

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

OCTOBER, 1834.

No. IV.

J. S. Alexander
ART. I.—*Guerike's Manual of Church History.**

THE rapidity with which this work was sold, is a sufficient proof that it was wanted. The German press teems, it is true, with valuable books in this department, nor are there wanting in that language convenient manuals for the use of students. But research is continually adding to the stock of knowledge; and the favourable change, which has occurred of late years, in the religious views of many, has created a necessity for a compendious work, which should not only furnish the results of recent investigation, but present them in a form consistent with evangelical belief. This task Professor Guerike has undertaken in the work to which we now invite the attention of our readers. He is *Professor Extraordinarius* of theology in the University of Halle, and is well known as a strenuous adherent to the creed of Luther, but at the same time as an humble and devoted Christian. Some of our readers may perhaps recollect him, as the author of a life of Francke, which was reviewed in a former volume of this work,† and from which the late lamented Rezeau Brown

* Handbuch der Allgemeinen kirchengeschichte. Von H. E. Ferd. Guerike. a. o. Professor der Theologie zu Halle. Halle, 1833. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1120.

† See Bib. Rep. for July 1830.

Richard D. Anderson

ART. VII.—*The Church Establishment of England.*

IN our last number, we exhibited to our readers, "THE CASE OF THE DISSENTERS," accompanied with a sketch of their history; we wish now to turn their attention to the nature of the union which subsists between church and state, in England; or to bring into view the prominent features of the church establishment which exists in that country. This will be necessary, in order to form an impartial judgment respecting the interesting question which is now so earnestly agitated in that enlightened and powerful nation, in regard to a separation between church and state.

As in our former article, we had the opportunity of presenting to the American public, the substance of a well written argument vindicating the claims of the Dissenters, from the pen of one of the estimable Dissenting ministers now on a tour of observation in this country; so now, we have it in our power to give notice of another discourse of a different kind, but intended to promote the same object, from the other of these highly respectable clergymen.* The design of this last mentioned pamphlet is, to convince the pious members of the Episcopal church of England, that the legal establishment of that church is exceedingly detrimental to its spiritual prosperity; and that they, above all others, ought to desire a complete dissolution of their connexion with the civil government. The writer also labours to convince them, that no reformation of the church can be expected, until its alliance with the state is dissolved. We hope to have room to give the substance of some of his forcible statements and reasonings, before we conclude. Our principal object in this article, however, is to furnish our readers with a concise but satisfactory view of the English church establishment; or to point out the nature of the alliance which subsists between the civil and ecclesiastical constitution in that country.

It is a remarkable fact, that in every country where Christianity has become the prevailing religion, it has been taken into union with the civil government, and has been established by law—its support being enforced by the power of the State—until the United States, upon becoming independent, determined to try the experiment of separating the civil and ecclesiastical governments; and of leaving religion to provide for itself. The

* Religious Reform of the Episcopal Communion impracticable, while it remains united with the State: An earnest appeal to pious members of the Established Church. By Rev. James Matheson, second edition, corrected.

reasons which induced Christians of former days to pursue the course which they did, are exceedingly obvious; and prior to the results which experience has brought forth, were plausible, and apparently conclusive. The church and state under the Mosaic dispensation were most intimately united. Indeed, they did not form two systems, but under the theocracy, were identical. From this scriptural example, it was confidently inferred, that when the rulers of any country became Christian, they ought to exercise the same care and government of the church, as did the kings of Judah and Israel, for it was not considered, that the theocracy ended with the destruction of the Jewish polity, and that Christ wisely ordained, that his kingdom should not be "of this world," or have any connexion with the civil authorities of the nations of the earth.

Again, when kings and emperors embraced Christianity, they felt it to be their duty to advance the kingdom of Christ, by all the means in their power, and as they could do much by suppressing idolatrous practices, and by affording support to the church, and comfortable subsistence to its ministers, they concluded that this was undoubtedly their duty, since kings as well as others, were bound to make the best of all the talents committed to them, for the glory of God, and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

The principle assumed in this reasoning is good: all men ought to promote the glory of God, by the advancement of Christ's cause. The fallacy of the argument consists in this, that the kingdom of the Redeemer will be benefitted by the exertion of civil authority in its defence and support. Partial good may, doubtless, be effected by the power of the magistrate, exerted for the propagation and support of religion; but the experience of ages has taught, that this union of the state with the church, this interference of the civil power in spiritual matters, has been the fruitful source of innumerable evils; and has had greater influence in corrupting the church of Christ, than all other causes combined. It is right for all men to exert their influence to promote religion, but that influence must be one suited to the pure and spiritual nature of religion; which cannot endure, without injury, the unhallowed association with worldly institutions. The civil magistrate may have meant well in taking religion into his embraces, but he was not aware that a plant so delicate would be crushed by such an intimate contact with a body so diverse from itself. Another reason for the universal practice among Christian nations, of uniting church and state, was, that in all countries, the Pagan religions were intimately incorporated with

the civil government ; so that, frequently, the highest civil and ecclesiastical offices were united in the same person.

Here, also, it is proper to remark, that this union of church and state never exhibited features of such deformity, as when the ecclesiastical power became predominant, and threatened to swallow up, or annihilate, all civil power, by the rise and extension of the Papal hierarchy. This system has furnished the completest example of unmixed tyranny, which has ever existed. But, happily, the exorbitant power of this ghostly dominion is exceedingly weakened ; and the whole fabric, notwithstanding all the exertions of its friends to prop it up, is tottering to its fall. Its ruin is clearly predicted, and the time of its overthrow draws near.

During the time in which the Popish hierarchy was at its highest pitch of power, the kingdoms of Europe could hardly be said to be in alliance with the church ; they were actually in a state of subjugation to the ecclesiastical power. But when the era of the blessed reformation arrived, those countries which renounced the authority of the Pope, considered it necessary to substitute something in the place of that dominion, which he, by his legates and emissaries had for ages been permitted to exercise : and the principles of religious liberty not having been understood, at that time, the Protestant kings and governments deemed it proper and necessary, to assume to themselves that authority over the church, which was now withdrawn from the Pope. Accordingly, as soon as Henry VIII. came to an open rupture with the court of Rome, he obtained from the parliament an act by which he was declared to be the head of the church ; that is, of the English church, both in matters temporal and spiritual. The intention was, that the same power and authority which the Pope of Rome had for so many ages exercised in the English church, should be transferred to the legitimate sovereign ; and, upon the accession of Elizabeth, the same headship over the church was asserted, and for a long period, it has been required of all persons receiving office, to take the oath of supremacy, in which the right of the sovereigns of England to be the head of the English church is asserted. This oath was peculiarly offensive to Papists, and also to Dissenters ; and, indeed, to all the Reformed churches. Calvin and Knox, particularly, exposed the absurdity of making *a woman*, who was incapable of any ecclesiastical office, the head of the church.

The extent of the king's prerogative, as it relates to the church, has been very differently understood by different jurists and divines. By some, it has been so explained, as to mean no more than a denial of all authority in the Pope or any foreign

power over the realm of Great Britain; or, in other words, a renunciation of all allegiance to the Pope, and an acknowledgment of subjection to the rightful sovereign of the country.

But the union of church and state in England, does not consist in this or that particular enactment; the civil government claims the right of legislating for the church in all matters whatever. The parliament could, at once, change the whole structure and polity of the church; for as the present establishment owes its existence to acts of parliament, so the same power which has established, is competent to annul. If there is any constitutional obstacle in the way of such legislation, it must be in the king's coronation-oath, in which he swears to maintain the church as established by law, and the Protestant succession. But this goes no further, than to prevent the introduction of Popery. Suppose the parliament should enact a law, (as was once done,) to establish presbytery instead of episcopacy, there is nothing to hinder this being done; and if instead of the thirty-nine Calvinistic articles, now established by law, the civil government should choose to establish the dogmas of Socinus or the dreams of Swedenborg, there exists no constitutional obstacle. The fact is, therefore, that, properly speaking, there is not in England any union between the church and state, but that the church is in complete subjection to the state. As a body, the church has no power whatever. If all her ministers should, to-morrow, be convinced that their whole system was antichristian, they could not alter a single article of religion without an act of parliament. Formerly, the ministers of the church were permitted to meet in Convocation; the dignitaries in one house and the common clergy in another; but they had no power to establish ecclesiastical laws; they could only suggest to the governing powers what they wished to be done. The chief object of their meeting, however, was to grant subsidies to the king; but as it was apprehended that they might aim at an increase of power, they have not been permitted to meet since 1717. Except, therefore, the idle privilege of the bishops sitting in the House of Lords, the church of England possesses no ecclesiastical power, whatever. She is the mere creature of the state; dependent for her very existence on the civil authorities. In this respect, the church of Scotland, which is governed by her own general assembly, is in a far preferable condition.

The declaration that the king is the head of the church is comparatively a matter of insignificance: it extends merely to the appointment to ecclesiastical offices; but the power of parliament over the church, which extends to its very being and constitu-

tion, is a tremendous usurpation of the rights of Jesus Christ, the King of Zion.

Having considered that part of the British constitution which makes the king the head of the church, and gives to parliament a complete control of all her concerns, we will now take a view of that part of the establishment which is properly ecclesiastical. The archbishops and bishops are called "the lords spiritual." Of the former, there are two, and of the latter, twenty-four.* All these have a seat and vote in the House of Peers; and this is said to be in virtue of certain ancient baronies which they held, or were supposed to hold. Prior to the dissolution of the monasteries, by Henry VIII., there were twenty-six abbots who also had a seat among the lords, upon the same principle as the bishops. Before the reformation, therefore, the spiritual lords were equal in number to the secular peers; but since the monasteries were dissolved, no persons of this description are admitted into parliament. When convened in parliament, the spiritual lords possess no peculiar privileges, as ecclesiastical persons. They never act as a distinct body; nor have they, in their character as bishops, any negative on the acts of parliament; but are considered in all respects as the other peers; deliberating and voting on every subject which comes before them, as individual members of the body. It is, however, customary for the bishops to take but little part in the discussions of the house, unless in cases where the interests of the church are supposed to be directly or indirectly concerned. Every bishop in the House of Lords might vote against any bill, yet if there was a majority without them in its favour, it would pass into a law and be as valid as if they all voted in favour of it. In fact, as members of the House of Peers, the bishops are in no respect distinguished from an equal number of lay-members.

The clergy, on account of their office, and that they may devote themselves exclusively to the duties of their sacred vocation, enjoy many immunities. They cannot be compelled to serve on a jury, or to accept any temporal office. During their attendance on divine service they are exempt from arrests in civil suits. They have also their disabilities. No clergyman can be a member of the House of Commons, or farm any lands, or keep a tavern or brew-house; or engage in any manner of trade.

The election of archbishops and bishops is nominally in the chapter of the cathedral connected with the diocese; and in very early times, Blackstone says, "election was the usual mode of

* Since the union with Ireland, four bishops from that country have been added; so that now twenty-eight bishops have a seat in the House of Peers; which, with the two archbishops, make the whole number of spiritual lords, thirty.

elevation to the episcopal chair, throughout all Christendom, and this was promiscuously performed by the laity as well as the clergy ;” but now, the right of appointing archbishops and bishops is in the hands of the king. Before the reformation, the Pope of Rome claimed the right of investiture to all ecclesiastical offices, and “Gregory VII. published a bull of excommunication against all princes who should dare to confer investitures, and against all prelates who should venture to receive them.” This was a bold step towards rendering the clergy entirely independent of the civil authority ; and long and eager contests were carried on for ages between the civil and Papal authority, in regard to this very matter. But when the Pope’s authority ceased in the realm of England, as has been shown, all the customary authority, exercised by him, was claimed by the king, as the legitimate head of the church.

An archbishop is the highest ecclesiastical dignitary in the church of England. To him appertains the oversight of the bishops within his province, as well as of the inferior clergy ; and he may, by his own authority, deprive them of office, for “notorious cause.” Besides this general superintendence, each of the archbishops has his own diocese, in which he exercises episcopal jurisdiction. Without the king’s writ, however, the archbishop cannot convene the clergy of his province. Appeals are received by him in person from the decisions of the bishops ; and from the episcopal courts of each diocese, to his archepiscopal court.

To the episcopal office, by the canons of the church, belongs the right of ordination exclusively, and also the power of confirmation. The bishop has also the right of visiting every part of his diocese, of rectifying abuses, and of administering censures. The bishop of a diocese has several courts under him, which are held by chancellors appointed by himself ; they must be skilled in ecclesiastical law ; as a security for which, they are required to have taken the degree of doctor of laws, in some university. A Dean and Chapter are the council of the bishop, to assist him with their advice, and to aid in managing the temporal concerns of the diocese. The name Dean, according to Blackstone, was derived from the circumstance, that originally they were superintendents of ten of the inferior clergy ; for when the other clergy were settled in the villages and country, these were retained to perform divine service in the cathedral, and had under them canons and prebendaries. Deans can be elected only by a writ from the king, called, *conge d’elire* ; the canons and prebendaries who make up the chapter, are sometimes appointed by the king ; sometimes by the bishop ; and sometimes by those

of their own order. The division of England into parishes, is placed by Camden as early as the beginning of the seventh century; but, according to other respectable authorities, this division did not take place until the twelfth century. The learned Selden is of opinion, that a medium between these two dates comes nearer to the truth than either of them.

In early times, there was no appropriation of tithes and other ecclesiastical dues to any particular church, but every man contributed to whatever priest or church he pleased; only it was necessary that he should contribute his due proportion somewhere; and if he made no appropriations himself, they were paid into the hands of the bishop, whose duty it was to distribute them among the clergy, and to other pious uses, according to his own discretion. As, however, Christianity spread, the lords began to build churches on their own land; and in order to have divine service regularly performed, obliged their tenants to appropriate their tithes to the officiating minister of the parish. The whole number of parishes in England and Wales is between ten and eleven thousand. Some of these, however, are very small and poor, only producing an ecclesiastical revenue of a few pounds: while others are very large, and the income amounts to several hundreds of pounds sterling. By the increase of population in some of the suburbs of London, there are parishes which contain more than thirty thousand souls. The clergyman who has full possession of all the rights of a parochial church, is called a parson, (*persona*), "because he is in himself," says Blackstone, "a body corporate." He is sometimes called the rector, "but the appellation, *parson*, is the most legal, most appropriate, and most honourable title, that a parish-priest can enjoy." It is evident, however, that this name is improperly applied to clergymen in this country. When parishes were first established, the tithes of the parish were distributed into four parts, one for the use of the bishop, another for maintaining the fabric, the third for the poor, and the fourth for the officiating minister. When the revenues of the bishop became ample from other sources, the division was into three parts only; but the heads of religious houses continued to get a large portion of these funds, diverted from their proper object, and appropriated to the abbeys; which were all lost to the church, when these institutions were suppressed.

The difference between a parson and vicar is, that the former has a complete right to all the ecclesiastical dues of the parish; whereas, the latter has generally some one above him, entitled to the best part of the profits. There are four things necessary to one's becoming a parson or vicar. These are, ordination, pre-

sentation, institution, and induction. Ordination must be by a bishop; presentation is made by the patron, to whom this right belongs. The bishop may refuse to receive a clergyman on certain accounts, but if an action be brought by the patron, he must assign the cause. Institution is the investiture of the person presented, with the spiritual charge of the parish; and induction is performed by a mandate from the bishop to the archdeacon, who usually issues a precept to another clergyman, to perform it. It is done, by giving the parson "corporal possession of the church, by some ceremony, such as holding the ring of the door, tolling the bell, or the like."

According to the laws of England, the rector or parson of a parish has a right to a tithe of all productive property. This law granting tithes to the clergy has been in force for more than a thousand years, in England. "Tithes are of three kinds, first *praedial*, as of the productions of the earth, corn, grass, hops, wood, &c. : secondly, *mixed*, as of wool, milk, pigs, &c. ; such things as are natural products, but nurtured by the care of man. Thirdly, *personal*, as of manual occupations, such as trades, fisheries, and such like." Of these last, only the tenth part of the clear gain is due. Every thing which yields an annual increase is subject to be tithed; but not that which belongs to the substance of the earth, as stone, chalk, lime, and the like. Nor is any tithe due for wild animals; but for all domestic animals and their wool or milk, tithes are due. The law requires, that tithes of the first and second sort, mentioned above, should be paid in kind.

However vexatious and impolitic the system of tithing may be, there is no injustice done by it to the landholder; for the right of the parson to his tithes is derived from the same source, as the right of the landlord to the soil. When a man buys land in England, he buys it subject to this incumbrance, and, of course, pays so much less for it; just as with us, when land is purchased, subject to a perpetual ground-rent.

We do not find that there is now, or ever has been, any tax laid upon the people for the support of the church. The clergy are supported entirely by church property and by tithes. All other fees are gratuitous. Now, it may be asked, since the right of the clergy to a tenth of the productions of the country, and to the avails of the property of the church, is held by the same tenure as any other property, what is the real connexion between the church and state? To which we answer, that this alliance, so far as it is capable of being defined, may be said to consist,

First, in the power of parliament to make ecclesiastical laws.

Secondly, in the constitutional right which the bishops have to a seat and vote in the British parliament.

Thirdly, in the supremacy which the king claims over the church, in virtue of which he has the right of appointing all bishops, &c.

Fourthly, patronage, or presentation, by the exercise of which, the right of the people to choose their own pastors is almost entirely taken away. According to the statement of the "APPEAL," herewith published, out of 10,891 parishes, only 64 retain the right of selecting their own ministers; and of the rest, only 3769 are in the hands of the church.

Fifthly, the Act of Uniformity was the greatest infringement of the religious liberties of the people. When Charles II. was restored to the throne of England, it was fully expected that religion would have been placed on such a footing, as that the establishment would comprehend, at least, all those who adopted the doctrines and discipline agreed upon by the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Indeed, this monarch had repeatedly and solemnly promised to the commissioners of the Presbyterians, who were sent to negotiate with him at Breda, and other places, that he would comply with all their wishes, as it related to religion. But after his restoration, although he parleyed with them for a while, and still held out a prospect of a scheme of the church, which would comprehend them; yet, in the end, he broke all his engagements, and gave his sanction to an act, by which more than 2000 of the most able and evangelical ministers in England were deprived of their places. A more iniquitous law than this was never enacted; for while it cast upon the world, without the least provision for their support, so many godly ministers, there were scarcely any found to occupy their vacated places, who were comparable to them in qualifications for the office; and, indeed, many of the new incumbents were, both as it relates to moral character and intellectual furniture, entirely incompetent for the stations which they occupied.

The Act of Uniformity provided, that every minister before the feast of St. Bartholomew, 1662, should publicly declare his assent and consent to every thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer, on pain of being, *ipso facto*, deprived of his living. A motion was made in parliament to allow the ejected ministers one-fifth of the profits of their livings; which was not carried. The declaration mentioned above was not only required of every beneficed minister, but of every fellow of a college, and even of every school-master. By this act, all the ceremonies were reinstated, and no indulgence was given to the least non-conformity, in any respect. The upper house, who were less bigotted than

the lower, inserted a proviso, that the king might dispense with the surplice and the sign of the cross in baptism, but this was struck out by the commons.

Another high church principle, never before introduced, was adopted, in regard to re-ordination. "It had been usual," says Hallam, "from the very beginning of our reformation, to admit ministers ordained in foreign Protestant churches, to benefices in England. No re-ordination had ever been practised with respect to those who had received the imposition of hands, in a regular church; and hence it appears, that the church of England did not consider the ordination of presbyters invalid." But now the divine right of episcopacy was for the first time avowed; "a theory," says the same author, "naturally more agreeable to arrogant and dogmatic ecclesiastics than that of Cranmer, who saw no intrinsic difference between bishops and priests; or of Hooker, who thought ecclesiastical superiorities, like civil, subject to variation; or of Stillingfleet, who had lately pointed out the impossibility of ascertaining, beyond doubtful conjecture, the real constitution of the apostolical church, from the scanty, inconclusive testimonies, that either Scripture or antiquity furnish. It was, therefore, enacted in the statute for uniformity, that no person should hold any preferment, in England, without having received episcopal ordination."*

It was at first believed by the dominant party, that the Presbyterian clergy would submit very quietly to the law, when they found all their clamour unavailing; but when two thousand beneficed ministers at once resigned their livings, instead of extorting praise from their bigotted enemies, it rather inflamed their resentment.

Rumours of conspiracy were industriously circulated, and the government, instead of mitigating the act of uniformity, went on to add to the burdens of dissenters by fresh enactments. In the year 1664, a law was passed for the suppression of seditious conventicles, which inflicted on all persons, above the age of sixteen, present at any religious meeting in other manner than is allowed by the practice of the church of England, where five or more persons, besides the household, should be present, a penalty of three months imprisonment for the first offence, of six for the second, and seven years transportation for the third. This act was rigidly executed; insomuch that jails were filled, not only with ministers, but with the laity, who attended these meetings; and what rendered the hardship more grievous was, that by reason of the ambiguity of the words of the act, it was left to a sin-

* See Hallam's *Con. Hist. Eng.* v. ii. p. 404.

gle magistrate, commonly adverse to the dissenter, to give what construction he pleased.

But this conventicle-act was not all. Persecutors seldom retrace their steps. In the ensuing year, 1665, it was enacted, that all persons in holy orders who had not subscribed the act of uniformity, should swear, that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatever, to take arms against the king—and that they would not, at any time, endeavour any alteration of the government in church or state. Those who refused this oath were not only made incapable of teaching in schools, but prohibited from coming within five miles of any city, corporate town, or borough sending members to parliament. Hallam properly calls this “an infamous statute,” by which the Dissenting ministers were cut off from all those resources by which they might have acquired a comfortable subsistence; and involving principles utterly at war with that liberty which all Englishmen glory in as their birthright. The sufferings under these several acts were severe and of long continuance; but it does not fall within the compass of our plan to give any further account of them.

These laws remained in force, with the exception of the short indulgence granted by James the Second in favour to the Papists, in which, for the sake of appearances, the Dissenters were included, until the glorious era of the revolution in 1688. The acts already mentioned were directed expressly against the Dissenters; but they suffered also by some which were intended especially for the Papists; as for example, the test act.

But now, by the act of toleration, Dissenters were exempted from the penalties of existing statutes against separate conventicles, or absence from the established worship; provided they would take the oath of allegiance, subscribe the declaration against Popery, and the thirty-nine articles, with the exception of three, and a part of a fourth. Meeting-houses were required to be registered; and were protected from insult by a penalty. No part of this toleration is extended by the act to Papists, or to such as deny the Trinity. This was indeed a very meager measure of religious liberty; but the spirit of toleration began now to prevail. Some further attempts were made to comprehend the Presbyterian ministers in the church establishment, by making some alterations in the liturgy; and by saying nothing about re-ordination, but, as before, they utterly failed.

It will be remembered, that by the act of toleration, no more was done than to suspend the penalties of the acts against Dissenters, on certain conditions. These laws are not repealed to this day.

The “**EARNEST APPEAL**,” already named in the margin, dif-

fers from all other essays on this subject, that we have seen; inasmuch as its object is not to complain of the grievances and disabilities of Dissenters; but to demonstrate the many evils which arise out of the religious establishment to the church of England itself. Especially, the author attempts to prove, that as it relates to spiritual edification, church purity, and the facilities of doing good, the ministers and members of the establishment labour under peculiar disadvantages. Our readers will judge for themselves of the force and justice of the remarks contained in this pamphlet. To us they appear, to say the least, very plausible. But, perhaps, none of these writers have sufficiently and impartially considered the consequences which would result from a sudden dissolution of the religious establishment of a country which already contains within itself so many seeds of irreligion, fanaticism, and dissension. We are of opinion, that no evil whatever would arise from denying to the bishops a right to a seat in the House of Peers. It is, in fact, an invidious privilege, which is of no service to the church. The influence of the bishops in parliament is inconsiderable; and, as the peers are generally members of the church of England, there would be little danger of any acts which would militate against the church. If the right of patronage were also done away, and the privilege of electing their own pastors restored to the people, it would, as far as we can judge, be attended with no evil, but with many advantages. But if all the benefices which now support the clergy should at once be withdrawn, the consequences would probably be extremely ruinous, and we do not see how this could be done consistently with the acknowledged principles of law and justice. For, while a few would contribute to the support of the Gospel, a large majority, unaccustomed to the maintenance of their own religious teachers, would give no assistance. The churches would soon be deserted and shut up. Confusion, fanaticism, and infidelity would prevail to an awful degree. We confess, therefore, that we should be afraid to pull down at once a fabric which has been extending and deepening its foundations for ages, lest, in the crash of its fall, the bonds of civil society, with which the ecclesiastical establishment is so intimately combined, should be ruptured, and the whole structure be precipitated into remediless ruin. The events of the French revolution speak to us on this subject with a monitory voice.

There might, however, be a complete separation between the church and state, without depriving the church of England of its property and funds; except the tithes, for in regard to these, it is certain, that they must soon be given up. The popular feeling against the exaction of tithes is too strong to be long re-

sisted. Indeed the government have had it under profound consideration for some time, to substitute some other provision for the clergy, in the place of tithes.

But it is now time that we should pay more particular attention to the cogent reasonings of the author of the pamphlet which we mentioned in the commencement of this article. After an appropriate introduction, the writer proceeds to the consideration of the subject of patronage, and as a specimen of his style and spirit we will give an extract of some length from this part of the discourse.

“We shall, first, give a condensed view of the principal evils and dangers to which the religious interests of Diocesan Episcopacy are exposed, by its connexion with the state; and then endeavour to show, that the only security for the spiritual character of that denomination, is to be found in its release from the secularizing influence of the state alliance.

“Among the moral evils, which afflict the Episcopal communion, *patronage* may be considered as exposing its religious character to greater danger than almost any other. Even Churchmen who are not truly religious, admit this; and pious members of the establishment deeply lament what they see no means of curing.

“What is this evil? It is the legal right, which chancellors, bishops, nobility, gentry, and corporations possess, of presenting certain persons to the cure of souls, irrespective of the approbation or disapprobation of the people over whom they are placed. To this system may be traced nearly all the moral maladies of the established church. To this denial to the people of their inalienable rights, may be traced the abominations of pluralities—of non-residence—of extravagant incomes—and of miserable pittance! To this Episcopacy is indebted for sporting clergymen, in short, for thousands of blind leaders of the blind. We have no doubt, that had it been possible to restore to the people the power of choosing their own ministers, the church would, long ere this, have been placed in its legitimate position.

“How affecting is the consideration, that out of 10,891 livings in the National church, there are only sixty-four to which the people possess the right of appointing. Men of infidel principles—men who are ignorant of religion, and of the qualifications which religious teachers should possess—having livings in their gift, bestow them on relatives, or individuals recommended to them by some political or worldly consideration. There is reason to fear that this system has been the ruin of millions of immortal spirits; for men have been placed over thousands of

parishes, for generations past, who never, in their public discourses, directed their fellow-sinners to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." There is an indifference, a criminal indifference to this evil, on the part of the pious clergy and laity of the established church, quite unaccountable. No voice has been raised against a system of oppression and injustice, as much greater than that of nomination boroughs, as the things of eternity exceed in value and importance those of time. Many churchmen protested against the interference of the nobility and gentry in returning members to the House of Commons; they spurned at the idea of allowing individuals to usurp the privileges of the people, and their remonstrances were successful: yet the very same persons who were zealous and determined advocates for civil liberty, tolerate a system of nomineehip in the affairs of eternity without a murmur, without a protest.* How can we account for the fact, that the same noble lord, who has been deprived of the power of appointing representatives in Parliament for a particular place, should still be allowed, without remonstrance, to place over its inhabitants, as their religious teacher—as their guide to heaven—a man unknown to them, and ignorant of them; without their consent being sought or obtained—without even the courtesy of previously informing them what are his qualifications for discharging the duties of his office? Are the affairs to be transacted by the British Legislature, of greater importance than those which relate to eternity? Are pecuniary interests more dear to Churchmen than the interests of their immortal spirits? Is the liberty of choosing a member of Parliament more to be desired than the liberty of choosing a teacher of religion—a guide to them and to their children in the way to heaven? Is it more essential, to ascertain the qualifications and the principles of a candidate for Parliamentary honours, than to examine the qualifications, and to ascertain the principles of a minister of religion? Who will assert that pious members of the Church of England are better able to judge of political qualities, than of moral and religious character? Must we then

* Does not the following list show the necessity for urgent remonstrance on the part of the laity?

Livings in the gift of the Nobility and Gentry	5033
—————of the Church	3769
—————of 'the Government	1014
—————of the Universities	814
—————of Public Bodies	197
—————of the Inhabitants	64!!
	<hr/>
	10,891
	<hr/>

conclude, that all those Churchmen who were zealous in seeking a reform in Parliament, are unbelievers, or ignorant of the Gospel of Christ, caring nothing about their own salvation or that of their children? We dare not suppose this, for we know the contrary. This indifference among evangelical members of the Episcopal communion, appears, to our view, an ominous circumstance. We are not surprised, when men of the world—when mere formalists, succumb to the despotism of a patron, and raise no voice against *his* choice of a pastor for them. *They* feel no interest in the subject—they act as their fathers did—and they would indeed wonder at any resistance to the exercise of a power like this. Religion presents no aspect of importance to them, and if the regular services of their church are performed, they are perfectly content. From such churchmen, their communion can have no hope, as it regards, real, efficient, enlightened help, in the hour of danger; they form the dead weight in that denomination, and would soon bring it to ruin, were there not numerous real Christians, who preserve the body from entire debasement. But is it not matter of equal surprise and regret, that the better portion of that communion should allow this state of things to continue? They cannot but see the injurious and destructive effects produced by the law of patronage. They must know, that there are thousands of clergymen in their church, utterly unfit for the sacred duties of their office; and who, but for the present system, would never have occupied a station among the professed ministers of Christ. They must also know—for the thing is not done in a corner—that even in those parishes where faithful ministers are placed, there is no security that, when they die, men of similar views will succeed them. The very persons who, under God, owe their conversion to these devoted men—who have been brought together to attend to divine ordinances, so far as the system will allow—may, on the death of their pastors, have men of opposite sentiments placed over them. What remedy have these injured people? They must either consent to receive the instructions of a man who preaches another gospel, or must *leave* the church, and hear the truth in an unconsecrated building, except it happen that a neighbouring parish is blessed with a clergyman who preaches the Gospel. Grievous as the result may be, the patron has only exercised his legal right, a right which *human* laws have given him. In most cases, the people who love the truth, must seek a teacher *beyond* the pale of a church, which, by this antichristian law, robs them of the provisions of the Gospel. Is there a man in the Episcopal denomination, valuing the Gospel more than he values the forms and ceremonies of any church, that can say, these Christian peo-

ple do wrong in becoming Dissenters, in circumstances like these?

“How long will members of the church of England continue to despise their birthright as Englishmen, and their liberties as Christians;—to forget the just claims of God and of conscience, and yield unwarrantable subjection to secular laws in religious matters? They boast of their apostolic, primitive form of Christianity: but surely no denomination, in which the people are excluded from the choice of their pastors, can be either apostolic or primitive. We might, indeed, if necessary, rest the question at issue between the established church and Dissenters on this single point, as alone sufficient to justify separation; for while the Episcopal denomination submits to this law, it must, of necessity, remain a corrupt community. This is a subject which loudly demands immediate attention, for the present condition of the vast majority of their congregations is most affecting. But the existing state of things would have been much worse had not certain means been employed to counteract the evil. There has been, for more than forty years, a fund, supplied by the voluntary contributions of evangelical churchmen, by which young men of piety have been supported at the universities, and curacies or small livings afterwards obtained for them;—a circumstance to which ‘the church of England’ owes a great portion of the evangelical preachers to be found among its clergy.”

The next evil which the author mentions as weakening and endangering the Episcopal church, is “the indifference of the great mass of its nominal members to the spiritual character of their own communion.” “They may,” says he, “esteem themselves good churchmen, and despise others; but they have no desire to see their own denomination pure, zealous, and useful.” This state of indifference he traces to the same source, the influence of patronage, in appointing ministers who do not preach the Gospel. Hence multitudes remain in ignorance of the nature and importance of true religion. From early years they are taught to frequent the parish church, whatever be the doctrines preached there, and to shun all other places of worship, though the Gospel of Christ may be faithfully proclaimed in them. People of this description, he informs us, chiefly complain of those abuses which are of a secular nature; such as inequalities in the value of livings, pluralities, non-residence, and cathedral sinecures. “But no desire is expressed by this class of Episcopalian, that the religious character of their clergy should be of a more elevated kind; that errors and imperfections in their formularies should be corrected; or that the discipline of the New

Testament should be practised among their members.”—“If their clergy are merely not immoral, they boast of this negative character. High-toned piety—decided non-conformity to the world, are not generally expected, or even desired.” This state of things is traced by the author of the “Earnest Appeal” to the unfaithful preaching and worldly lives of anti-evangelical ministers. This indifference is also strengthened by the fact that the people have no voice or influence in the appointment of their ministers; and of course feel no interest in the concerns of the church.

“Among the dangers to which the church of England is exposed,” according to this author, “there is not one more alarming than the hostile attitude assumed by Dissenters towards the establishment.” On this subject, he observes, there exists much misconception among Episcopalians. By them Dissenters are considered as the enemies of their church, and as being leagued with infidels to accomplish this object. The author here distinguishes between *the church* and *the establishment*. For, while he acknowledges that they do seek the abolition of the parliamentary sanction by which the church is now supported, he denies that they seek the ruin of Episcopacy as a distinct and important denomination of the Protestant church. “We wonder,” says he, “that pious men can imagine, that the separation of episcopacy from the state is synonymous with its destruction.”

In answer to the question, why do Dissenters attack the established church, he says, “why does that church continue to inflict penalties on Dissenters, because they separate from its communion?” “The established church is by many of its supporters declared to be the only true church of Christ within these realms. Its three orders of clergy are declared to be apostolic; and those who believe in the equality of Christian ministers are accused of heresy. The prelates of that church lay claim to the dignity of being the successors of the apostles; assert that they only have a right to ordain men to the work of the ministry; and that no sacrament can be valid, no soul can be secure, out of the national Episcopal church; that all other ministers are only *pretenders* to holy orders; and that, whatever be their characters or attainments, they are *intruders*, false shepherds, heretical teachers, and illiterate men.”—“When our members are held up to the scorn and contempt of the nation by leading members of a religious denomination, which we believe to be the least spiritual of any in the land, is it wonderful that feelings of irritation should be produced?—We are, in fact, put on our defence by the lofty and exclusive pretensions of our accusers; and we should be acting unworthily, both as men and as Chris-

tians, if we did not, on proper occasions, and in a Christian spirit, show, that the haughty assumption of diocesan Episcopacy is unscriptural; and that the formularies of the established church contain many things opposed to Christian liberty, and to the word of God." The writer then goes on to observe, that if this religion was not sanctioned by the state, Dissenters would be much less disposed to make attacks upon it; but that its claims are such as cannot be granted by them, without being guilty of rebellion against Christ. He then proceeds in the following animated strain :

"When we see the great injury done to true religion, in our own country, and indirectly to the world, by the connexion between church and state; when we believe that the legislative establishment of a church, which acknowledges the king to be its head, is a direct interference with the prerogatives of Christ; when we see Christian liberty restrained, and civil liberty injured; when we behold multitudes of nominal churchmen without any suitable means of religious instruction being provided for them, though by a legal fiction this is supposed to be done for every parish in the kingdom; when we feel the injustice of the laws which still penally affect Dissenters, for acting according to the dictates of conscience; in short, when we can trace all these evils, and many more, to this connexion of a church with the state, what, we ask, is our duty? What would be the duty of Episcopalians, if they were placed in our circumstances, and held the same opinions respecting the nature of Christ's church, on the supposition that ours were to become the established church? Unquestionably it would then be *their* duty to seek a separation between our church and the state; but not to interfere with us, as a Christian denomination, in altering our forms or observances. This *is* now *our* duty, and as soon as this object is effected, we shall cease to have any controversy with diocesan Episcopacy as a denomination. Its high prelatival assumptions will then be comparatively disregarded, if they are not lowered, and all parties will have the privilege of going forward in their career of usefulness. The bitterness of party spirit, the irritation of mind, produced by the arrogant pretensions of a dominant sect, will be unknown; and harmony among all denominations may reasonably be expected. Our opposition, which, we repeat, is not to Episcopacy, but to its incorporation with the state, would then terminate. As a denomination, its own religious character and zeal would then have fair play, without injuring others; whereas, according to its present constitution, it cannot prosper, without treating others with injustice, and directly in-

terfering with that equality of civil privilege which ought to exist among Christian sects. Let not the nature of our hostility be mistaken. We unfeignedly love all that is unquestionably good in the Episcopal church—its great doctrines, and those of its members who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. We shall rejoice in its augmented zeal, purity, and success in the wide field of a yet partially enlightened world; and we are persuaded that the real safety, honour, and usefulness of that denomination, can only be secured by *separation from the state.*”

The demands of this writer, as well as the author of the “Case of the Dissenters,” are high and uncompromising; and they appear to represent a large portion of the English Dissenters. They no longer ask merely to have pluralities abolished, residence enforced, tithes commuted, bishops released from attendance in parliament—they will no longer be satisfied with exemption from penalties for non-conformity, and with the privilege of sending their sons to the two universities, of being buried in the public cemeteries, and having the marriages solemnized by their own ministers registered; but they insist on a complete separation of the Episcopal church from the state. They say, “We shall continue to seek this change, because it is just to others as well as ourselves; because the civil and religious liberties of our country can never be secure, while a prelatical hierarchy exercises authority in civil matters, and extends a baneful influence throughout the land: in short, because the interests of religion, both at home and abroad, are deeply injured by the present state of things. We must continue to seek this separation, because we are the servants of Jesus Christ, whose laws are violated, whose authority is usurped, and whose cause is retarded by the unholy alliance now subsisting.”

The next evil affecting the Episcopal church which this writer notices, is the *sectarian* spirit of the establishment. Her claims to a tolerant spirit he utterly denies, and alleges, that history proves that the dominant sect has always been, more or less, bigotted and injurious. He represents the church of England as more sectarian than the church of Scotland. “The latter acknowledges other Protestant churches; but the former refuses to hold communion with any other Protestant denomination; even the sister establishment of Scotland she repudiates as schismatic and anti-apostolic, while she opens her arms to the church of Rome! The ordination of the latter she counts valid, while that of Presbyters is rejected. It cannot, therefore, be expected, that Protestant Dissenters can be viewed as worthy to be admitted to her communion.”

Another evil which occasions great distress to many pious Episcopalians, is the total absence of discipline in their church. On this subject our author makes many forcible remarks; but as the fact is notorious and indefensible, we deem it unnecessary to enter into particulars.

The next evil, on which he remarks, is the *compulsory* mode by which the Episcopal church is supported; which he represents as "directly opposed to the rights of conscience, the great principles of justice, and the means prescribed by the Christian dispensation." Next, he combats the idea, entertained by many, that if the present plan of support were changed, and the voluntary system adopted, their church would fall. The result of such a measure would probably be disastrous for a time. It is proved by experience, in this country, that a people long compelled to contribute to the support of the Gospel, when this necessity is removed, and they are restored to perfect freedom, will generally do very little towards the support of the institutions of religion. A fair experiment of this kind was made in the state of Virginia, after the revolution; and the result has been, that the Gospel has not been supported; not only have not convenient houses of worship been erected, but most of those which existed, have been permitted to fall into irreparable ruin; and the wealthiest people pay nothing or very little towards the support of the Gospel, and among the poorer class, the opinion has been exceedingly prevalent, that it is wrong for ministers to receive salaries for their services. These facts, however, do not affect the principles which our author lays down. He says truly, "that the apostolic writers enforce on Christians the duty and privilege of giving temporal support to the ministers of the Gospel." If all were duly informed and rightly disposed in regard to this duty, there would be no difficulty; but when a community is only nominally Christian, and ardent in the pursuit of worldly gain, the obligation of this duty is feebly felt. He says again, "The Founder of the Christian religion has not given the civil power any right to demand from believers or unbelievers support for it." This, indeed, is the very hinge of the question, on both sides of which much might be said in the way of argument that is plausible; but it is a question which we have neither space nor inclination to discuss. His next principle is a fact highly deserving our profound consideration. It is, "That the churches of the New Testament flourished, though they voluntarily supported their own worship; or if in any case they received foreign aid, it was freely sent." It may be laid down as a reasonable expectation that sincere Christians will be disposed to support their ministers; but people are not generally pious in

any country. It may be expected, therefore, that a majority of merely secular men will neglect this duty. The question then is, whether, when the people of any country generally neglect to support competent teachers, it is the duty of the civil authority to provide for the maintenance of religion by law. An experiment is now in progress in these United States, in relation to religion, on which the eyes of all considerate men in Europe are turned. The result of this grand experiment it would be premature to announce. We, who are in the midst of it, and witnesses of its progress, are waiting for its further developement. We, of course, wish it complete success, but awful forebodings alternate with our most sanguine hopes; at any rate, we must go forward. To talk of a union of church and state in this country, where so many conflicting sects exist, and where religious liberty is mingled, as it were, with every breath of the people, is more than weakness—it is folly in the extreme. No such event can possibly take place, until the country undergoes a revolution greater than has been experienced on this side the Atlantic. It is, however, a mere watchword for designing politicians, or envious sectarians. No such idea, we are sure, is entertained by any Protestant denomination.

Our author takes up and answers, briefly, but forcibly, the arguments of Warburton in favour of an alliance between church and state; and shows, convincingly, that, at present, the church is completely at the disposal of the civil power; not only in its temporalities, but also in its spiritual condition. The Parliament may lessen or increase the number of bishops; may decrease the number of parishes and clergy; may remove its formularies, creeds, and canons; may abolish subscription; may require new oaths; may sit in judgment on the thirty-nine articles, and discard the creed of Athanasius. "What freedom of thought," he asks, "can exist in a community thus enthralled? Even divine truth is weakened, when it comes to men under the authority of an Act of Parliament. The Episcopal church ought, unquestionably, to have retained the power of altering and amending its own religious forms; for no civil government ought to be permitted to control or interfere with sacred institutions; and till this power is restored there can be no safety. But the state will not surrender it until the compact be entirely broken, and the church give up the patronage of the state, and her exclusive demands, for the sake of obtaining her religious liberties."

The last evil arising to the church from the establishment, mentioned by this writer, is her inability to fulfil the commands of Christ, with reference to the spread of the Gospel, at home and abroad. We are not much struck with the pertinence or

cogency of this consideration. Such, indeed, may be the arrangements and usages of the English church, that her ministers are trammelled in their benevolent exertions; but we see nothing to hinder the pious members of this church from entering into associations for the propagation of the Gospel. And is it not a fact, that many of her ministers are active and influential members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which has given so wonderful a diffusion to the word of God throughout the world? Some ministers of the establishment were also active and zealous founders or members of the London Missionary Society. But is it not also the fact, that societies of great energy and extensive benevolence exist in the bosom of the church of England, and consist entirely of her members, as the Society in Bartlett's buildings, of which most of the dignitaries of the church are members. The Church Missionary Society is also one of a more evangelical cast, and has manifested as much Christian enterprise, and has possessed as devoted Missionaries, as any other similar body. And if a king, or other rulers, were truly zealous for the spread of the Gospel, what is to hinder them from so exercising their power and employing their resources, as to facilitate the extension of the kingdom of the Redeemer? Is it not predicted that kings shall be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers, to the church? There is, however, little reason to expect any valuable aid from the "powers that be," in schemes for evangelizing the world. But there have been royal personages who esteemed it an honour to use their influence to advance the cause of Christ; and prophecy assures us, there will be such hereafter. It is earnestly to be desired and hoped, that civil authorities will learn to keep within their own proper sphere, and not dare to usurp authority in the kingdom of Christ, which must be governed by his own laws and his own officers; for it is not of this world, and abhors that carnal policy by which secular men, and ecclesiastical men also, often endeavour to govern the church.

We are rather surprised, that this respectable writer should enumerate it among the evils of the establishment, that one minister is not permitted to go and preach the Gospel in the parish of his neighbour. This, indeed, may sometimes hinder the doing good; but in every well regulated church, the preservation of order, and the prevention of endless dissensions, require such a rule.

The remainder of this pamphlet is taken up in considering the method by which these specified evils, and others of like kind, can be removed, and the dangers averted. The writer asks, "Is there any reasonable prospect, that when the expected plan of church reform is brought into operation, this will be accomplish-

ed?" He then endeavours to show, that any *religious* reform in the Episcopal church is impracticable while it remains in alliance with the state. He insists, that the only hope of pious Episcopalians is in a complete separation of their church from the state. "From these evils and dangers," he says, "the state will not and cannot deliver them, except by leaving Episcopacy free, and on a level with other Christian sects." He then proceeds to inquire, whether a reformation can reasonably be expected from the three branches of the legislature, the king, lords, and commons, but determines, for plausible reasons, which he assigns, that no relief can be expected from that quarter. He next endeavours to show, that the desired deliverance from these evils cannot be reasonably expected from the bishops and clergy; or finally from the laity of the established church; and comes to the same conclusion in regard to them all: that no reformation of a *religious*, or thorough kind, can be reasonably hoped for from any of these sources.

"The chief hope for Episcopacy, is in the religious character and principles of the pious clergy and laity. If they remain indifferent, or if they are satisfied with a defective reform; if they do not use means to free their church from the evils above named, even though a separation from the state should be the consequence, they will be answerable for the result. Let the pious clergy especially do their duty; let them openly and candidly state their convictions; let them seek a spiritual character for their church, and try to close the door against the entrance of mere hirelings; let them use means to restore the rights of the members of their communion; let them be the guides and leaders in seeking relief from the despotism of patronage; let them demand, as an essential part of their office, the liberty of keeping persons of known irreligious character from the Lord's Table; and the happiest results will ensue.

"Surely there rest with the pious laity of the establishment, responsibilities of no common order. If their conviction is, that their church greatly needs a *religious* reform, let them state their conviction to their ministers; let them candidly examine the questions, which at present agitate the Christian church, respecting the nature of Christ's kingdom, and let truth have free course. If they should discover, that their ministers are afraid to act up to their convictions, let them attempt to inspire them with moral courage. Let them, above all, seek to be guided, in their reform of Episcopacy, by the New Testament. 'If the laws of Christ are recognized, as authoritative in this matter, we do not fear the result. Either the Episcopal communion will be *religiously* reformed, or its spiritual members, lay and clerical,

will separate from it, and form a distinct Episcopal denomination. A separation from the state, by promoting religious reform, might prevent the necessity for the latter; which we are quite ready to allow, must be a painful alternative. Many cannot bear the thought of being compelled to separate from a church with which all their early associations are connected. They love their own forms, they prefer their own liturgy; nor can they see any other existing denomination, with which they could cordially associate. We would say to such persons—let your decision be the result of conviction; take no step but what the Word of God and conscience sanction; but, at the same time, be careful that proper means are used to understand the subject, to enlighten the judgment, and to instruct the conscience. Take nothing for granted: let not early habit and strong attachment overcome plain, commanded duty. Let no principle of *expediency* supersede the authority of Christ. Let no fancied hope of being more useful in the established church, even in its corrupt condition, than if separated from it, tempt the pious clergy to do evil that good may come. Let not the serious laity suppose that this matter should be left to their teachers. They form the strength of Episcopacy—it could not exist as a denomination without them; and every individual, holding communion with that church, is bound to think and act, in a question like this, as if all the success of the attempt depended upon his individual exertion. This is the *crisis* in the *religious* character of Episcopacy. If the reform, which is expected from the government, only touch secular evils, Episcopalians may rest assured that the power of the state will be greater than ever over their church. It will make patronage and other evils worse than before, for it will *confirm*, in the nineteenth century, the usurpations and errors of the sixteenth.

“In seeking a *religious* reform, Episcopalians alone should be urgent and persevering. Dissenters do not wish to interfere with any alterations they may think necessary in their forms or ceremonies. Something must be done immediately by Episcopalians to secure a better change than a mere plausible and inefficient reform. If they wait to see the effects of the ministerial change, we fear they will only add to evils, which are already almost too great for remedy. The nature of Christ’s kingdom will, ere long, be better understood by churchmen; they will be brought to the conclusion, that Christ is the only Head of the church. Already, a mighty advance has been made in the public mind on this subject; and it only requires the influence of good men, of all denominations, to secure Christian freedom for every section of the Christian church—freedom from state oppression, and liberty to obey all the commands of the Son of God.”