











## Review.

VERSES FOR 1851. London: George Bell, and Hatchard & Son. 1851.

This little volume, published in commemoration of the third Jubilee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, is edited by the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, who has executed his task in a very judicious manner. The "verses," are of various shades of merit: some of them exhibit poetical powers of no mean order, and as a whole they form a graceful tribute to the venerable Association whose labours they commemorate. There is something touching and sweet in the following stanzas from

## THE EMIGRANT'S CRY:

And let the Church that first did bless—  
The Mother of our youth—  
Go with us through the wilderness,  
And hold the lamp of truth.

And let her words, so sweet and strong,  
In the old measure flow,  
Lest we forget the cradle-song  
That lull'd us long ago.

Lest in the time that's far away,  
Estranged in heart and word,  
Your children, to our children, say,  
"Ye serve another Lord."

## THE ANGLICAN CRISIS.

(From the True Catholic.)

(Continued from our last.)

Throughout the whole conflict, there has been a mixture of elements: now the question of patronage has been most prominent, and now doctrinal questions. But the doctrinal questions have been too frequently those between the two erroneous systems on either side of the Church, and the contest for patronage has been in effect, whether the external episcopate should be possessed by the Pope, or by the civil authority. The conflict has thus been kept up, for the most part, between erroneous principles; and the distinguishing characteristic of the third crisis, is that the truth in both matters is more distinctly and prominently brought into view than on any former occasion.

In the first crisis, doctrinal matters were not very prominent, although they must, of necessity, have been in some degree mixed up with the other matters in dispute. The patronage of the Church was at that time the object most directly in view, and the origin of the struggle was rather more than doctrinal. When the higher patronage passed into the hands of the civil authority, and the inferior into those of individual laymen, a check was reserved in the hands of the clergy, to prevent the abuse of so dangerous a power. The nomination to the Episcopate was subject to the refusal of existing bishops to consecrate; and the nomination to such benefices as might be held by a priest, to the direct negative of the bishop of the diocese. But these checks were found to be practically of small value, more especially against the encroachments of the sovereign civil authority.

The emperors could always find bishops who would consecrate their nominees; and when they thought fit to interfere in the case of inferior benefices, their will was practically irresistible. When the western empire was divided among the barbarian kings, they assumed all the rights, real or pretended, of the emperors, only giving them a feudal character. They undertook to dispose of the bishoprics and other valuable benefices, by a sort of feudal investiture, giving possession of them by the symbols of the ring and staff. These symbols signified spiritual power and authority, and although the Church insisted that the persons who exercised such power and authority, should be duly ordained and consecrated, she was perhaps only able to do so by yielding, for the time, to the storm, and consecrating all whom the sovereigns designated for office. The emperors, who claimed a more direct succession from the old Roman empire, led the way; they were followed, not only by the kings, but by the great vassals who, without the royal title, exercised royal authority over great tracts of country. There was an universal combination, throughout western Europe, to dispose, absolutely, of the Church benefices. Even where as in the case of the see of Rome, there was no acknowledged patron, the neighbouring princes and great nobles found means, through their temporal power, to dictate who should succeed on every vacancy.

Political power is almost always used corruptly. In the hands of an irreligious and dissolute body of princes and nobles, always at war with each other, and always seeking to increase their own wealth and power, it could not be, that the benefices would be properly filled. The clergy became as corrupt as the patrons, from whose class, in fact, the higher clergy were recruited. Even in our own day in England, we see that it is regarded as a matter of course, that the son or brother of the patron should be presented to the vacant living, without much, if any, regard to his moral or spiritual qualifications. It is even not unusual for such persons to enter the ministry, with a single eye to the living which their position secures to them.—The same feelings or principles, if we may so term them, operated yet more powerfully in the middle ages upon the great men who wielded the more

important patronage, because they were surrounded by fewer checks, either internal or external. Direct simony, or the purchase and sale of promotion for a stipulated sum of money, was not by any means uncommon; while the disposition of Church preferment, for considerations virtually simoniacal, was the rule, not the exception. The disposal of a Church benefice to conciliate a rival, to secure the aid of a powerful man, to reward services, perhaps of a questionable nature, or even plainly criminal, or to strengthen the family interest, by elevating to a high and influential station one of its members, are all acts of a simoniacal character.—Yet such were the only motives by which patrons were governed in the eleventh century. Is the case very different in the nineteenth? But in the eleventh century the motives operated without any check. The consequence was an universal corruption of the clergy. The great evil of the age was simony, and it is a curious illustration of the extent to which it had grown, and of the deadness to its moral guilt, which its commonness has produced, even in the minds of those who most keenly felt the evil, that Gregory VI. actually purchased the bishopric of Rome, in order that he might be in a condition to put down simony. Nay he employed many years in accumulating a great sum of money, by means, which must often have been questionable, no doubt often sinful, sometimes it is probable even simoniacal, in order that he might be in a condition to make the purchase. Yet he was regarded as the head of the reforming party, and of the better clergy; and it was during his pontificate that the contest began, which has made so famous his great successor, Gregory VII.—Hildebrand was, in fact, the adviser of Gregory VI., in compliment to whom he assumed the name of Gregory, on his own accession to the papacy.

The great evil of the times, which excited the indignation and aroused the zeal of both the Gregories, was the corruption of the clergy. This had its origin in the abuse of patronage, by which it was also perpetuated. The only remedy, however, which seems to have occurred to any one, was a transfer of the whole patronage to the Bishop of Rome. The external episcopate was not to be abolished, but handed over to the Pope. This was the great error of the Churchmen during that crisis, but not the only one.

Irregularities in sexual matters have, in all ages been the besetting sins of the great, and were so rather in a greater degree than usual, during the middle ages. The evil extended to the dignified clergy; many of whom lived in open concubinage. Some of them, and many of those whom it is now the fashion to call the working clergy, were married and not a few even of the latter class imitated the licentiousness of their superiors. It has been supposed that the reforming party at Rome, conceived that the best remedy for this licentiousness was the introduction of a strict rule of celibacy. It is very possible that they fell into that mistake, conceiving that the proper and most effectual mode of weaning the clergy from their irregularities, would be to impress them with a notion of the necessity of their preserving a greater degree of purity than was required of the laity. But it is certain, that the marriage and concubinage of the clergy, both tended to increase the evil of simoniacal practices, by connecting the clergy more with the world, through the medium of children, for whom they were bound by the ties of legitimate or illegitimate affinity. It is probable, moreover, that a man of Hildebrand's genius saw the advantage which would be gained, to the whole body of the clergy, in their conflict with the secular power, by an universal celibacy, which would separate them from all ties, except those which bound them to their order. The celibacy of the clergy was then made the second object in the designed reformation.

It was found more easily attained than the other since the princes cared very little about it, the worldly clergy made no objection to a nominal celibacy; while they either secretly or openly, substituted concubinage for marriage, and the more religious lost much of the weight which properly belonged to their character, while they were contending for a personal privilege. They did however, maintain the contest for a great while; and there were still cases of married clergymen down to the period of the Reformation. But long before that period, they were placed in the position of violating the acknowledged law of the Church, and their own solemn vows; so that the cause was really lost.

On the right of patronage, however, a determined resistance was maintained by the whole laity of western Europe, which produced a sort of compromise, in which the popes left the nomination of bishops virtually in the hands of the princes, retaining for themselves a negative. But with respect to the inferior benefices, they betrayed their allies: for they suffered the absolute negative, originally belonging to the bishop, to be changed into one, for which he, the bishop, must be prepared to assign reasons. Moreover, they never very formally ratified the compromise, and never abided by it when an opportunity occurred of obtaining advantages by violating it. From the eleventh century to the sixteenth, the history of the Church is the history of the endeavours of the popes to obtain for themselves the patronage of

the Church, and through its means the absolute government, both of the Church and of the world. The princes on their part, were not slack in endeavours to counteract their movements, and as a means of so doing, many of them showed an inclination to adhere to that body of doctrines which was least favourable to the independence of the Church. Matters were thus brought into a false position. The popes came to be the representatives of the independence of the Church, and of Church doctrine generally. This gave them a great advantage; and they were, upon the whole, during the middle ages, the champions of the better cause against the kings, who were decidedly in the wrong, since they struggled for the subjugation of the Church to their own power, and for the extinction of Church independence, and with it, of Church doctrine. Still, it is not possible to say that the clergy were in the right, since they had substituted for the idea of the independence of the Church, that of its dependence upon the pope, and had corrupted the true Church and Sacramental doctrine, by the exaggeration of the physical element in religion.

This brings us to the Reformation, which differed from the first crisis, in that, the first crisis related primarily to the patronage or external episcopate, and only incidentally affected doctrine, while the Reformation was brought about, by the union of two distinct parties, carrying on two distinct movements, one relating to the patronage of the Church, the other to doctrine. Long before the commencement of what is known as the Great Reformation, there had been, in several parts of Europe, doctrinal movements. They were mostly towards extreme doctrines, and generally endeavoured to bring themselves into connexion with the opposition to the papal and clerical power.—The princes of the South of France lent themselves to a movement of this sort, in the case of the Albigenses; but the popes were able, by stirring up at once the bigotry and the ambition of the rest of France, to overwhelm them with ruin. In England, the house of Lancaster favoured the Lollards, so long as they were contented with a delegated power; but when they had usurped the throne, they were obliged to purchase the countenance of the popes by the persecution of the Lollards. In Germany the dissenters broke into rebellion against the ruling powers, and provoked a combination of Church and State against them. But the old quarrel between the popes and the princes was not at an end, and broke out again simultaneously with the great doctrinal movement of the sixteenth century.

The great doctrinal movement everywhere began among the inferior clergy. Its leaders were at once thrown into a position adverse to their ecclesiastical superiors; from whom they were to look for nothing but the most deadly hostility. In some of the Swiss republics, the governing powers, chosen by and from among the people, were not slow to join in a movement which furnished an excuse for confiscating the property of the Church, and ridding themselves of the only class of men, whose wealth and acknowledged rank overshadowed the democratic equality in which they rejoiced. In the neighbouring principality of Geneva, the people thought it a good opportunity of driving away their Prince Bishop, and founding a republic. In Germany and Scotland, and, in some degree, in France the nominal heads of the governments were struggling with their powerful subjects to retain or recover the power naturally belonging to their position. In all those countries, the nominally supreme authority reconciled itself to the pope in order to secure his aid; while in all of them, at least, a part of the nobility took the other side.

They were enabled to change the ground of the actual contest with the popes, for instead of claiming the mere patronage of the Church benefices, the reforming clergy consented to the extinction of the benefices themselves, and the appropriation of the property by which they were supported, to lay purposes. The pope, meanwhile, quietly arranged his difficulties with the princes who adhered to him, giving up the controversy about patronage, and only retaining a negative, which has, since the Reformation, been seldom used, except so far as to give trouble to, and extort concessions from, individual ecclesiastics, who had rendered themselves obnoxious to Rome. Where the Roman religion was suffered to retain the countenance of the government, the papal power submitted to great restrictions. In all the countries we have named, there was a severe struggle. In France it terminated in a compromise, which, while it strengthened the power of the crown in other respects, raised an *imperium in imperio*, in the shape of a Protestant aristocracy. The latter was, however, undermined by degrees, by the gradual seduction of powerful members, and the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, extinguished Protestantism in France for a time. In Scotland, the power of a double aristocracy, a lay one of birth and wealth, and a pseudo-ecclesiastical one of talent and zeal, was consolidated and the ancient royalty reduced to a mere shadow; the mere existence of which was perhaps only preserved by the union of the Scottish and English Crowns. Protestantism triumphed in doctrinal matters, and the power of the popes was entirely and forever extinguished. In Germany, what re-

mained of the Imperial power came to an end; but the Emperors secured a modification of the papal in their hereditary dominions; while the princes of the North of Germany established a virtual independence of the Imperial authority, and seized on the wealth of the Church in their own domains.

But it was in England that those occurrences took place, which were most important, both in themselves and in their relations to us. In that country the doctrinal movement met at first with no countenance from those in authority. All political power was there divided between the King and the Church. The ancient nobility had been nearly extinguished in the wars of the roses. The House of Commons had not as yet acquired any real power; in the House of Lords the clerical members were the majority. Henry VIII., in the beginning of his reign, courted the pope, because he perceived that an union with the clergy rendered him all powerful. But when the pope thwarted his personal inclinations, he discovered that the only rival to the royal power was that of the Church. He then conceived the idea of changing the rival into a convenient instrument of government, by seizing upon the external episcopate.—In this design, the pope, against whom he was personally irritated, was the great obstacle. He determined to break down the power of the pope, and succeeded. The scheme, however well conceived and successfully prosecuted, was, in one respect, a failure. The cupidity of the King and his courtiers was not contented with seizing the patronage of the Church, but to a very great extent, confiscated the whole of the property and abolished her great offices. Thus they broke down the power, not only of the pope, but of the English clergy. The latter was done in two ways, by diminishing their number in the House of Lords, and by subjugating them to the royal will. Had Henry been contented with seizing the patronage of the Church, and thus controlling the clerical majority in the House of Lords, he might through that majority, have governed, and the history of England would have been very different from what it has been. As it was, however, the House of Lords passed into the hands of the independent lay peers, who, in time, felt their independence; while the scattered wealth of the Church helped to build up an independent body of commoners.

It was not, however, during Henry's life, perceived that the lay peers had succeeded to the political power, and the new possessors of the Church property to much of the social influence of the ancient clergy. In his son's reign this appeared; and the doctrinal Reformation found protectors among them, the more readily that the claims of the pope were unfriendly to the new arrangement of property. It found, also, more honest friends among some of the clergy whom Henry's hostility to the pope had raised to stations of influence.

A doctrinal Reformation, the most sound and the most moderate which occurred anywhere was the consequence. Under the direction of Divine Providence, the true sacramental doctrine was preserved in England; although the external episcopate of the Crown was substituted for that of the pope.

The general effect of the Reformation, throughout Europe, was a reduction of the papal power, both by its entire destruction in many countries, and by the introduction of new checks where it was retained. The power of the pope had, at the period of its rise, been really preferable to that of the princes, not only in theory, but in practice. It had afterwards been abused to the consolidation of an erroneous doctrinal system, to the personal exaltation of the popes, and to the plunder of every country in Western Europe. Yet its existence seems to have been the Providential means of preserving the Church from a total corruption of morals. It is for this that we are indebted to Hildebrand; as we are to Luther for the destruction of that power which Hildebrand had raised up.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century, however, left ecclesiastical affairs in a very unsatisfactory state. The power of the external episcopate was chiefly in the hands of princes and laymen, the counterpoise of the papal authority removed in a great part of Europe, and greatly diminished in the remainder. Western Europe, long separated from the Eastern Church, had made no progress towards a re-union with her, and was now itself much divided in doctrinal questions. The two extreme parties, on these questions, have ever since been continually getting farther from each other, and from the truth, which they have left between them.

The true doctrine more or less mutilated, was preserved in the symbols and formularies of most of the Protestant communities, and through the merciful guidance of Divine Providence, perfect in those of the Church of England. But it was not long generally held by individuals, and in process of time, every where, even in England, it came to pass, that the doctrine practically held by the majority of the individual members of the Churches, was not that of the Churches of which they were, respectively, members. That class of errors, which underrates the physical element in religion,



