

World. quotes from an autograph letter among his papers written by Adam Clarke, L. L. D., and dated January 6th, 1821. It was addressed to the then Rector of Winwick, and is very instructing. In the course of this long and pleasant epistle, the justly esteemed Methodist commentator and preacher says: "I have a small request to make. Do not call me *Reverend*. That title I never could take, because to it I never had *right*. When I shall have Episcopal or Presbyterian ordination I shall not object to it. Neither of them I ever had; and the latter I am sure I never shall have. Lately, being obliged to take an oath in the court at Prescott, Mr. R.....had written "the Rev. A..... C....., L. L. D." I said: "I can conscientiously swear as Doctor of Laws, but as a *Reverend* I cannot, and will not"; nor would I take the oath till they had blotted this out. I can give this title as a right to every clergyman of the Established Church, to every Moravian minister, and to every Catholic priest, because they are *episcopally* ordained; and I give it by courtesy and custom to Dissenting ministers, for they assume it. But as I have no other ordination but that which comes from God, I can neither affect nor take the title. I *revere* those to whom it of *right* belongs." An *assumed* title, says our contemporary's correspondent, "which is acknowledged merely as a matter of custom and courtesy, or from a desire not to offend, is surely irksome to him who gives, and worthless to him who receives."—*Church Eclectic.*

ENTHUSIASM FOR THE OLD TESTAMENT

From beyond the borders of the Catholic Church, there has recently been poured in upon us a body of criticism upon the Old Testament very important in its character, and which has been accepted, to some considerable extent, far too hurriedly, as I venture to think, by some truly excellent leaders of thought within the borders of our ancient Church who are respected by us all. As to that criticism I shall say very little indeed. It demands most thorough examination, and it is receiving it, and will receive it. There must be no panic respecting it, no blind abuse of it, no ignorant assault upon it; but certainly there must be no weak and hurried acceptance of it, and no rash or hasty giving up of one single point of the traditional view of the Old Testament Scriptures which the Church has so long rested upon. The last word has by no means been said in this controversy; far, far from it. And if we blindly and hurriedly accept the new theories which have come before us, we may live to be ashamed, indeed, of the rashness with which we have acted, and of the mischief which we may have done. Let us regard the newly proclaimed criticism with caution, with calmness, and with confidence that in the long run (by the guidance of that all-faithful Spirit which ever fills the Church of God) the Old Testament Scriptures will stand forth in truer glory and on a firmer foundation than ever in the past, and that God's real truth will greatly gain, and in no degree lose, by the searching scrutiny to which it is subjected. True faith demands of us this calm confidence. Let us keep as closely to the Divine Saviour's general teachings in this matter, as the limpet cleaves to the rock.

The divine and human Lord of Truth can never, no never, be in the wrong. He is 'the truth' itself, and 'to bear witness to the truth' He came into the world. Let, therefore, the Divine Saviour's teachings and general posture with regard to the Old Testament, be our

anchorage until the waves again are still. The Old Testament, so far as we know, was the Saviour's one book. The Old Testament was His spiritual food through life. The Old Testament was the witness to Himself to which He appealed, and in which He bids us trust. The fulfilment in Himself of that witness proves that there is Divine inspiration in that book. Twice even in His forty days of risen life He bore witness to this fact, once to two faithful souls alone, and then to His disciples together. In His direst temptations the Old Testament was our Lord's strength; in every controversy it was His final appeal. In His dying anguish it was in Old Testament language that He sought to express His unutterable woes. In His dying moment itself, it was in Old Testament language that He committed His soul to God. With regard to one most essential part of the Old Testament it was that He said 'Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law till all be fulfilled.' The Divine Saviour's whole spirit was impregnated with the Old Testament. It was for Him the word of the Invisible God. As truly as He, the personal Word, was divine, so truly did that personal Word see real divinity in the written Word. Let us be one with our Divine Lord and Teacher in this utter and absolute acceptance of the Old Testament Scriptures, and let us cleave firmly to Catholic truth in this matter. And whatever new discovery may at length be established as to the history and formation of the Old Testament, let us of this be sure, that in those ancient Scriptures 'Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' Come what will let us hold by this truth. And let us prove its truth in our own experience. Let us find for ourselves that there as well nigh as much of Christ's Gospel in the Old Testament as in the New; and how did it get there but by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? Let us prove for ourselves the Divineness of the spiritual truth which the Old Testament contains. Let us draw forth more than ever from the infinite stores of Heavenly teaching which are enshrined in it; teaching to which every fibre of the Christian spirit does so truly respond. And let us draw forth from these stores food most precious, not only for our own souls, but for the souls which are looking up to us for teaching.

And in this way may the present controversy bring benefit and blessing to us—viz, by leading us to deeper insight into the unspeakable treasure which in that Old Testament we possess. It is God Who has raised up, or has permitted to be raised up, these waves of new thought, and it is God Who will over-rule them, and turn them to His good purposes in due season. But let none be hasty and let none be rash. It may be years before the last word in this controversy will have been said. And I believe that when that last word is said it will be a good word, and a true word, though in a degree, perhaps, a new word; for just as God causes all things to work together for good to those who love Him and whom He loves, so has God always, and so will God always, make all things work together for good to the Word which He has inspired. But, in the meantime, let us hold fast by our Saviour's example. Let us cast our very weightiest anchors firmly into the soil of the Old Testament Scriptures as well as into that of the New, and then let us wait with confidence until clearer daylight comes, if such clearer light be needed. —Archdeacon Melville-Scott.

WHO BUILT THE CHURCH SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND?

THE Rev. H. Granville Dickson, Secretary of the Church Defence Association, Palace Chambers, Westminster, writes to the *Standard*:— It is not, of course, to be expected that at a Liberation Society's meeting anything like appreciation or acknowledgment of the great work

being done by the Church of England for the people of the country should be shown. A statement just made by Mr. Asquith is, however, so distinct, and at the same time so absolutely inaccurate, that I must crave permission to expose it.

The following is an extract from the report of Mr. Asquith's speech: 'Let them look at the state of things which prevailed under this sanction of the law in every rural parish in England. In those parishes they found schools which, in the majority of cases, were built and maintained by public money, and to which every mother and father in those parishes were practically compelled to send their offspring. It would naturally be supposed by an intelligent foreigner that those schools were managed, both as to the instruction of children, the appointment of teachers, and everything that concerned their administration and discipline, by the representatives of those who contributed the money to found and support them. But, in point of fact, they were managed by the parson of the parish, the minister and office of the State.'

What are the facts? Mr. Asquith states that the rural schools, 'in the majority of cases, were built and maintained by public money.' The rural schools, on the contrary, in the vast majority of cases, owe their existence to the liberality of Churchmen, and to nothing else. Two Royal Commissions have demonstrated this, and Vice-Presidents of the Council, one after another, both Liberal and Conservative, have testified to it. So recently as February 21st, 1890, Mr. Chamberlain, in a speech in the House of Commons, made the following statement, for which, as will be seen, he claimed the authority of Mr. Mundella: 'The right hon. member for Sheffield appealed to the patriotism of the managers of the Voluntary schools, and proposed that they should hand over their schools for public uses when the original purpose for which those schools had been erected should no longer exist. For his part, he did not think that the managers would do this. It was highly unlikely that in the majority of cases these schools, which his right hon. friend admitted had been built, as to three-fourths of the cost, at private expense—it was highly improbable that these schools, built for a particular purpose, would be handed over to anybody for a different purpose.'

Let me, however, give the actual figures. According to the evidence of the late Mr. Patrick Cumin before the last Royal Commission—The grants towards building Church of England schools from 1839 to 1882 amounted to 1,515,385*l.*, while Churchmen contributed during the same period 4,296,519*l.* Now, the total amount of contributions of Churchmen for the same purpose from 1811 (the year of the foundation of the National Society) to 1890 was no less than 13,116,000*l.* If, then, we take into account the annual State allowance of 20,000*l.* for Church and other schools from 1833, the year when Her Majesty's Government first became aware of its duty to elementary education, to 1839, and add these sums, making 120,000*l.* in all, to the 1,515,385*l.* which Mr. Cumin gave as the amount of building grants from 1839 to 1882, we find that, while Churchmen have raised more than thirteen millions for building schools, the State has found little more than a million and a half.

It must be remembered that the State made no grants for school building prior to 1833, nor has it done so since 1870, though grants promised in 1870 have been paid subsequently, the last of these being in the year 1882. I may add, since this also may be new to Mr. Asquith, that during the same period (1811-1890) Churchmen have contributed no less than 20,630,000*l.*, towards the maintenance of Church schools.

Seeing that under the new morality there is a tendency to claim these Church schools as national property, it may be well, apart from Mr. Asquith and the Liberation Society, that the figures which I have quoted, and which tell their own tale, should be weighed and borne in mind.