

nell, now Bishop of Bath and Wells and chancellor of England, did not seem desirous of the office. The monks of Canterbury gladly accepted it also, pleased that a Franciscan monk should be called upon to succeed a Dominican. The appointment pleased every one, for the mendicant orders at this time were very popular in England.

Peckham was duly consecrated and installed amid much splendor at Canterbury, and thus Friar John, the monk of poverty, found himself a spiritual peer, waited upon by the first lords of England.

Peckham was a strange mixture of pomposity and humility. He desired still to be called "Friar John," but he threatened to put under an interdict, a last and extreme punishment, any parish that would dare to receive the Archbishop of York in any form, except as one inferior to himself.

King Edward, who was not a man to be played with, soon found that the new archbishop was not a true-hearted Englishman, but in reality a devoted servant of the pope. Yet Peckham was an honest man and a good disciplinarian. He found many of the clergy and members of religious orders immoral and irregular in their lives. With these he was particularly severe, requiring of them very rigorous acts of penance. He bore heavily also upon the married clergy, of whom there were great numbers at this time in England.

In reading of the travels of "Friar John," as he moved from place to place, we get a strange picture of the customs of the period. The journeys were made on horseback, and the archbishop was attended by a retinue of between fifty and a hundred horsemen, who were held to be necessary for the safety of the party, in days when the highways and the forests were infested with robbers. Packs of hounds were brought also, and were used for hunting game, so as to aid in securing necessary subsistence. Blacksmiths, cooks, and people of many trades and callings, were among the extraordinary cavalcade. How times have changed since then, in these days of railroads, when an Archbishop of Canterbury, if he chooses, may travel with speed and safety unattended and alone!

The mendicant archbishop, by strict attention to the performance of his own duties, did not come into much conflict with the king. He, no doubt, had wisdom enough to see that it would not be wise for him to do so. Edward also, though a strong, determined man, had no desire to quarrel with his archbishop, for at heart he was truly religious, and took a deep interest in the progress of the Church within his own realm. In the year 1285 he was gladdened by seeing the completion of Westminster Abbey, a work which his father had commenced. He allowed, it is true, a cruel persecution of the Jews, and a final expulsion of them from England, but this may have been part of his religion, for the Jews,

as the crucifiers of the Saviour, were deemed worthy objects of cruelty and scorn. The archbishop aided the king in this and, no doubt, thought he was doing a good work in driving the enemies of our Lord from the kingdom.

It is more than probable that the honest friar, trained, as he had been, in quietude and peace, found his high position a trying one. The pope, the king, the Archbishop of York, the clergy, the Jews, all conspired to make his position no bed of roses, but from all he was at length released on the 8th of December, 1292, by the hand of death.

CHURCH EDUCATION.

EDUCATIONAL work is a direct fulfillment of our Lord's great missionary commission; for, to be worthy of the name, it must include the training of the spiritual no less than of the mental faculties.

So far, no satisfactory method of giving religious and secular instruction separately has been devised. Nor is any such method likely to be devised. For it is not probable that the separate education of faculties so intertwined as the mental and spiritual in man can ever be satisfactory. No greater problem than that of education faces English Christianity to-day. Both in this country and in England the question of religious or secular education, a question forced upon us by our unhappy divisions, is felt to be a vital one.

To the Church there can be but one answer to that question. Education, to be what it ought to be, to be such as will secure the well-being of future generations, must be religious. The bishops of the Church in the United States, in their Pastoral Letter of 1886, gave emphatic expression to their conviction of this. "The policy of the day on this subject," they said, "has lapsed into the perilous heresy of modern secularism—that these schools (the public schools of the country) can best do their proper work when giving no religious teaching whatever." And again: "It is not to be denied that we are confronted with tendencies in the training of the children of the Church and of the nation which indicate changes in the feeling and opinion of this generation as dangerous as they are profound, changes which strike at the Church's hold upon the loyalty and love of the children now being nurtured on her bosom, and threaten to inflict an invisible wound upon the moral interests of the nation."

A correspondent of the English *Guardian*, referring to the school system of America, from which the teaching of Christianity is practically excluded, writes: "It is of course very difficult to measure the moral results of such a system upon the community at large; but there are many who claim that the astonishing rate