

devised by a Mrs. Bridget Bevan for the use of "the Welsh Circulating Charity Schools." These schools, with the assistance of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, were established by a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England, the Rev. Griffith Jones, Rector of Llandownor, and author of an exposition of the Church Catechism used as a text-book in them. Their primary object was to teach poor people—adults and children, to read the Bible, and to instruct them in the Church Catechism, in the responses of the Church Services, in the principles of the Christian Religion according to the Church of England, and generally in their duty to God and man. It cannot be said that the intentions of the donor are respected, if money bequeathed for the use of schools of this type is diverted to the support of education which is practically secular.

J. POWELL JONES.

ART. III.—ECCLESIOLOGY: ITS ROOT AND ITS FRUITS.

"IT appears to be a fixed law of the spiritual world, necessary in the established order of events, that man should pass a period of existence during which, by belief, he virtually realizes to his own convictions that better system of things on which he is subsequently to enter by sensible experience."¹ History, however, shows us most unmistakably that man in his unregenerate state has no desire to make faith in God the mainspring of his course of life. A longing for *sensible* experience in the present, led astray the people of Israel when they cried to Aaron, "Up, make us gods which shall go before us, for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him;" and the like sensible experience has been the bait which has allured men to set up that vast sacerdotal system which has turned faith into credulity, made the word spiritual a mere synonym for supernatural, and the term religious "a title which might not be given to parents and children, husbands and wives, men and women fulfilling faithfully and holily in the world the duties of their several stations, but only to those who had devised a self-chosen service for themselves."² To such persons, "the patient waiting for Christ" would be intolerable, and the idea of the Church being in her minority most distasteful.

¹ Prof. Archer Butler's Sermon on "The Expediency of Christ's Invisibility."

² "On the Study of Words," by Trench, p. 9.

They made a grand ideal to themselves, but it was of the earth earthy, and though decked out with Christian names and gorgeous attractions, its very hopes were diluted with ignorance and darkened with uncertainty.

That Ecclesiolatry, or Church worship, could gain the sway that it has done in the Christian world, shows how ready man is to prefer the experience of the senses to that of the spirit; and it would be interesting to trace in detail how the mischief has worked in all branches of Christian doctrine. It must suffice now, however, to draw attention to some of the serious social evils which "Church worship" has produced to the imperilling of the very foundations of society. As a necessary result of the materialistic sacramental teaching in this far-reaching system, there is an assumption of sacerdotal power by the priest, and he is raised to a position of dignity and authority, which is as dangerous to the common weal as it is to the spiritual life of the nation. In the palmiest days of Ecclesiolatry, our English Church Constitutions give a fearfully sad insight into the moral, or rather immoral, condition of the priesthood,¹ and yet to such men as these was entrusted the frightful and terrific weapon of excommunication. The frivolous manner in which even prelates wielded that weapon may be gathered from the following extracts from our public records and other documents.

In the Constitutions of Boniface (the Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Henry III.), it was stated that if any prelate be called by the King's letters before a secular jurisdiction to answer them upon any of the long list of matters set out in the Constitution—"We ordain by authority of this present council, that archbishops, bishops, and other prelates do not come when they are called for such spiritual matters, since no power is given to laymen to judge God's anointed." The bishops are directed to punish canonically any sheriff, bailiff, or official giving effect to a lay decree; "and if the king persist in his hardness," then the bishop who is particularly concerned is to "lay the cities, demesnes, boroughs, castles, and vills of the king himself under an ecclesiastical interdict;" and

¹ For example, in Archbishop Langton's Constitutions it is ordered, "Let not clergymen that are beneficed, or in Holy Orders, publicly keep concubines in their manses, or have public access to them with scandal, anywhere else." ("A Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws," &c., by J. Johnson, M.A., Vicar of Cranbrook, A.D. 1720, vol. ii. 1222-31). And Canon Liddon, in his sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral, on May 18, 1870, stated: "The experience of Christendom is distinctly unfavourable to any compulsory celibacy imposed on a world-wide order. Records preserved in the archives of this Cathedral, which refer to the clergy of the City of London during the century immediately preceding the Reformation, or, again the present condition of the clergy in South America or the Azores, supply evidence on this head, the force of which is irresistible."

if the king still repent not, "then let the archbishop and bishops lay their own dioceses under an ecclesiastical interdict."

The same kind of grasping authority over the laity and the jurisdiction of the Crown is frequently asserted throughout this Archbishop's Constitutions; and because the ecclesiastical proceedings against the Jews were often restrained by the lay courts, the Archbishop continues: "We ordain that such Jews be driven to make answer in such cases before a judge ecclesiastical, by being forbidden to traffic, contract, or converse with the faithful; and that they who forbid and obstruct, and that distress judges and others on this account, be coerced by the sentences of excommunication and interdict."¹ It would seem from this, that "Boycotting" is not an invention of the Irish Land League, but of prelates of the unreformed Church so far back at least as the year 1261. The ecclesiastical threats were levelled at the king when his uncomfortable position with the barons must have embarrassed him, and might have prevented energetic action on his part; but in the seventh year of his reign, on the occasion of some injunctions having been issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Lincoln, that no person should sell any victuals to the Jews, nor have any communication with them, the king ordered the sheriffs and mayors of Canterbury, Oxford, and Norwich to issue counter-injunctions, and to imprison any one who should refuse to supply the Jews with victuals or other necessaries of life.² Thirteen years later, the Bishop of London issued similar injunctions, which were at once countermanded by the king in a writ to the mayor and sheriffs of London.³

In the seventh year of the following reign (Edward I.) Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, ordained divers constitutions, and as to some which were in opposition to the laws of the realm, he was summoned before Parliament and obliged to submit to their revocation.⁴

It was in the same year that Archbishop Peckham quarrelled with the Archbishop of York as to precedence; and threatened to excommunicate every one in the province of Canterbury who should have any intercourse with the Archbishop of York, or supply him or his servants with the necessaries of life. He was obliged by the King and Parliament to revoke his threats.⁵

Again and again the struggle was renewed, and whenever the

¹ "Ecclesiastical Laws, Canons," &c., by John Johnson, M.A.; part ii. 1261.

² Claus 7, Hen. III. m. 29: Prynne, "Ecclesiastical Records," ii. p. 387.

³ Claus 20, Hen. III. m. 23: Prynne, ii. 476.

⁴ Claus 7, Ed. I. m. 1: Prynne, iii. 235.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Crown showed weakness, or was embarrassed by domestic or foreign difficulties, the ecclesiastical power strove again for the ascendancy.

Early in the reign of Henry VIII. the question whether an ecclesiastical decree could free the clergy from temporal punishment for criminal charges before the temporal judge, was formally argued in the case of the Abbot of Winchcombe, before the judges and temporal counsel of the Crown, in the presence of the King at Blackfriars. The matters were fully discussed. The Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop of York, protested to the king that the clergy were most loyal in their allegiance, but that they would not yield in this matter. The Chief Justice replied, and the King finally gave his decision :—

By the will of God I am King of England, and by ancient custom have no superior save God. I intend to maintain the rights of my crown as fully as any of my progenitors have done. You yourselves, of the spirituality act expressly against divers of the decrees, and interpret them according to your fancies. I will never consent to your desires.¹

The discourse on "True Obedience" by the noted Bishop Gardiner, published in 1536, with a commendatory preface by Bishop Bonner, is interesting, as showing the line of argument which was then taken, when a man of the position and learning of Gardiner came forward to support the Royal authority in matters ecclesiastical. It shall suffice to quote two passages. The Bishop argued against the distinction then attempted to be set up—

That the prince should govern in temporal matters, and the Church in spiritual : after the which distinction, the prince, as the moon which is called the lesser light, should have charge of such matters as are of the night, but the other, which be of the spirit and of the daylight, he must reserve to the sun alone to be discussed. Forsooth a blind distinction, and full of darkness.

Again, he says that—

The Church is not one-handed, nor cut off by the stumps, but that it consisteth perfectly whole, the same prince being as the head ; whose office is to take charge, not only of human matters, but much more of divine matters. . . . (and) "How often do we read that the causes of heresy have been debated before emperors and princes, and discussed by their trial ? If we will boulte out the ancient laws of the kings of England in times past, how many shall we find concerning religion and the Church, made, proclaimed, and bidden to be put in execution by the commandment and authority of those kings.

¹ "Keilway's Reports," 7 Hen. VIII. p. 180, &c.; and Burnet's "History of the Reformation," part I, book i.

We might have hoped that, in our Reformed Church, Ecclesiolatry and its attendant difficulties would have found no place; but just because the Church is, and always will be, imperfect on earth, we must expect that evils which spring from a low spiritual state, will appear in greater or less force when the Church's spiritual pulse beats so languidly that fancies, the outgrowth of false ideas of the supernatural, take the place of spiritual realities. When we read the Ritualistic manifestoes, we might imagine ourselves back again in the times of Boniface and Peckham. The latter no doubt carried their pretensions to an extent beyond that which is possible at the present day; but the arguments now advanced for ecclesiastical disobedience seem to have been borrowed from the Middle Ages.

In one particular the moderns suffer by comparison with the ancients, for their inconsistencies are more glaring. The moderns, with few exceptions, have voluntarily taken orders in the Church since the year 1833, when the old plan of making the ecclesiastical appeals to the King in Chancery was altered to that of making them to the King in Council. If they did not like such a mode of appeal, they should not have joined a Church where such was the rule, and even now they can relieve themselves by taking advantage of the Clerical Disabilities Act; but so long as they are members of the Church, the proper and Christian course is obedience to the law. Sir R. Peel, in March, 1841, well expressed such course, when, with reference to the endeavour made in Parliament for the release of *contumacious* Dissenters, who had been imprisoned by the Court of Arches for disobedience to its monitions in Church-rate questions, he declared—

The true and only safe principle to be, that while the law remained in force it must be obeyed. Alter the law if they pleased, but while it remained in force there would be a dissolution of the bonds of society, if upon the allegation of religious scruples individuals should presume to violate it.¹

Again, many of these moderns have been invested with the dignity of a parish priest, by virtue of powers derived only under the "uncanonical" Church Building Acts, and in direct opposition to the ancient Church laws as to the formation of new parishes, which prevent a bishop from licensing a clergyman to officiate in a parish without the consent of the incumbent. If they voluntarily accept uncanonical statutes to gain admission into benefices, how can they consistently repudiate similar statutes which regulate the Church Courts?

¹ Hansard, 57, p. 367.

Again, these moderns, who lose no opportunity of disparaging the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, were the first to appeal to it in matters ritual; and it would be well for them as they look at their crosses, credence tables, and variegated communion cloths, &c., to call to mind the indisputable fact that but for the Judicial Committee in the Liddell cases, all these articles of ritual furniture or ornament would be illegal. Even the late Bishop Philpotts decided against crosses and vases of flowers on the Sacramental Table as being illegal.

We gladly bring our remarks to a close, for Ecclesiolatry is a sign of a low ideal of Churchmanship, and to dwell at any length on such a subject is painful. It is refreshing to turn to the following incident in the Rev. Henry Martyn's Memoirs, as an illustration of that highly spiritual condition which our Church desires to see in her members, and which she forcibly strives to promote in the Ascension Day Collect, where the prayer is that we may ascend in heart and mind into the Heavens, and with our Lord *continually* dwell.

Very decidedly (it is stated of Martyn) did he differ in some important points from the Baptists. But it was with the sincerest grief that he heard, during his abode at Alden, of an order issued by the Government (though it afterwards proved that he was misinformed) to prevent their preaching and distributing tracts. So perplexed and excited was he by this intelligence that it even deprived him of sleep, and he spoke with so much vehemence against the measures of the Government, as, upon reflection, to afford him matter of self-condemnation. "I know not," he said, "what manner of spirit I am of. I fancy it is all zeal for God, but what a falsehood is this? . . . Did Jesus canvass the proceedings of Government in the spirit of one of this world? I pray to be preserved from ever falling into this snare again. . . . I trust I shall be able to distinguish between zeal and self-will. Let me never fancy I have zeal till my heart overflows with love to every human being."¹

B. A. HEYWOOD.

ART. IV.—PALESTINE AS A FIELD OF MISSIONS. .

AN inquiry into the position and prospects of Mission work in Palestine would probably be interesting to readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* at any time, but it must have a special interest at the present moment from the fact that the diocese is now without a bishop, and the Missions themselves are passing through a time of severe trial. The Holy Land being now one

¹ "Henry Martyn's Memoirs," by Sargent.