

The Church Guardian

— EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: —

L. H. DAVIDSON, D.C.L., MONTREAL.

— ASSOCIATE EDITORS: —

REV. H. W. NYE, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean, Bedford, P.Q.; REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Address Correspondence and Communications to the Editor, P.O. Box 504. Exchanges to P.O. Box 1950. For Business announcements See page 14.

Special Notice.

SUBSCRIBERS IN ARREARS are respectfully requested to remit at their earliest convenience. The LABEL gives the date of expiration.

CALENDAR FOR OCTOBER.

- Oct. 5th—15th Sunday after Trinity.
 " 10th—16th Sunday after Trinity.
 " 17th—17th Sunday after Trinity.—*No-tice of St. Luke.*
 " 18th—St. LUKE Evangelist.
 " 24th—18th Sunday after Trinity.—*No-tice of St. Simon and St. Jude.*
 " 28th—St. SIMON and St. JUDE, A. & M.
 " 31st—19th Sunday after Trinity.—*No-tice of All Saints.*

PRAYER FOR UNITY.

O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace, give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice and whatever else may hinder us from godly union and concord: that, as there is but one Body and one Spirit, and one Hope of our calling: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A Word to Subscribers.

Many—far too many—of our subscribers are IN ARREAR: and we respectfully urge them to remit at once. We endeavor to carry on this work on a cash basis: and payment of subscriptions promptly in advance is necessary to enable us to do this. The weekly outlay in cash is heavy: and we must ask our friends not to add to our care and labor in this work for the Church, by delay in remitting the small annual subscription. We have learned that July and August are always "poor" months: but this should not continue through the year. With a subscription list rapidly increasing, if old subscribers will only pay up without necessitating further expenditure in commission to collectors, and will also not only continue themselves, but aid in securing additional subscribers, we will be able to improve the paper still more and make it worthy of the Church in Canada. Though we have received assurances from all quarters—(England, the U. S. and Canada) that the paper has improved immensely and much

satisfaction has been expressed, encouraging us to go on—we ourselves are not yet satisfied: but aim at making the CHURCH GUARDIAN a still greater power for good and for the up-building of the Church: but we cannot do this unless our subscribers will support us heartily and promptly. We have also suffered much loss through discontinuing of subscriptions without payment of arrears; and by unnecessary expense in renewed canvas after a year or two from date of first visit of our agent. Surely this should not be so in face of the unsolicited expressions of approval received from all parts of the Ecclesiastical Province. Why should Churchmen be less in earnest in supporting their Church paper than are dissenters? That they are so is undeniable.

MONASTICISM.

In the course of the debate which took place at the last meeting of the Provincial Synod, upon the motion touching Brotherhoods, a good deal, wise and unwise, was said. Some of the speakers, in the heat, probably, of the discussion, used expressions and made charges of a somewhat extravagant nature: one or more of them condemning the whole system and work of the Monks, and characterizing Monasticism as an "abomination," etc. There were found these on the floor of the Synod who repudiated such wholesale denunciations; and amongst them men who could not be accused of holding extreme views. A friend has supplied us since the meeting of Synod with the following striking extracts from a paper on "*The Early History of Mediæval Institutions*," by the Rev. Edwin Hatch, D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Dr. Hatch says:—

It is no doubt easy to frame an indictment against the clergy of any period, and not only against the clergy, but against any class of society, by raking together and presenting in one view all recorded instances of misconduct. But the inference of the low level of clerical life in the eighth century is drawn not from individual instances, but from the fact of repeated legislation. There are laws which are two explicit to refer to an imaginary state of things, and too frequently repeated to be explained by the hypothesis of a rare or transitory phenomenon—against clerks frequenting taverns, staying there until midnight, and tottering about the church from drunkenness while engaged in holy offices. Against this degradation of clerical life there came a profound and permanent reaction. That reaction came from Monasticism. The first impulse was given to it by the preaching of monks, in whom we may ourselves take an especial interest, inasmuch as they belonged to a great extent to our own islands: to the monasteries of Ireland and Scotland and the south of England. The impulse which they gave was chiefly that of their own example. The influence of that example worked silently for at least a century before it showed itself in the common life of the clergy. But gradually, and side by side with the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, which gave birth to the mediæval diocese and the mediæval parish, rose the institution of semi-monastic life for the clergy, which gave birth to the mediæval cathedral. The one and the other—for the one was the complement of the other, and both

were parts of a great ecclesiastical reformation—were brought about by the co-operation of Church and State, by the civil authority of the Frankish kings and the spiritual influence of the Bishop of Rome. They agreed in the policy of withdrawing the clergy from ordinary society, of setting before them the ideal which had been from time to time framed for them by general and local councils, and of imposing upon them a common rule of discipline.

This institution of the "canonical rule," or "common life" for the clergy, has had such wide ramifications, and fills so large a place in modern ecclesiastical systems, that it will probably be interesting to trace its beginnings and early developments. The first trace of it in legislation is in a decree of the Council of Vernon, 755. It was there enacted that clerks should live either in a monastery under monastic order, or under the control of the bishop under canonical order. In a capitulary of Pippin for his kingdom of Lombardy, in 782, the bishop was required to compel his clergy to live under "canonical" order; and if he failed to do this, the king's officer was to decline to treat them as clerks, and to put them on a level with other freemen in regard to liability to military service. That this penalty was an onerous one may be inferred from the number of persons who became clerks in order to escape it. The meaning of the term "canonical order" is more explicitly given a few years later in an enactment of Charles the Great at Aachen, which first requires presbyters and bishops to live "according to the canons," and then gives the following summary of what is required of those who live the canonical life:—"Let them not be permitted to wander out of doors, but let them live under complete ward, not given to filthy lucre, not fornicators, not thieves, not murderers, not ravishers, not litigious, not passionate, not puffed up, not drunkards, but chaste in heart and body, humble, modest, sober, kind, peaceful, sons of God, worthy of being promoted to holy orders, not living lives of luxury or fornication or other kinds of iniquity in the villages or homesteads adjoining a church, without control or discipline." * * * This was the first stage of legislation on the subject. It is obvious that, assuming the truth of the terrible indictment against the clergy which the last quoted enactment implies, such legislation was needed. It is also clear, from the repetition of such enactments, and from the instructions given to Imperial Commissioners to see them carried out, that Charles was thoroughly in earnest in this work of ecclesiastical reform.

The next stage of legislation was to provide the material conditions for living such a life. The theory was that in cities the Bishop and his clergy, and in country places the chief presbyter and the younger clergy should live together under the same roof. Where the Bishop's house was not large enough, another building was to be provided; but whether it were the Bishop's or another building, it was a "claustrum," or "cloister," a building kept under lock and key, with a common refectory, and above all, a common dormitory. In the third stage it was enacted that those who thus lived together, "according to the canons," and in a common building, should live by a common rule. Early in the history of the movement, about 760, a Frankish Bishop, Chrodegang, of Metz, had recast the monastic rule of St. Benedict into a form suitable for the conditions of clerical instead of monastic life. In a meeting held at Aachen in 818 or 817, Lewis the Pious adopted this rule, with some modifications and additions, and made the observance of it obligatory. In the original form of the rule, the Bishop and Archdeacon were mentioned as the administrative officers of the clergy who thus lived together; the conception was simply that of a Bishop's house, regulated by strict rules of life are observed, and the place of the Archdeacon is supplied by the "præpositus," or provost, an officer who might, no doubt, be the Arch-