schools which Churchmen are combining with all denominations to create." We will not take upon ourselves to judge his motives, and say this is the whole intention, but we do say that this will be the whole effect of his Bill.

This is the "screw loose" which will ultimately shake to pieces the whole machine; and, till this is remedied, we say that it is the bounden duty of every Churchman to oppose, so far as in him lies, the introduction of a Bill which contains a principle so entirely opposed to the Mind of Christ. We use this expression advisedly, and accept Mr. Entwisle's challenge. We do so on these grounds. The whole Bible is the Doctrine of the Christian religion. You may begin with teaching this portion, or that portion—the Sermon on the Mount, as Mr. Entwisle would recommend, or any other portion that you please; but if you do this with the deliberate intention of suppressing some other part which may not suit your views so well, then you are acting in the spirit of Antichrist. The words of the Bible are plain enough, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye *diminish* ought from it; that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." If you intentionally suppress, you may call it what you will, but you are intentionally diminishing from that Word; and in this case it is some One else besides Archdeacon Denison who, as Mr. Entwisle says, "pronounces a curse, and consigns to damnation, all who are engaged in the promotion of such a scheme." It was not Archdeacon Denison who wrote, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this

prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and from the Holy City, and from things that are written in this Book."

Let not Mr. Entwisle mistake us. We do not "judge" him. We do not say that he is Antichrist, nor do we "consign" him to condemnation. He is, we have no doubt, a very estimable man: he is certainly very much in earnest, and, in some respects, we thank him for his plan, in which we see much to admire: but *that clause* is ANTICHRISTIAN, and, as long as that clause remains in the Bill, though the rest of it came to us by the hands of an angel, the servants of Christ and of His Church can have nothing else to do with it than to oppose it.

ARTICLE III.

WE have often thought that to those earnest and painstaking men who are occupied in devising, perfecting, and carrying out schemes for the Education of the People, in connection with State controul, it must seem most wonderful—most unaccountable—that they meet with such determined and persevering opposition from Churchmen. What—they will say—is not Education wanted, most grievously, in this country?—is not an imperfect system of Education better, at all events, than absolute ignorance?—are we not honest ourselves?—do we not sincerely desire the good of our country?—do we not offer it the very best in our power, and are not these people unreasonable, and ungracious too, who, because it is not in our power to offer better gifts, thwart and oppose, and misrepresent that which, though not exactly what they want, is after all the very best we have it in our power to offer them?

Now this is, with men conscious of their own honesty of purpose, a just and reasonable ground of complaint; and so honest, and so sincere do we consider, not indeed all, but certainly some of those men, that we do freely admit that were not our grounds for opposition very strong indeed, we should be altogether inexcusable in opposing them.

But we do consider these grounds very strong indeed: that *they* may not consider them so is very possible, because they may not give the same weight to certain considerations which a Churchman does and must do; but at least we demand in our turn that which we are ready to accord to them; we demand that they consider us, as we consider them, honest and sincere, and conscientious.

Our reasons for opposing them are these:—

- 1.—We consider that all interference of the State with Education must ultimately lead to an Education Rate.
- 2.—That an Education Rate must lead to a system of District Committees.
- 3.—That under the existing conditions of the State (that is to say, where the State is not identical with the Church, but a much larger body, containing many forms of religious belief) these Committees must be of a miscellaneous or all-denomination character.
- 4.—That Miscellaneous Committees lead, as a matter of necessity, to Unitarianism.

Eliminating the middle terms, therefore, we believe sincerely that the interference of a State, which is not the Church, with Schools which are the Church, leads to Unitarianism; and believing this, we, as Christian Churchmen, are bound to oppose them—and, as Ministers of Christ, we are more especially bound, because they have vowed to give all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away strange doctrines.

This is our position. We see the steps and the end to which they lead:

we are bound to oppose, but our opposition is perfectly consistent with our appreciation of the entire sincerity of purpose in those who see the steps, but not the end. Lafayette possibly was an honest man, and a sincere patriot. Bailly most certainly was both the one and the other: he died a martyr to his own principles, by the hands of his own followers. Yet it is not the less certain that both these contributed, and in no small degree, to the murder of their King, and the establishment of the Reign of Terror.

But we are required to do something more than state our convictions, we must give fair grounds for them. Let us try.

1st.—To prove the first of these steps, many words will not now be necessary. A few, only a few years ago, and the very idea of an Education Rate would have been scouted. "The country would never stand it," it would have been said; but the wheel of time has rolled round, and the country does stand it already—is already, in a great measure, prepared for it. Inspector's reports teem with facts and statements, shewing the absolute necessity of it. A Committee is already formed, a local bill is already put forth as a tentative, while the Chairman of that Committee admits, that he fully believes the principle will be adopted throughout the land. And so it will—and so it must be adopted—the consequence is inevitable, and every one sees that it is so.

2nd.—But this Rate being collected from people of many different forms of belief, is it just, is it reasonable, is it constitutional even, that they should have no control over it? The district, however small it be from which the Rate is collected, will, in all probability, comprehend Baptists, Unitarians, Wesleyans, with innumerable varieties from all of these, possibly also Roman Catholics. Are these men to have no voice in committee—will you not permit them to look after the expenditure of their own money? If there is a rate, there must be a committee; if there is a committee, that committee must be of a character as miscellaneous as its constituents; common justice demands this. He, who pays, must also dispense.

3rd.—So far every one will agree with us, but in this point of the argument come in the numerous plans that have been suggested. Numerous they are, and ingenious, but among them all, there is only one which does not involve, in one shape or another—openly or disguisedly—directly or indirectly, the admission of the miscellaneous principle, or the controul of the Miscellaneous Committee; and that one is the scheme of Archdeacon Denison, put forth in his pamphlet on "the Church and the School." This does indeed give to every religious body alike its own proportion of the grant, leaving to every one of them alike, the uncontrolled power of applying it. Give us this, and we accept it readily—give us this, and we have no ground for complaint or opposition—give us this, and our whole ladder of objections is overthrown, and falls to the ground. But we cannot calculate upon it. How many of our just demands have been refused; how many more, which could not be refused, have been evaded and set aside? What does history and precedent lead us to expect? Was not this very principle tried in America, when the New England States raised a compulsory rate for the maintenance of religion, in which each rate-payer was to assign his own portion to the support of that form of belief which he himself affected. Did not the whole scheme work so as to call forth the encomiums of the republican Cobbett? and where is it now? let the avarice and the jealousy, which are part and parcel of human nature, answer the question. It is already a tale of other times, and we fear, we fear greatly, that from the action of the very same causes the similar plan of Archdeacon Denison will fail too, or rather will never be accepted.

At all events, without some guarantee of Government that it will be

taken into consideration, we cannot calculate upon it. There remains, therefore, nothing but the Miscellaneous Committee principle.

4th.—Now this we say must, as a necessary consequence, lead to Unitarianism; and for this reason—

The Christian Religion consists of two elements—Faith and Reason, and revealed or distinctive doctrines are a matter of faith. The Church of Christ contains all the Articles of the Christian Faith. Dissent of different kinds is the undue prominence given to one or other of these Articles, to the detriment of the rest; and Unitarianism is Christianity exhausted of them all. Unitarianism, therefore, is Rational Religion as opposed to Faithful Religion. The Miscellaneous Committee, every member of which holds firmly for himself some Articles of the Christian faith, but not the same Articles as those held equally firmly by his brother member, can coalesce and work together only by sinking them all. And this is Unitarianism.

ARTICLE IV.

It is idle to say that each member will represent and maintain the doctrines as well as the rights of his own peculiar sect. So they will in the outset, and jealousies and quarrels innumerable will be the first result; but novelty ceases, zeal cools down, peace and quietness have their charms, and the condition into which the Miscellaneous Committee ultimately settles down—its working state, in short—is that of suppressing distinctive differences, of holding or not holding Baptismal Regeneration, of maintaining or not maintaining Episcopal Orders, and so on with each distinctive doctrine of Christ's Church, till the whole settles down to that condition to which the State would if it could reduce the Church as well as the School. And that condition is Unitarianism.

This is theory, but it may not be difficult to give an instance of this, working out the same position practically, and by living examples.

LAST week we endeavoured to shew, from reasoning and induction, that the natural result of Miscellaneous Committees—that is to say, Committees composed of members holding different forms of religious belief,—in the management of Educational affairs, was inevitable Unitarianism. We shewed that it must be so from the nature of the case; that the natural tendency of a peace-loving society is to elide points of difference; that, in the present case, those points of difference are the separate doctrines which, taken collectively, form the Church of Christ considered as a religion; that Unitarianism, being the absence of distinctive doctrine, is approached step by step as we elide one doctrinal point after another, and results just as inevitably from the absence of them all as darkness results from the absence of light, or cold from the absence of heat.

We now go one step further, and assert that all Committees, or forms of management in Education, which interfere with the parochial system, have a tendency to the miscellaneous character; and it is so on both these grounds:—1st. That the management is in the hands of Miscellaneous Committees; and, 2ndly, that these Committees, being district Committees, do interfere with the parochial system. It is on both these grounds that we object to the Manchester and Salford scheme, as it at present stands before us.

This is our position; and, as in our last remarks we endeavoured to prove this from abstract reasoning, so, we repeat, in the present article we shall endeavour to arrive at the same result by reasoning from facts; and as the locality of the illustration is given, with allusions to individuals, it

may be well to present it in the form of a personal narrative, and with the authorization of one who occupies a place in it:—

“In the City of ——— there is what is called a Central School—that is to say, one Church-school for boys, and another for girls,—which, together, serve for all the parishes collectively. These schools are managed by a Committee, chosen from all the parishes, which as they, together with the Cathedral, contain a sample of every school of theology within the Church, is necessarily composed of materials somewhat incongruous and uncongential.

“The secret history of ———, with respect to this establishment, was precisely what might have been expected from such an arrangement—an undercurrent of petty quarrels and jealousies, rippling up at rare intervals into print,—till, finding this state of things far from pleasant, the parties concerned seem to have entered into a sort of mutual concordat, whether tacit or explicit I am unable to say, that they would sink ‘distinctive doctrines’ for the sake of peace and quietness.

“In this school I was myself much interested, having passed through all its classes in the capacity of either pupil or teacher, and having acquired from it all I know of the practice of education; and in the year 1850 I was appointed one of its Examiners. On receiving this appointment, I was cautioned earnestly and repeatedly, by more than one of the members, to beware of doctrines; and I did my best both to comply with this request, and at the same time to draw out and exhibit the great amount of Scriptural knowledge, such as it was, which I knew existed in the school. Beginning, therefore, at the regency of Athaliah, I elicited from the children such a clear and distinct narrative of the facts which occurred between that era and the captivity as would have done credit to a school of much higher pretension. I have no doubt but that the feeling of the Committee was that of entire satisfaction with their scholars—and they deserved it; still the examination itself was precisely of the same nature as I might have given them from the History of England.

“In the following year a Confirmation was held by the Bishop of ———, at ———, and it so happened that one of the best scholars from this very school came under my examination. She had been for some time a monitor, had been selected for an apprenticed teacher, had passed the Government examination satisfactorily, and had been disappointed of her office only because some of the alterations of the Committee of Council about the number of teachers had interfered with her claims; and thus it was that I found her at the age of seventeen, in service in my parish, and consequently one of my Catechumens.

“The examination now was not historical, but on those doctrinal points to build up which the history of the Bible, when put to its proper use, serves merely as a scaffolding; I was not surprised certainly at my Catechumen’s utter ignorance of all the doctrines of Christianity—those of the Incarnation and Atonement, no less than the more mysterious doctrines of Sacramental Grace and the Apostolical Succession—I had expected it; it was inevitable. The cause did not lie in the teaching of the schoolmistress—nominally a Churchwoman, but married to a Dissenter—but in the mutual jealousies of the Miscellaneous Committee which permitted such a state of things to be possible. I was not, therefore, surprised at this; but I was surprised at finding how utterly impossible it was for me to convey ideas of *doctrine* to my Catechumen. She had every advantage; she bore a good character, she was regular at Church, she was anxious (though she had no very clear notion why) to be a Communicant; her mistress was a sound Churchwoman, who assisted her to the utmost of her power, but the girl’s mind seemed incapable of comprehending or retaining one idea of the Unseen, or any one thing which depended exclusively on faith.

“I presented her at last to the Bishop, not by any means satisfied with

the present state of her mind, but trusting to the effect of the invisible operation, in a willing heart, of that Divine grace she was about to receive. Still I felt convinced, and feel convinced now, that, though belonging to the Church by habit, and custom, and association—in mind, and heart, and feelings, that girl was a Unitarian; she had no perception of revealed doctrines, from her having been led to regard every fact of Scripture in an historical light only; her very intellect had dwarfed and killed her faith. To a girl of inferior abilities, the effect, though it must have been injurious, might not have been so to the same degree, but the very circumstance of her having been one of the leading scholars of a leading school rendered her unconscious of her own deficiencies, and inapt to receive instruction. By means of her school, her own abilities were turned to her own spiritual disadvantage. The better the school, the higher the intellect, the more dangerous as to eternal salvation is the position of the scholar.

“My friends at —— will perhaps be angry with me for this; they are proud of their schools, and they have many reasons to be proud of them; had they been otherwise, they would have been of no use as an illustration in this controversy. They will say, too, that I am arguing from a single instance—that this is the exception. It may be so; I trust it is so. This is the only instance I have had to deal with, and I mention only what I have experienced; still the impression on my mind is that anything which interferes with the parochial system produces Unitarianism. There must be parties—all probably equally balanced, and all equally zealous—and the result is, first, quarrels; then indifferentism. In parishes, the teaching of the Parson, and the zeal of some leading individuals, will determine the general tone of the place; other parties may exist, but they will be subordinate. The parish will be High or Low Church, as the case may be; nor, comparatively speaking, does it greatly matter which it is. Many a Catechumen have I received from the latter, with whose spiritual condition I have had every reason to be satisfied. Catechumens like these require perhaps more teaching, because they have been acquainted with some only, and not all the Articles of the Christian faith; they are perhaps less steady, less trustworthy, fixed less firmly in their Church, but they do possess the leading elements of all religion—faith, zeal, earnestness—and upon this it is easy to build the superstructure.”

But it is not easy to build it on a knowledge of Scriptural history, nor upon a knowledge of scriptural morality. The Sermon on the Mount itself—that summary and essence of all Christian duty—if taught as Mr. Entwisle recommends or allows, disjoined from the doctrines of revealed religion, would be taught without authority—would be taught as the Scribes teach—would become mere human doctrine. Divine and holy as it is in reality, in the mind of the learner it would become humanized and desecrated.

It is far easier to build upon ignorance than upon such a foundation as this, because this system of Biblical teaching has already produced in the mind a system of religion corresponding to it—a teaching devoid of doctrine has already produced a Christianity devoid of doctrine—and that is Unitarianism; for, where doctrines have been ignored and placed in the back-ground in the school, there they must be degraded and placed in the back-ground in the mind of the scholar. You will have to unteach as well as to teach; to convert a schismatic, not merely to instruct a Catechumen. In proportion as such a school has advanced the intellectual element, in the same proportion it has debased the religious; in proportion as it has fitted the citizen to push his way in the world, in the same proportion it has unfitted the Christian to work out his salvation.

It is for this reason that all faithful Ministers of Christ's Church, be

their school of theology what it may, are bound by the vows of their Ordination to protest against any scheme, however promising it may appear, which, by interfering with the parochial system, by necessitating district Committees, by forcing those Committees to be Miscellaneous, by suppressing the doctrines of the Church of which they are the sworn servants, becomes the first step of a downward course, of which the inevitable end is Unitarianism.

ARTICLE V.

WE have been endeavouring hitherto to shew the effect which placing the government of schools in the hands of a Miscellaneous Committee must have on the faith of the rising generation, and the consequence of the peculiar course of education which necessarily results from it—that is to say, a course professedly Scriptural, and received by the pupils as Scriptural,—but in reality denuded of Scriptural doctrines. We have endeavoured to point out that the study of Scriptural History divested of its typical character, and the inculcation of spiritual morality divested of its Church doctrines, is not an education which though incomplete for the present leaves space for the introduction of the completing element, but is a system of education complete and perfect in itself—though based upon false principles—that it does not leave the child's mind like a sheet of blank paper open to receive any doctrinal impressions which may subsequently be presented to it, but that it has already produced in it a religion of its own,—a hard, reasoning, faithless substitute for true religion, which occupies and fills the mind, hardening and annealing the heart and the affections, and thus rendering the soul incapacitated for the reception of Christian teaching of any kind whatever; that it is, what Archdeacon Denison calls it, a sham and not a reality—a husk and not a kernel; that it is but the semblance of religion; but that, being the semblance, it occupies the place of, and in consequence excludes, religion itself.

We will now go one step further, and say that the necessarily miscellaneous character of the Committee—the bare fact that men of different forms of religious belief do associate for a religious purpose—must have precisely the same tendency on every member of that Committee which their united government will have on the children whom they educate. No set of men can agree to sink the differences of religious faith in others who do not end by involuntarily sinking them in themselves. The mind of each individual member, becoming accustomed to the maxims of expediency, becomes also blind to the principles of immutable truth. The faith which he may not profess, the doctrines which he may not urge, the arguments which he may not build upon, in the presence of his daily associates, lose their importance in his own eyes; his private faith follows the tenor of his public speeches, and he has already far advanced it into unconscious Unitarianism, before he is aware that he has even let go the first grounds of his religious hope. It is an admitted fact that familiarity with error in morals—that is, vice,—does in itself so dull the conscience that it opens the way to vice itself. Why is it unreasonable to suppose that precisely the same effect will result from familiarity with errors of faith?

If the Church of Christ be all the articles of the Christian faith collectively—that is, all the distinctive doctrines which Christ has given us—if Christianity be what St. Paul says it is—the “holding fast that form of sound words,”—the “keeping of that good thing committed to us:” if Unitarianism be the absence of those distinctive doctrines—that “form,”

that "good thing,"—then the doctrines of Expediency are the doctrines of Unitarianism,—that is to say, they ultimately lead to it,—because each individual step in Expediency is the letting go of somewhat of that form which we were commanded to hold fast—the losing of somewhat of that good thing which we were commanded to keep. Voluntarily to suppress one of the least of these our articles of faith is like voluntarily consenting to break one of the least of God's commandments. There may be no intention of going further in the individual who does so, but he who admits the principle is guilty of all.

The first preacher of Unitarianism in the Church of Geneva was Calvin himself. At the Reformation, the Church of England held fast by all the old principles of Christ's Church. Calvin constructed a new system on some of them, sinking the rest for the sake of expediency. Time rolls on; the Church of Christ remains unchanged, unchangeable; the Church of Calvin is Unitarian.

Had it in those days been charged against Calvin that he was then and there preaching Unitarian doctrines—that is to say, doctrines which, as an inevitable consequence, must lead to Unitarianism, he would have repelled the charge with the indignation of Hazael—"Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing and sin against the Lord?" and yet it is not the less true that the greatest part of Geneva is now Unitarian. Had the same charge been brought in our own days against Mr. Hugh Stowell, he would have repelled it with the same lively indignation, and yet it is not the less true that the words reported to have been uttered by him, on the 28th of August last, do contain the germ of Unitarianism, precisely in the same manner as the writings of Calvin contain it; they involve the sacrifice of eternal Church principles to the principles of present expediency; and this is the first step on that road in which Unitarianism is the last.

"It has been objected to myself (said Mr. Stowell); you are sacrificing Church principles at Manchester." I said in reply—"There is an antecedent question of far greater importance; are we sacrificing our Christian principles at Manchester? My first concern, as a Minister of Christ, is as to Christian principles; my next concern, as a Clergyman of the Church of England, is as to Church principles; and, when I find Church principles are in collision with Christian principles, I FLING THE FORMER ASIDE, and stand upon the latter."

Now, Mr. Stowell is not an unlearned man. Mr. Stowell, in his own mind, is perfectly aware that the Christian principles are the principles of Christ's Church, and the principles of Christ's Church are the Christian principles; he knows full well that, though there was a time in Christian history when there was no Bible, there was no time whatever when there was no Church; that the principles which he would fling aside, therefore, are the principles of Christ's Kingdom; that the Bible itself is one of them; that their foundation is on the Apostles and Prophets; that among them, according to St. Paul, are the doctrine of baptism, of laying on of hands, of the resurrection of the dead, of eternal judgment; that he is not permitted to choose among these eternal principles, and to determine which are and which are not suited to the exigences of the times,—which are or are not in collision with what he considers Christian principles.

Mr. Stowell is not a dishonest man, and yet he entered voluntarily into the service of the Church whose principles he sits in judgment upon; he once declared his unfeigned assent and consent to the Liturgy embodying those principles; he vowed, at his Ordination, to give his diligence, so to minister the Doctrine, and the Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and AS THIS CHURCH AND REALM HATH RECEIVED THE SAME; and yet, remembering all this, he can imagine a case in which Church principles can come into collision with Christian princi-

ples, and remaining, as he does, the sworn servant of the Church, can contemplate the possibility of flinging aside those particular principles, which at the most solemn moment of his life he promised "so to teach that the people committed to his charge may observe and keep the same."

We have been in the habit of regarding Mr. Stowell as a pious, honest, zealous, and conscientious man; and we have every reason to believe, from all we have heard of him, that he fully deserves the character; but he has associated himself, for religious purposes, with a Committee composed of Unitarians, Independents, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics; and to succeed in his plans he must adapt his speech and sentiments to them all—that is to say, in all the acts which he performs in union with these several parties, he must suppress all the doctrines and all the principles of Christ's Church which would militate against any one of them. How can this do otherwise than warp the judgment even of the most honest; how can a man habitually speak one thing in public, and think another in private? His lips and heart must eventually come together: that which he has spoken of lightly, he must think of lightly;—and this, too, is the effect of such associations on the pious, the honest, the zealous, the conscientious. What must be its effect, then, on those (and there are some such in all Committees) who are neither pious, zealous, nor conscientious? If we had no other ground of objection to this Miscellaneous Committee than this alone, this alone would be sufficient, that it has been able to induce such a man as Mr. Stowell to make such a speech as that ascribed to him on the 28th August.

No man, who has once deliberately broken through a command of the Bible, can hope to preserve his integrity on any condition short of retracing his steps; he who has once transgressed the Apostolic precept—"Mark them which cause divisions contrary to the doctrine which ye learned"—may be honest in his purpose, may be pious, may be conscientious as he will, but he has, by so doing, taken off the keen edge of his own conscience, and blunted his own faith, and blinded his own perception of duty; he may, therefore, not see the path along which he is leading his followers; he may, like Calvin, die before the consequences of his conduct be worked out; but he has been serving God against God's commandments, and he will find that, like Saul, he has been forcing himself to do sacrifice, through his own impatience and want of faith; like Jeroboam, he has been setting up the altars of expediency, or, like Mr. Stowell, he has been "casting Church principles to the winds."

And when those inevitable consequences shall have been worked out—when the Expediency of Jeroboam has borne fruit in the Idolatry of Ahab, where will that man be who, instead of avoiding those who caused divisions, consorted with them; who sank the differences which the Church of Christ had established; who removed his neighbour's spiritual landmark; who bartered his own faith for expediency, and made the blind go out of their way,—what will he have to plead that he be not rejected with Saul, and that his name be not written down in the Book of Judgment with that of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin.

To Wm. Entwisle, Esq.

SIR,—In avowing myself the author of those articles in the *English Churchman* which relate to the Manchester and Salford Education scheme, let me state plainly, in the first place, that I have never regarded you in the light of an opponent. In truth, and in fact, we are contending for the same object, only we are contending for it by different means. The point of contention between us is simply this—that those means which you consider safe and conducive to our common object, we consider dangerous, and certain eventually to disappoint it. The object itself we are both equally anxious to attain. If, therefore, in this controversy you should succeed in convincing us, or if we should succeed in convincing you: or, failing this, if you should discover that the points to which we attach so much importance are not points of importance to you—and if in consequence you should be induced to yield to prejudices, which you consider groundless, things which are to you immaterial, we are in fact not opponents but allies. In one sense we are allies already: the aim of both parties alike is to secure to the people a religious education.

However much I may differ with you as to the means to that end which you would employ, this does not in any way interfere with or diminish the very high respect which I entertain for you personally. You have addressed yourself boldly to the remedy of a crying evil; you have undertaken a task of extreme difficulty, complicated as the case has now become by reason of, and in punishment for, our sins of schism. Your task is one in which many have failed, and in which few would have the courage to engage.

But, Sir, let me add—it is a task of extreme responsibility also. If you succeed, your name will be recorded in the annals of your country among those of its greatest benefactors: but, on the other hand, if through you the Church of Christ should suffer wrong—if your act should prove eventually the means of introducing into it “false doctrine, heresy, and schism”—if this should be—I do not take it upon myself to pronounce *ex cathedra* that it is so—but, if it *should* be, you are adding to the sin of acting against the Mind of Christ the cumulative guilt of “teaching men so;” and, in such a case as this, we find no allowance made by our Blessed Saviour for our motives and intentions; be your motives as pure as they may, you will be “the least in the Kingdom of Heaven;” and if you “offend”—that is, place a stumbling-block in the way of “one of these little ones”—“it were better for you that a millstone were hanged about your neck, and you cast into the sea.” It is a fearful responsibility that you have incurred, and you would do well to examine carefully the grounds on which you undertake it. You may find them sound, no doubt; but still it is possible that they may fail you, and the penalty attending a failure is no light one.

You complain (both in your own letter and in the official document put forth by the Secretary of your Committee) that you are misrepresented. It is natural that you should consider yourselves misrepresented; aware as you are of the honesty of your own motives. Dazzled as not only you, but men invariably are, by the advantages of a favourite measure, —you overlook its defects; and when those defects are seized upon, and perhaps roughly handled—at all events, when a prominence is given them which they do not bear in your estimation—you conceive yourselves misrepresented: it is not so; we do not misrepresent you; we see a danger which you do not see, or which, if you do see it, you undervalue.

You complain, for instance, that we treat your exceptional cases of rate-

built schools as if they were the leading principle of your Bill. We are convinced that, from the operation of inevitable causes, they must eventually become the leading principle; and, until you can convince us that they will not, you must not be surprised if we treat your Bill, not as what you intend it to be, but as what, contrary to your intentions, we feel sure that it will become.

You complain, again, that we obstinately refuse to see the difference between a Miscellaneous Committee managing the funds of the school, and a Miscellaneous Committee managing its education. We do not see this difference. We are convinced, not only from reason and general experience, but from the actual advances made to a state of control by the Committee of Council, that "they who hold the purse govern the house." If this be our present conviction, till you have convinced us to the contrary, you must not complain that we misrepresent you when we say that you would put all Church Schools under the management of a Miscellaneous Committee. That you do not intend to do so, we admit; that you imagine you have guarded against it, we allow. We do not misrepresent you, only we are not satisfied with those guarantees which satisfy you; we think that the result will disappoint your own intentions.

Our reasons for coming to this conclusion, I have endeavoured to set forth in a series of articles in the *English Churchman*; but perhaps it will be necessary also to say a few words on the observations you have made upon them. These you have divided into five heads, which I will notice as they occur.

(1). Your first, however, I will, for the present, pass over, as it may be more satisfactorily answered when taken in conjunction with your fifth.

(2). In answer to my objection that the District Committee may make bye-laws and regulations, subject to the approval, not of the Parson nor of the Bishop, but of the Committee of Council, you say that clause 7, sec. 5, precludes "any interference, on their part, with the internal management, discipline, or instruction of any schools." This does not, in my mind, obviate the difficulty; I should object to all such power vested in a Miscellaneous Committee, because, whatever might be the theory of such bye-laws, they cannot be made to work practically without bringing those who make them into continual collision with the parties who are really responsible for the teaching and discipline of the school.

The very position you take up is in itself a contradiction in terms: if the power of making these bye-laws be "absolutely necessary," then it cannot be "a mere matter of form;" if it really be only "a mere matter of form," then it should be eliminated to avoid the possibility, not to say the probability, of abuse.

(3). You say that the District Committee has not the power of appointing teachers; you forget that they, who have the absolute power of approval or rejection, have virtually the power of appointment also, because they have the uncontrolled power of refusing all who are not of their own way of thinking on religious subjects. Whether this clause might be admitted if properly guarded, or might not, admits of a question. It is not so guarded at present, and at all events is in opposition to your own professions of non-interference with "the teaching of the schools," and "the matter and manner of education."

(4). You "state positively that the instructions do not contain any authority for the alteration of title-deeds at all." Whatever your object may be, surely the effect of a clause, "barring any Bill in Equity against the Trustees or Managers of any schools, for placing such schools in union with the District Committee," and "the power to settle a new scheme for the election of a Committee of Managers," is "an authority for the alteration of the title-deeds," whenever they interfere with the proposed scheme—and that is precisely what I state.

(5). You say that all appeals against the District Committee shall be made to the Committee of Council. How can there be an appeal against the District Committee, of any sort, if that District Committee have "no directing power" or "right of interference?" What should parties appeal about? This is, in itself, an admission of one very objectionable point.

I now come to those parts of your first and fifth observations, which, according to my judgment, touch upon the principal vice of the Bill. The action of the Privy Council on the Education of the Church is at present merely by sufferance—merely a matter of temporary arrangement—which we may agree with and profit by, or reject and repudiate, according as its requirements are, or not, such as we can conscientiously admit. Your Bill would make its control the law of the land; and with my own consent I will never place autocratic power in the hands of any irresponsible body whatever. That it may be made responsible to the House of Commons, which furnishes the supplies, is nothing to the purpose, with respect to Church education. Churchmen are citizens of a far higher country, and an assembly which shuts out no class of men, be their Creed what it may, excepting only the Ministers of Christ, can be no Court of Appeal as to the matter and manner of that education which Christ commanded those Ministers to teach to His own people. So far as the Church is concerned, the Committee of Council is autocratic and irresponsible.

I have had myself much correspondence with the Committee of Council, and I am happy to have this opportunity of testifying publicly my sense of the kindness and consideration with which I have invariably been treated by it, the attention it has always paid to my wishes, and the readiness with which it has always granted whatever was in its power to grant. Hitherto, the periodical visits of its Inspectors have been productive of unmixed good. I owe much to the suggestions of Archdeacon Allen, of Mr. Brookfield, and of Mr. Warburton, to all of whom I offer my best thanks. At this very time I am endeavouring to organize an industrial branch of the schools at Westbourne, after the draft of Mr. Moseley. I am under great obligations to the Committee of Council collectively as a body, and individually to its officers. Neither do I expect to be anything but benefitted by them during the course of my natural life and Ministry. But, with all this, I will not with my own consent admit a principle which may be visited on the heads of my successors.

A citizen of Christ's kingdom, I would resist the legal establishment of any autocratic irresponsible power whatever which might possibly infringe on the liberties of that kingdom, even though I expected that nothing but good would accrue to myself from it; and, when I say autocratic and irresponsible, I mean irresponsible to the Church of Christ and to its Parliaments: not irresponsible to an assembly of men who are not necessarily Churchmen, many of whom are not even nominal Churchmen, and which, under a very conceivable fluctuation of popular opinion, might not possess even a majority of Churchmen at all.

If you doubt the fact of that power being autocratic, I would refer you to the whole series of alterations and additions which one after another have been put forth by the Committee of Council at their own good pleasure. I would refer you to your own letter, where you so triumphantly remark that I must be wrong in imagining the possibility of a Dissenting Inspector over Church schools, because the Committee of Council appoints none but Clergymen; and would ask you what means you have of making good your own assertion? What guarantee can you give us that the Committee of Council will not cancel this quasi agreement? A mere Order in Council would give it the full power of doing so, and send us Lay or even Dissenting Inspectors next year. What power has the Committee of Council itself to guarantee its own engagements in the case of a change of Ministers?

That it is not your wish or intention to give to the Church Dissenting Inspectors I admit. That we cannot have them as long as the present regulations remain unchanged in the Committee of Council I am ready to agree with Mr. Richson, whose very able pamphlet has just been placed in my hands. I will go a step further, and confess that I see no present likelihood of such an infliction. But I am not satisfied in basing the Church's whole security, throughout the lapse of succeeding generations, upon a mere Order in Council, which the breath of one minister has made, and which the breath of another may sweep away. Your elephant does rest upon your tortoise, your tortoise does rest upon your stone: but your stone rests upon nothing.

While the system of education is carried on by grants from the Committee of Council, accompanied by certain conditions, be those conditions what they may, we have always in our own hands the power of shaking off the control by refusing its grants, if ever the requirements should become such as we cannot in conscience admit; and, under these circumstances we may feel pretty confident that no such requirements will ever be made. Once make it the law of the land, and we lose the check: the requirements become compulsory; the rate must be paid whether the use of it go against our conscience or not: no magistrate in England would, upon a plea of conscience, refuse a warrant for collecting it.

It is impossible, within the limits of a newspaper article, to answer fully your "Apology for a Churchman." Two observations only will I venture to make upon it. You are mistaken in imagining that there is any form of words sanctioned by the Church, in the training of its children, for the express purpose of teaching them "the points in which their own religious faith differs from that of their neighbour." The Church's teaching is entirely dogmatic; she is content with telling her children what is necessary for their own salvation, and ignores the existence of those who are without. It always has been so. You are in error in supposing that there was any time since the foundation of the Church in which there were no Creeds. "The Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" is in itself a creed. They were not indeed called by that name till some centuries afterwards: their scriptural appellation is "the Form of sound Words;" but the idea of a Christian without a creed is a contradiction in terms. Christian Truths and Christian Formularies are convertible expressions, and for this reason. Doctrines are abstract ideas, but they cannot be communicated except by words. Words must be authorized words—*i. e.*, "Forms of sound words, or Formularies." To teach Formularies, therefore, is to teach Doctrines: to forbid the teaching of Formularies is to forbid the teaching of Doctrines. To teach the Doctrines of Christ's Church, while we evade the Formulary in which the Church herself teaches them, is no doubt possible, but it is a proceeding so disingenuous and un-English that I feel certain I have not rightly understood your 22nd page, which seems to allude to such a proceeding. I am convinced that such an evasion would entirely fail on trial; Churchmen would call it Jesuitry, and Dissenters would reject it with contempt.

I am surprised at your asking so solemnly whether we consider the teacher bound to insist on dogmatic teaching, for the sake of his own conscience only, or as a matter of duty towards the children of the Church; or out of consideration for the conscience of the (Dissenting) child himself. Most distinctly, with Dissenters and their consciences we, the Ministers of Christ's Church, have nothing whatever to do; so long as they are Dissenters, their consciences are in their own exclusive keeping. They did belong to us at baptism, but they have chosen to withdraw themselves, and we heither have nor wish to have the power of retaining them against their will. If, for the sake of benefitting by the Church's teach-

ing, they should at any time be tempted, as you imagine they may, to simulate Churchmanship, and to conform outwardly to the Creeds and Catechism of the Church, we do not complain of the fraud practised against us; we leave them to the punishment due to hypocrisy in general; but with their consciences we have nothing to do; our concern is for ourselves, and for our own charge exclusively; and we will neither force our own conscience, nor endanger the salvation of our own children, for the sake of those who refuse our Ministry.

We believe, and are convinced, that the faith we hold is the unchanged and unchangeable faith delivered by Christ to His Apostles, and that the different articles of it are its necessary component parts. We do not admit of two Christian faiths; we judge none that do not believe as we believe, but we acknowledge for ourselves ONE FAITH, as well as One Lord, and One Baptism. We have indeed no special direction in the Bible for the conduct of our schools, inasmuch as schools did not then exist, but in every analogous situation we find that we are distinctly forbidden to associate with those who do not hold the articles of our faith: "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers;" "Ephraim is gone to his idols, let him alone;" "Mark them which cause divisions, contrary to the doctrine ye have learned, and avoid them;" "if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican;" "if any come to you, and bring not *this doctrine*, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his deeds." From these, and similar expressions, we conceive that we are forbidden to associate, or to permit those confided to our charge to associate, with Dissenters, as long as they continue Dissenters. The grievance is not that any one is "compelled to receive a formulary of faith from which he has been taught to dissent;" no one is compelled. The grievance is, that you would compel us to receive into our Society those with whom, as we conscientiously believe, the Bible forbids us to associate.

When you quote Archdeacon Denison's words, that "it is impious to admit a Dissenter into a Church-school without compelling him to learn his Catechism," you mistake his meaning.* We believe that it is impious for us to admit a Dissenter into our schools on any terms. We admit not the Dissenter, but the Penitent and the Convert; and this penitence and conversion he is at liberty to shew by subscribing to the Formularies of the Church. We are ready to admit all who come to us; but we may not admit them in their errors, because a far higher duty than any we owe to them is the duty we owe to our own Church children. You would feel a reluctance to associate, or to allow your children to associate with, persons defective in morals; and you would say that your reluctance was founded on the fear of the contagion of bad example. Precisely the same reluctance do we feel, and from the same cause too, in the case of persons defective in matters of faith. Our laxity in this respect is the parent of our schisms; they spring from that misdirected charity which is the characteristic of the present century, just as surely as by-gone intolerance may be traced to the misdirected zeal of other days. Look at that vast and multitudinous sea of vague, and aimless, and indefinite, and fluctuating schism, which is now overwhelming the Church of England, daily increasing, while it daily becomes more vague and more purposeless; why is it so different from the stern, self-denying, uncompromising-non-conformity of the 17th century? What is the cause of it all, but the benevolence of those who would be more charitable than Christ Himself; charitable to the schism as well as to the schismatic—to the sin as well as

* Archdeacon Denison has written to the *E. C.*, stating that these are not *his* words, but Mr. Entwisle's gloss upon his words.

to the sinner ;—who would enlarge the boundaries of their Master's Kingdom, by effacing its line of demarcation ; who would make the fold more capacious by breaking down its walls ; who would widen the road to Heaven by removing its landmarks. You call us bigoted and intolerant ; and if a firm determination to shew forth the whole truth, as we believe it to be—to let slip nothing of the faith entrusted to us—to uphold to the uttermost the laws and doctrines of our Master's Church, be bigotry and intolerance—we are so. That we are at this moment Christians and Churchmen, we owe to the bigotry of those who went before—the martyrs and confessors of the ancient Church,—and what from them we received unimpaired, unimpaired we will transmit to those who come after us.

I now state my case. I need not speak of this Bill as a local Act. You express your hope that, if passed, it will become general ; I fully believe that it will ; and I therefore treat it as if it were so already ;—taking it in this light, then, I say—

You put forward a scheme for the education of the nation ; Archdeacon Denison does the same. You declare that your own scheme, and that of the Archdeacon, are nearly identical. Mr. Birley affirms this more strongly and directly ; and the newspapers reiterate it in various forms.

On the contrary, the Archdeacon himself repudiates all identity ; he declares emphatically that, whereas your scheme implies education “mixed, general, undogmatic,”—the essentials of his are education “unmixed, particular, dogmatic.”

In almost every respect I hold with the Archdeacon, still I profess myself—

“Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.”

I am not Archdeacon Denison, and my sentiments are my own. My own opinion, therefore, is that there is certainly a general resemblance between the two schemes, but that there exist points of very material difference.

I do myself consider these points to be of such extreme magnitude and importance, that I cannot imagine the possibility of eliminating them without exhausting also the very pith and marrow of your Bill. Still, there is no reason why you, Sir, should not be able to see what I cannot see. There is no reason why you should attach to these points of difference the importance which I attach to them. You say that they are immaterial to the principle of the Bill ; I cannot see this myself, but there is no reason why you should not. I will state them concisely ; but, first, let me state distinctly the principle on which they all depend.

We, the Ministers of Christ's Church, claim, under the bequest of our Master, the religious education of that Church's children.

Under the prohibition of that Master, we refuse to associate, or to permit our charge to associate, with those who do not hold the Catholic faith pure and undefiled.

From these premises, we deduce our four objections to the principle of your Bill.

(1). We cannot permit any Committee, containing men who are not Churchmen, to control or regulate, directly or indirectly, either the matter or manner of Church Education ; and, though it is true that the preamble to your Bill does repudiate such interference, yet the context of the Bill itself does make it unavoidable, as I have shewn in the first article. more fully in a subsequent letter.

(2). We hold the wilful and deliberate suppression of Scriptural doctrine in the same light in which we hold the wilful and deliberate suppression of the Scripture ; we consider it a spurious imitation of Romanist teaching, quite as reprehensible, and not so honest. We, therefore, cannot but oppose a Bill which contains a clause to that effect, whether that clause be exceptional or essential. This I have shewn in article 2.

(3). We hold that our Blessed Saviour, previous to His Ascension, did give to us a definite "form of sound words"—and did command us to hold certain and distinctive articles—the *whole of which collectively* form the faith of His Church. Believing, as we do, that we still hold all these articles without addition or diminution, it follows that we must consider those who differ from us are not holding ALL the Articles of the Christian Faith, and, under this conviction, though ready to admit them *if they seek us*, we cannot admit them in the character of Dissenters, because we conceive that, by so doing, we should shake the faith and endanger the salvation of those children of Christ's Church who are committed, and who have committed themselves, to our charge. This I shew in the third and fourth articles.

(4). We conceive ourselves forbidden to associate, especially for religious purposes, with those who do not "hear the Church," and are not in communion with her; we conceive it not only dangerous to ourselves, and to our own faith to do so, but liable to produce in us that deadness to revealed and distinctive doctrine which ends in Unitarianism. This I have pointed out in the fourth and fifth articles.

To the Education rate—on which point, also, your plan differs from that of Archdeacon Denison—I do not object, as a matter of conscience; I object to it as involving, of necessity, the adoption of those points which I do consider matters of conscience. It is to these points, primarily, that I turn my attention; and I say that these four objections, which I have enumerated, do appear to me to be of the very greatest importance; you, on the other hand, pronounce them to be immaterial.

Now, what I require of you, Sir, is this—either

(1). That you declare openly that, when you asserted these differences between your plan and that of the Archdeacon to be immaterial, you had not sufficiently considered them; but that they are really of such intrinsic importance as to produce virtually an incompatibility between them. In which case I do admit that, respecting as I do your motives, and admiring as I do your energy, I should hold that it is the bounden duty of every faithful servant of Christ, whether Lay or Clerical, to do his utmost to oppose you.—Or else

(2). If, on consideration, you shall still pronounce that these differences are, in your opinion, immaterial, then I do call upon you, as a Christian man, to give them up. Think us what you will—bigotted, irrational, prejudiced—we may be all this, and more—we are not careful to deny it—but we are conscientious. This, bigotted and exclusive as it may be, is our faith; in this we live and die; and you, as a Christian man, have no right to force upon us what, in our conscience, we are convinced is treason to our Lord and to His Kingdom.

To Wm. Entwisle, Esq.

Yours faithfully,

HENRY NEWLAND.

SEVENTEEN ROMAN CATHOLIC NOVELTIES

AND ERRORS. Third Edition., enlarged and revised, in bold type, on a large sheet, with Ornamental Border, for Cottage Walls, &c. Price 1d., by post 2d., or 7s. per 100.

CHURCH EDUCATION THE ONLY EDUCATION

IN WHICH THE CLERGY MAY TAKE ANY PART. A Catechism for the Times. Price 1d., by post 2d.

PAROCHIAL WORK FOR CLERGY AND LAITY.

Under this heading, a SPECIAL DEPARTMENT has recently been added to the "ENGLISH CHURCHMAN," which it is confidently hoped will prove permanently useful and acceptable to all parties and classes of Church-people, and be one of the means, under God's blessing, of inducing many persons to devote, and of suggesting how they may beneficially employ, much more time, attention, and energy, in the real *Practical Working* of the Parochial system of the Church. It is quite evident that, without some very considerable additional and systematic efforts, the *immense work* of Christianising the masses of the people, and giving something more deep and practical than the mere nominal Christianity and Churchmanship which prevail among a large proportion of "those who call themselves Christians," will not only be left undone, but it will go on increasing most fearfully.

The discussions and controversies of late years have, doubtless, done much to clear the ground, and to interest many persons in religious subjects who would not have become interested by ordinary means; but our contentions have not only created suspicion and disunion, but have also drawn off much time, money, and energy from the *work*; and it is to be feared that, unless some special, prompt, and persevering measures, are taken to prevent it, the interest which many persons have taken in Church matters, will die away (if it has not already done so in many instances) as the heat and excitement of controversy abate, and give place to the more sober and difficult task of *carrying out into practice* the principles and duties for which they have been contending, and without which the controversy will have been a mere hollow mockery of God and man—a delusion and a snare—a sad waste of time and talents, and a fearful increase of responsibility; for, in that case, men and women who have, by their controversies, in public and in private, in word and in action, proclaimed that they "knew the Lord's will," will be found among those who "do it not."

Such "revivals" as that which has been going on among us are graciously designed to promote not only the glory of God, but the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people at large; and any plans or suggestions which have this for their object, and aim at inducing people of all classes to take a *practical* interest in such matters, will be thankfully received and published, *whether from Clergy or Laity—from "High Churchmen" or "Low Churchmen"*—provided they are not inconsistent with the principles and practices enjoined by the Church. *Inquiries* upon strictly practical subjects will also be inserted. Among the subjects upon which Practical Information is desired for this Department, with a view to promote these several objects, we may specify the following:—

- Increasing the attendance at Public Worship (especially of classes who now neglect it) and promoting reverent kneeling and responding.
- Increasing the Candidates for Confirmation, and Communicants.
- Promotion of Singing and Chanting, in Churches, Schools, and Families.
- Means of creating and sustaining an intelligent interest in the Church Services
- Occasional Offices, and Sermons.
- Expository and other "Lectures" in Church, on special subjects.
- Popular Lectures on Familiar subjects, and Readings from Newspapers, &c., with comments, in the School-room or other suitable place, for all classes, periodically.
- Means for promoting regular District Visiting, reading to the poor, teaching, and hearing children read (in School, or at their own houses, or at the houses of the Visitors.)
- Parochial Schools, School-books, rewards and punishments.
- Means for improving cleanliness, decency, and good order, in the houses of the poor.
- Lodging-houses for single men, especially in Agricultural Districts.
- Provision for the better employment and recreation of young persons of both sexes and all classes, in their leisure hours, so as to improve their own characters, and benefit their neighbours.
- Arrangement of classes and meetings for instruction in Parochial Work, and in the performance of religious duties.
- Garden Allotments, Spade-husbandry, Public Baths, Wash-houses, Nurseries, Clubs, Societies, &c.
- Copies of Documents, Rules, Plans, Circulars, Forms, Pastoral Addresses, and Details, relating to the practical working of Clergy and Laity in the foregoing matters, and in any others which tend to the *spiritual and temporal* welfare of the people, and to attach them to their Church, their Clergy, and their neighbours.

"English Churchman" Office, 159, Fleet Street, London.





