

more or less coarse. With all its faults the Church of England preserves among its members a spirit of reverence and gravity, and is a medium of refinement in religion. Cardinal Manning, for example, can still remember with affection the church of his native parish, and can recall with pleasure his early studies as an Anglican of Holy Writ. If this Church with its ministry were swept away, then, or what would in the long run come to pretty much the same thing, if it were cast for support upon a people unaccustomed to the voluntary sustenance of religion, a downward step would be taken, and an influence that, on the whole, and everything being considered and allowed for, tends rather towards what is good would be undermined. The way of infidelity would be made still broader at once, or those sects whose very existence depends on the coarseness and want of culture of their adherents would be strengthened for a time, until the march of civilisation made it no longer possible for them to retain their followers.—Certain arguments, nevertheless, that have been urged for the preservation of the Established Church do but betray the cause they advocate and bring out into relief the faults that distinguish this Church above all other sects. We find, for example, the very want of unity—that characteristic that is so distinguishing a note of the Church of Christ—the very one at sight of which the unbelieving world should be converted—we find, that great want pleaded by the Bishop of Durham the other day, as a reason for the maintenance of the Establishment. “The promoters of disestablishment would supply them with the best arguments,” he said. “They called themselves Liberationists, and, therefore, it must be assumed that their leading motive was liberation. But he would ask—what Church was more free already than the Church of England? What were the two tests of freedom? They surely were these—freedom of opinion and freedom of practical development. The Church of England enjoyed both of those to a very large extent, and he looked upon it as their glory so long as there was a loyal adherence to the main doctrines of Christianity and a loyal and practical obedience to the Church, and so long as there was a great latitude of opinion allowed. The Church was a great gainer from that freedom—from the existence of schools of thought—and for the reason that no man or school of men was perfect all round, and if they tried to expel one school of the Church, the Church must be impoverished to that extent. “But who shall distinguish as to those ‘main doctrines of Christianity,’ or decide as to those doctrines that are indifferent or unimportant? Well, indeed, does Allie write as follows:—“Has the Anglican communion any one consistent faith concerning the Catholic Church, and the sacramental system, which is in fact the applying of the Incarnation to the mystical Body of Christ and the souls which belong to it? Who will venture to say that it has, as a whole? I speak not of this or that party, Evangelical, Latitudinarian, or High Church, or the Oxford movement, within it; but does the Anglican Church as a whole deliver to men any belief as to where the Catholic Church at this moment is; whether the Roman is part of it or not; whether Presbyterianism in Scotland is a branch of it or not; whether it is infallible or not; whether if General Councils may err, the whole Church may err, and teach falsehood for God’s truth. Each individual in the Anglican Church will have his own answer, or none, upon these questions. Yet all repeat: ‘I believe one Holy Catholic Church.’ How can they believe what they do not know anything about?” and so, he goes on to say, it is with regard to Baptism, and the Blessed Eucharist, and Penance, and the Apostolical Succession. How, then, shall it be known by Anglicans what are the ‘main doctrines of Christianity’? Are those only main doctrines upon which all Anglicans agree—if any such there be—and is their agreement the test by which the importance of the doctrines is to be judged—Infallibility being in this agreement? Or how shall there be a “loyal and practical obedience” to a Church that allows a “great latitude of opinion,” and leaves every man to decide for himself? But still, perhaps, it should be easy to obey an authority that throws loose the reins, and lets a man wander as he will. Obedience, nevertheless, would seem to imply some sort of headship or control. But this Bishop seems to glory in his Church’s greatest shame, and to find in the subordination of God to Cæsar the reason for her continuance. On the influence of worldly affairs also on the changes and variations of his Churchmen’s teaching he places much stress. But these are spiritual guides of at least a doubtful nature. “The freedom of thought was to a great extent due to the fact that the Church was established. The Church secured that freedom in two ways. First, the broad ægis of the law was held over all parties, and the triumphant majority for the moment had no power to oppress the minority. Secondly, by the continued establishment the clergy were brought into contact with the mind of the nation, and were themselves put in harmony with the manifold and varied interests of the nation. These two facts were a most valuable guarantee against narrowness.” The thought of the Church regulated by the laws of the temporal power, and the teaching of the clergy coloured by the interests of the day. Here, indeed, is no Church chosen out of the world, but one of the earth earthy. “This is its origin,” writes Allie again “this is the principle on which it is built, the subjection of the spiritual power to the civil in spiritual things, in faith, and in dis-

cipline. *Humanam conati sunt facere ecclesiam.* They attempted and they have succeeded. . . . Let those who can put their trust in such a Church and such an Episcopate, those who can feel their souls safe in such a system, work in it, think for it, write for it, pray for it, and *trust their souls in it.* Nevertheless, as we have said, the downfall of the English Establishment would most probably, as things are, be a misfortune to the country—for, at least, whatever be its faults, and howsoever great its inconsistencies and confusions, even a “human Church” is to be preferred to the synagogue of Satan, by which it would be replaced.

DR. CROKE
CAUSES A
COMMOTION.

ARCHBISHOP Croke has utterly horrified the London *Spectator*. The *Spectator* wants to know to what the Church of Rome is coming at all, and to what depths of degradation especially it is destined to sink in Ireland. He says the Archbishop is convincing the heretical world that some prelates of the Church have renounced all connection with the teaching of the New Testament as to the respect due to the law. But that is a little thing, for if the heretical world has not from the first been fully persuaded that all prelates of the Church were altogether astray as to the whole teaching of the New Testament what right, we should like to know, has it to be a heretical world, or what excuse can it urge for its position? Let the *Spectator* however, speak for himself. He is alluding to the Archbishop’s addresses:—“The yare certainly pernicious to the moral welfare of the people, and instructive only in showing our heretical world how entirely some prelates of the Church of Rome in Ireland, have broken free from the principles and precepts of the New Testament on the subject of the respect due to the administration of the law. Even in that address at Kingstown in which Archbishop Croke poured out the first fruits of his communings with the head of the Church and declared *himself* by the way, not the Church, ‘unchanged and unchangeable,’ his advice to the people to avoid breaches of the law was put in this very sinister form. —‘You must be prepared not to put yourselves in the power,—in the power of what are called the friends of law and order.’—He cannot even recommend obedience to the law without telling an uneducated crowd that the representatives of law, and order, are only so ‘regarded,’ and by implication at least that they are perfectly at liberty to regard them as anything but friends to that cause. This is a broad hint from one who boasts that he is ‘unchanged and unchangeable’ as to the interior attitude of Irishmen towards the law, a hint which is certainly very unlikely indeed to promote that outward observance of law and order which he verbally enforces upon Irishmen.”—But those who are called the friends of law and order while they are engaged in carrying out the provisions of an unjust and brutal system of coercion may well be held up to the scorn and suspicion of the people, a grinding tyranny being no where sanctioned by the New Testament. As to the objection made that the Archbishop had spoken of himself, and not the Church as unchanged and unchangeable, he was hardly there for the purpose of teaching a Catholic people their Catechism. But there is worse to come. “Then within a few days,” our contemporary goes on to say, “at Fethard, Archbishop Croke receives another address from a religious confraternity,—the confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Jesus,—to which he replies:—‘If I were allowed to introduce anything profane into this matter, I should say that confraternities are the Land League of Heaven. Our National League was established here to break down the forces of a cruel and unjust monopoly amongst certain classes who dominated over this country for years, that is its object and aim. Our confraternities have a similar object and aim for heaven. The object of the National League is to fix the people happily on earth; the object of the confraternities is to give them life and glory in heaven.’” “It is hardly possible,” comments the *Spectator*, “to imagine violent politics dragged more completely by head and shoulders into the very heart of a religious subject than in this speech. We never heard before that there was supposed to be in the spiritual world a ‘cruel and unjust monopoly’ of the ‘life and glory of heaven.’”—Where then has our contemporary, the *Spectator*, been stopping his ears all these years—that is so far as the religious world is concerned? Has he not, indeed, heard of the “Lord’s elect”? or of those various sects that believe the Kingdom to belong to themselves alone? Do they not monopolise it, and cruelly as those whom they exclude may think? The *Spectator*, however, forces upon Dr. Croke’s words a meaning that the speaker did not intend to give them, and he fully explained the sense in which he made the comparison. But the *Spectator* is not particular as to exactness, when he deals with one who does justice to the Land League, nor is he himself anxious to avoid calumny and falsehood as is proved by his repeating the old unproven and unproveable accusations regarding the League. Here very respectable journalists and others have taken a license that must probably be allowed to them but only in virtue of the barefaced manner in which they lie, and will not refrain from lying. The true murder, however, is still to come, and all that the Archbishop has so far said is comparatively mere trifling: “But much the worst and most actively mischievous of Archbishop Croke’s addresses is that delivered at Banaha last week, in answer to