

THE REFORMATION.

By the Rev. A. J. MACDONALD, D.D.

THIS article is being written in a west country village where I am in sight of the Castle, the Church and the Priory. The Castle and the Church are still functioning as in mediæval times, but the Priory is a ruin. All this symbolizes the origin, course and result of the Reformation in England, and to a greater or less extent, according to circumstances, in other lands. In Scotland the cathedrals are in ruins as well as the abbeys, a significant fact indicating that the Scottish Reformation was more than a national revolt against foreign ecclesiastical domination ; that it was also a radical attack against the mediæval theory of local Church organization. The Scottish Reformation, like the Swiss and to a less extent the German, attacked the mediæval Church at both ends, it struck at papal administration at the centre, and at episcopal organization at the circumference. In England and Scandinavia the bishops were left untouched, and so the cathedrals were not gutted as north of the Tweed, but the English abbeys were ruined, because the monks were the militia of the Papacy.

In the middle of the sixteenth century the mediæval system of Church organization was a thousand years old. Before the time of Gregory the Great, it was by no means certain that the Church in Europe would become organized as a single hierarchy with the Papacy at the head. Indeed there were at least two periods in later centuries when the European authority of the Papacy was threatened by the civil power. Charles the Great at the beginning of the ninth century might well have set up in Germany a Church independent for all practical purposes of the Papacy. The theory and practice of the territorial Church, the *Eigenkirche*, of Teutonic tradition, might have become the model for the rest of feudal Europe. This was prevented by the coronation of Charles by Leo III as Roman Emperor on Christmas Day, A.D. 800. Again, when the Hildebrandine Papacy was attacked by the Franconian Emperors, the whole question of Church and State was discussed in favour of the secular view by over sixty civilian writers. If the imperial principles of the civilians of Ravenna had been successfully asserted against Gregory VII and Urban II, the kings of France and England would almost certainly have shaken off the ecclesiastical hegemony of the Papacy, and the Church in Germany, France and England, would have been organized, on what we should call to-day nationalist lines. The attitude of William the Conqueror and Lanfranc as well as that of Philip I of France to Gregory VII showed clearly what was practically possible. It was not that the western emperors and western kings sought to imitate the Caesaropapism of Justinian and his successors at Constantinople, by introducing

an ecclesiastical system which placed the head of the Church either at Rome, Rheims or Canterbury under orders from the monarch, even in doctrinal matters. Western monarchs of the Middle Ages dabbled little if at all in Church doctrine. What they resented, and in England with increasing intensity as the centuries proceeded, was the interference by a foreign authority with the legal and financial administration of the realm. The attitude of William II and Henry II in the disputes with Anselm and Becket revealed tendencies in English policy which were not uprooted when the English Church leaders, supported by the Papacy, secured Pyrrhic victories in those disputes. When England became the financial milch-cow of the Papacy in the time of Henry III, during the death-struggle of the Papacy with the later Hohenstaufen Emperors, and again in the reigns of the three Edwards, when the Avignonese sojourn of the Popes enabled English money to be used to equip the French kings against English arms, the attitude of Parliament, towards papal taxation and appointments to English benefices, by means of which the flow of English money to the papal coffers was facilitated, clearly showed that the day would come when an English king would have the support of Parliament in severing the connection of the English Church with the Papacy. All this lies behind Henry VIII's legislation in the Parliament of 1529-36.

A similar tendency caused the rise of Gallicanism, a spirit of national independence, in the French Church, assisted by the French monarchy. But in France the bishops played a much more definite part than in England. In mediæval Germany the bishops had been to the fore in the struggle with the Curia, but here the question turned on the dispute between Emperor and Pope, and not on the question of a German national Church. If the German bishops frequently took an independent line, it was generally upon questions of local and transient importance, and by the time the Reformation came, the quarrel between Pope and Emperor had long been settled in favour of the Pope. Yet, the question of finance remained, but there was no Parliament to take up that quarrel as in England, and the episcopate did not imitate the example of the Gallican Church of France.

Another feature in the mediæval dispute of the Papacy with the monarchs and governments of western Europe was the question of legal appeals to Rome. At a time when the interests of justice, and the maintenance of civil peace demanded increasing efficiency in the administration of the King's courts, efficiency and reform were both hindered by the practice by which appeals not only in specifically ecclesiastical suits, but also in suits which concerned property, finance and sometimes life itself, could be lodged at Rome. If Roman law had remained the sole legal code for western Europe a clear understanding, expressed in the form of a Concordat might have been arrived at between the Papacy and the civil authority in the different western lands. But on the one side the growing *corpus* of Canon Law, and on the other the prevalence of local national codes, Carolingian and Saxon, Norman and Lombard, accentuated the clash between the national courts of law and the appellate jurisdiction of the Papacy. The tension in England was especially acute, because Roman Law possessed little

influence here, and the development of English case or common law, and also of principles of equity, caused the papal legal interference to be more acutely resented than in countries where the Common Law was practically non-existent.

Of these two factors—finance and law—finance supplied the sharper irritant in the relations between the mediæval western governments and the Papacy, and finance was to play an even more dramatic part in the immediate causes of the Reformation. Mediæval economics had broken down. The manorial system, in which agriculture was organized, became obsolete, when the tilling of the fields was largely exchanged for sheep-farming, and the enclosure of small holdings in big estates, followed upon the great development of the woollen and cloth trades. Rents fell in value, and the owners of great estates found that the profits of sheep-farming were being absorbed by the new merchant class. Moreover, increased material wealth led, as always, to a fall in the value of money. This was repeated in later centuries when the gold of California, Australia and South Africa, sent up the price of corn. Where were King and magnates to find means to counter-balance the fall in the value of the currency? The Church lands offered an obvious source of relief. The obsolescence of the monastic system, and the secularization of monastic life, gave moral justification to the secularization of the abbey lands. The Church itself felt the same need of new sources of revenue, and although in England and Germany, the cathedrals and parish churches obtained little benefit from the redistribution of monastic property, the Papacy found its own means of replenishing its coffers.

The Papacy was faced by a double financial burden. Not only had money fallen in value, as well as become more difficult and expensive to collect, but the extensive building policy of the Renaissance popes increased enormously the demand for it. Hence the resort to the old mediæval system of indulgences. These had been sold since Crusading times, but then it was to finance the public policy of the Church. Now the system was developed and more widely applied in order to secure money for the private interests of the Popes—the rebuilding of Rome, the adornment of churches and palaces, and the maintenance of the luxurious lives of the Popes and cardinals. Tetzel's commercial travelling in Germany touched off the explosive tendencies in Luther's mind.

Another factor contributing to the complicated revolution which we call the Reformation was the quickening spirit of Nationalism. Yet this factor, like some others, must be appreciated with caution. For nearly five hundred years nationalism had been the practical expression of political organization in the greater part of western Europe. In theory Europe was organized as a political whole with the German Emperor at the head. But this was no more than theory—a dream, a figment which caused the internecine wars between Pope and Emperor, resulted in German resources being wasted by useless campaigns in Italy, and hindered the appearance of German national unity until the days of Bismarck. Indeed, Hitler is still struggling with the ill-effects of this ancient chimera. The Roman Empire was revived on Christmas Day

800, when Leo III placed the imperial crown on the head of Charlemagne, mainly in the interests of the Church, and especially of the Papacy. The Papacy had a claim upon the Eastern Emperors at Constantinople for support against the Lombards, or indeed against any other European depredator. As this was not forthcoming, the Curia created its own Emperor, in the West, on the theory of the old Roman Empire, of which the Byzantine Emperor was the effective heir. But the successors of Charles the Great, whether Salian, Saxon, Franconian, or Hohenstaufen Emperors, never became more than spectacular figure heads of the polity. Any attempt to interfere with the Kings of England or France would have resulted in the end of the western Empire long before Napoleon finished it off at Austerlitz in 1806.

To a superficial observer the conflict between Emperor and Pope fills the stage in the history of Europe in the Middle Ages, but careful students know that the central limb of mediæval history is the record of the gradual welding together of England and France on a larger, and of the Scandinavian kingdoms on a smaller scale, and of Spain and Portugal at a later date—all upon nationalist principles, and in pursuit of nationalist aspirations. It is true that the immediate causes of war between these territorial and ethnic groups were frequently dynastic rivalries and ambitions. Yet unless the quarrelling kings had been able to carry first of all the baronage, and then the yeomen and townsmen with them, there would have been no battles of Crecy and Agincourt, and no careers for Bayard and Du Guesclin. The dynastic wars of the western kings helped in the development of nationalism in western Europe. Growing divergencies of race—and we need not quarrel with Mr. Julian Huxley or Mr. Marion Crawford, provided they will allow for historical influences—the growing divergencies of language, and the fixed barrier of geography all contributed to foster the national spirit and idea, long before the sixteenth century dawned. Internally the process was carried on as the monarchy in western lands gradually overcame the centrifugal influence of the feudal baronage. Monarchy became the centre of national cohesion. The early rise and steady development of nationalism in mediæval Europe explains why England failed to implement the victories of Edward III and Henry V in France, why the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon were welded into modern Spain, and why, because the attention of German Emperors was deflected across the Alps, away from the national interests of Germany, that area of western Europe remained incohesive, the sport of Austrian, Spanish and French interference, as well as Italian, right down to the late nineteenth century.

Many text-books of history are content to enumerate the developing spirit of nationalism in the sixteenth century as one of the features or causes of the Reformation. No doubt that estimate is true, but it was only partially true. Nationalist tendencies were strong in France and Spain, but the Reformation failed to establish a footing in the former, and never properly got its toe across the threshold in the latter. On the contrary, in the original terrain of the Reformation—Germany—nationalism was weak. Yet undoubtedly the quickening of the rate in the national pulse in England, Scotland and Switzerland—if we may

in a general way apply the term to the steady republicans of that land—was largely responsible for the success of the Reformation in those areas—the causes of this we shall touch upon in a moment. In the meantime another factor, which has been too hastily appraised as a fundamental element in the rise of the nationalist spirit, and of which the Reformation was an expression, must be noticed. It has been too hastily assumed that the discovery of America, and the lifting and broadening of the European horizon, resulting from that enterprise, was one of the causes of the Reformation. But again this historical opinion must be accepted with reserve. Spain and Portugal benefited at first more largely than England by the fruits of naval and mining enterprise in the Americas, and yet no Reformation appeared in Spain. The discovery of America never affected Germany, the original home of the Reformation. If English independence and Nationalism were quickened, as no doubt they were, by the rapid absorption of the spirit of adventure, born of the discovery of America, yet this took place at a later stage of the English Reformation, in the reign of Elizabeth when the results of the Reformation were already won, and were being organized and conserved. Indeed it is an interesting historical speculation whether the Reformation might not have been hindered, if not entirely prevented in England, if the commercial results of the discovery of America, or more accurately the transference of Mexican and Peruvian silver to Europe, had begun on a large scale in the first, and not in the second half of the sixteenth century. The English King and magnates would not have been so strongly tempted to reimburse their depleted coffers by appropriating Church lands. Certainly in Spain, there was never any necessity to touch the treasures of the Church, while every year the galleons sailed, laden with riches, from Mexico and South America.

To return to our brief, in the sixteenth century on the secular side Nationalism was well organized in western Europe, and the glowing picture of a mediæval Roman Empire, so gaudily painted by Lord Bryce, had long been proved to be a mirage, the creation of excited, if hopeful, imagination. What the Western nations did feel as a straight-waistcoat to their development was the still existing mediæval hegemony of the Papacy, and against this reactionary hindrance the national spirit in Germany and England undoubtedly revolted. Here, of course, the secular difficulties, created by papal interference with law and finance, merge in the religious problem, which was the main question at issue, but it is sufficient at the moment to observe that during the Conciliar Movement in the first half of the fifteenth century, when an attempt was made by churchmen to reform the Church in head and members, the national tendency was so strong that the Councils of Pisa and Constance were organized for voting purposes on national lines. There were Italian and Spanish units as well as French and German in these councils. However, the Papacy was quick to make use of this national organization of the councils, and at Basle and Florence defeated the reform programme by bringing to an end voting by nations, and by packing the Italian delegation in order to outvote the rest. Moreover, national rivalries at this and earlier councils, helped to defeat the aims

of reform. But if nationalism was muffled in the councils, yet its assertion there was symptomatic, and it is not surprising that it asserted itself in the next century successfully in Germany and England in the teeth of the Papacy, when local interests in church affairs as well as secular administration were successfully asserted as of more importance than the central interests of the Roman Curia.

One other matter must have attention before we turn to a sketch of the religious and intellectual significance of the Reformation—I refer to the humanist movement, the so-called Renaissance. Now, it is patently clear that the Renaissance, by itself, could not have inspired the Reformation, and that, on the contrary the Reformation was very much more than a humanist movement. The chief centres of humanism were Italy and France, as Dr. Funck-Brentano has recently again reminded us, and the Reformation in Italy never secured more than a foothold ; and in France, in spite of Huguenot gallantry, it was finally suppressed, until quite modern times, to the limits of an obscure Protestant sect. In England the humanism of Colet and More hardly went further than the expression of a certain discontent, limited to certain individuals, with the life and teaching of the Church, and when the Reformation appeared here Sir Thomas More was found to be on the side of reaction. In Germany humanism certainly played a part in the development of men like Reuchlin and the knightly pamphleteer von Hutten, but the divine discontent which flamed up in Luther's heart was not originated by humanist studies. The strongest humanist influence in Germany was no doubt that of the Dutchman Erasmus, and Luther was never sure of him. Luther was never a Grecian in the humanist sense, although he learned Greek for the translation of the New Testament. He had been trained among the Augustinians as a schoolman, and a scholastic he largely remained to the end. Calvin in France in early life started out on a humanist career, and published a work on Seneca, but there was little humanism behind the *Institutes*, beyond knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, which formed his great literary contribution to the Reformation.

The chief humanist scholar to exert an influence upon the Reformation was Erasmus, whose Greek Testament work undoubtedly attracted the attention of students back to the primitive teaching of the Gospels, just as his zeal for S. Jerome, and other early writers quickened contemporary interest in patristic study. In later years Erasmus was a critic of the Reformation, though he never became an active opponent. Greek studies at Oxford and Cambridge, under Colet, Grocyn and Linacre, assisted by Erasmus at Cambridge, certainly laid the foundation for the acceptance of Luther's theological teaching, and at Cambridge a coterie of young Grecians who met at the White Horse Inn, near St. John's College, became known as "the Germans." But the sobriquet applied to them is significant. They were dubbed "Germans," that is to say Lutherans, and not Grecians or humanists. Although it is often contended that the Renaissance paved the way for the Reformation, and that the Reformation was no more than the theological expression or share of the Renaissance, that opinion cannot be accepted if it means that the Renaissance made the Reformation

inevitable. The fact remains that without the voice of Luther, and the constructive brain of Calvin, even the humanist work on the Greek Testament would have resulted in no more than an official edition of the Greek text issued at Rome, to take its place beside the Vulgate. About the age of thirty there appeared to be every reason to suppose that Erasmus would perform this task at Rome, under the aegis of the Cardinal of S. George. He was deflected by the invitation of Henry VIII to England in 1509. If this had been the story of the Greek New Testament in the sixteenth century, then its influence would have run to ground in the main stream of secular classical study which never succeeded in re-orientating human thought in Italy. In France a hundred thousand copies of Erasmus's Greek Testament were rapidly sold, yet the Reformation failed to establish a footing there. It appears to be a more credible conclusion that the leaders of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland made use of the humanist study of the original Greek and Hebrew writers of the Bible, in order to substantiate the new ideas which they were propagating, although their followers, especially in England, as the writings of Ridley and Cranmer, Latimer and Hooper show, were no doubt prepared for the Lutheran and Calvinist teaching by the new methods of Greek Testament study. This is a distinction which should be observed. Humanism, even when applied to the Bible text did not create the Reformation, but at the second stage, the work of Erasmus, Reuchlin and others, prepared the minds of readers of Luther's works for the reception of Reformation principles.

The influence of Erasmus was not confined to Greek Testament and patristic studies. His satirical writings, especially the *Praise of Folly* (*Encomium Moriae*), like the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, attributed to von Hutten, was a scathing criticism of the contemporary Church, and its bishops and clergy, monks and friars. Yet this kind of work had appeared before in ecclesiastical literature. The labours of Jerome painted a similarly lurid picture of the Roman clergy in the fifth century, and Peter Damiani did the same for the clergy of Italy in the eleventh century. Erasmus' work was read with interest and approval at Rome, especially in the circle of Leo X, and in England, Sir Thomas More was an enthusiastic reader, indeed he had some hand in the drafting of it. But again, the criticism of contemporary church life and teaching which Erasmus sustained throughout his career should be estimated rather as an expression of the wave of general discontent with religious conditions, which then manifested itself in western Europe, and formed favourable soil upon which the Reformation might fructify. That it confirmed the Reformers in their convictions there is no doubt, and doubtless, also, it played its part in bringing about the Counter-Reformation, when too late the Papacy began to set its house in order. Yet as a symptom of the condition of European opinion on the Church and its personnel in the sixteenth century, the satire of Erasmus is of sharp significance. It was one of many symptoms—local resentment of papal legal and financial administration, growing nationalism, the displacement of scholasticism by humanism—all indicating the same disease. Europe was wearied by mediæval theories of life and thought,

and was awaiting the Leader who should show the way to new life. So far as these criticisms were working also in the mind of Luther, to that extent they may be regarded as causes contributory to the Reformation, but they are better appraised as symptoms which rendered it necessary, and made its success certain.

It is hardly urgent to examine in detail the theological and ecclesiastical changes effected by the Reformation, derived from the teaching of Luther and Calvin. The Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith struck at the mediæval theological system as a whole. Man is saved by faith alone, and faith is a gift of God. Nothing that man can do, no matter how good, merits reward by God. Only the work of Christ was meritorious, and by faith in Christ alone can man share in Christ's merits. This was, of course, a revival of the teaching of St. Paul and of Augustine, though with a more complete depression of man's part in the process than either Paul or Augustine ever taught. The mediæval theory, splendidly systematized in the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, allowed full scope for human action and responsibility in man's relationship with God, but in practice it was vitiated by the penitential system which resulted in ordinary people attaching an exaggerated importance to good works, not the good works of the Gospel—love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance—but the payment of money for the endowment of Masses, or the building of churches and priories, all in the form of fines for sins committed; and all rather of a physical than a spiritual character. The effect upon piety and holiness in individual life was disastrous. Works of piety declined into mere commercial transactions. Moreover, even the mediæval theologians saw the weakness of the whole system, and attempted to bolster it up by the theory of the treasury of merits created by the virtues of the saints. But by this device they really gave their whole case away. Ordinary human merits were confessed to be hopeless, and the saints must be called in to clear the account. The Lutheran doctrine of faith as trust in God through Christ, not only lifted the spiritual outlook of men to a higher level, but it supplied an effective instrument for the reform of personal conduct, by demanding that the possession of justifying faith must be proved, and therefore accompanied by a good life; in other words, by sanctification.

In the wake of the Lutheran teaching came the Calvinist idea of the sovereignty of God, with an exaggerated notion of the effects of divine omniscience—the doctrine of election. In the hands of less capable exponents the doctrine of election declined into mere theological determinism, and ended in fatalism. If you were one of the vessels of wrath, why worry, you could do nothing to improve your hopes, God had not merely abandoned you, but pre-destined you to damnation. But this rule of thumb was as little characteristic of Calvin's theology as the seventeenth century disparagement of works of charity and piety was of the fundamental Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. Predestinarian Calvinism, and so-called Orthodox Lutheranism were alike destined to enter the limbo of worn-out ideas into which original Lutheran and Calvinist teaching had driven the mediæval theories of merit and good works.

Luther's greatest achievement was to liberate the individual conscience in its relationship with God. Each man must settle his own account with God, assisted, but only assisted by the teaching and ministry of the Church, and looking to the Bible as the final instrument of authoritative guidance. Of course, neither Luther nor Calvin, nor the English reformers set up the letter of the Bible as the source of authority. The idea of verbal inspiration came later, and was a perversion, like the Calvinist doctrine of election, of an earlier principle of reform. The original Reformation idea was that the conscience of the penitent reader possessed the guidance of the Holy Spirit in his use of the Bible.

The revolutionary character of the Lutheran principle of justification was at once apparent. It involved the overthrow of the mediæval authoritarian view of religion, and in western Europe men turned aside from the mediæval Church in order to obtain un-hindered and un-embarrassed access to God, in worship and personal life. The right of private judgment was established, and the significance of that principle for the future religious and political thought of Europe hardly needs emphasis. In its train followed not only the establishment of the Protestant Churches, but the revival of the humanist movement in the eighteenth century, when scientific thought laid the foundations for its triumphs a century later ; and also, the appearance of democracy in the seventeenth century, as the practical political ideal of the future. We may note in passing that Calvin himself was no democrat, and upheld the aristocratic idea as the best principle of political organization.

The Reformation was a great liberating movement in politics as well as religion. Yet there again, it operated upon ground which had been prepared. The mother of organized European political democracy was of course, the English Parliament, which finally established its influence during the struggle with the Stuarts in the seventeenth century, but the political structure then erected was grounded upon a foundation, which had been gradually prepared in England from the days of Edward II, even if we look no farther back in the history of Parliament. In that development the English Church played its part, as the late Miss Clarke, in her book *Mediæval Representation and Consent*, has again recently shown. An equal if not a larger part was played in the development of democracy by the theological principles set out by Calvin. His fundamental theory of the sovereignty of God aimed a blow at all previous ideas of sovereignty, ecclesiastical and political alike. The episcopal system went down before it in Switzerland and Scotland, and the Presbyterian organization of the Church carried democracy a stage farther by extending the idea of representation from the central authority, whether National Church assembly or Parliament, to the localities. The part played by the Presbyterian principle during the struggle of Parliament with the Stuarts needs no emphasis here.

Moreover, the influence of the Reformation upon subsequent political development was not confined to that exerted by Calvin's Presbyterianism. An equally powerful influence was exerted by the principle of Independency, which first appeared in practical form in the Congregationalist communities, and sprang from Lutheranism. This

represented a direct adaptation to small local units of the Lutheran principle of private judgment, first to Church organization, and then to political ideas and practice. It assisted in strengthening the conceptions of representation and consent. Local feeling and expectation must be represented in the governing body, and the representatives were responsible to their constituencies for their conduct in Parliament.

Thus the Reformation was a vast liberating movement, which secured freedom for individual thought and action, not only in the sphere of religion both in theory and practice, but it cleared the air for the rapid development of political liberty, and all the results of scientific discovery. If the Reformation had not followed close in the wake of the Renaissance it is doubtful whether the advance of science would have been assisted by the work of Kepler, Laplace and others in the eighteenth century. The attitude of the Roman authorities to Galileo and Giordano Bruno gives support to this suggestion. It may well be that some of the methods of the Reformers, and much of their mood might have been other than they were, as Erasmus more than once declared with reference to Luther. It is certainly true that the practice of toleration of individual liberty of thought was only gradually established in the churches of the Reformation. But the fundamental principle of the Reformation—justification by faith—set forth by Luther, released a stimulating principle of liberation, which was bound to issue in toleration sooner or later. Upon the recognition of that principle depends and has depended all real advance in human thought and life, even though periods may occur when in order to preserve or re-establish the conditions of orderly life, individual freedom must be inhibited for a time by the will of the exponent of some form of dictatorship. But dictatorship is never more than a temporary expedient for preserving or re-establishing the conditions of individual liberty.

The question may be raised : What was the connection of Henry VIII with the English Reformation in the light of what has already been set forth ? Let it be observed that Henry VIII, the life-long friend and correspondent of Erasmus, was a consistent opponent of Luther. Those facts supply the key to an estimate of his work. Henry was never a Reformer, even though he sanctioned the publication of the English Bible in 1538. The *Six Articles* of 1543, which re-emphasized the "real presence," Communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, vows of chastity, private masses and auricular confession, clearly indicate that Henry and his episcopal advisers never contemplated a reform of mediæval doctrine or worship. His anti-papal legislation, passed by the Parliament of 1529-36 represented the last stage of the mediæval revolt in England against papal influence in law and finance, a revolt which had been working up from the time of Henry III, expressing a desire for national independence of papal secular interference, which was as old as William the Conqueror. The so-called divorce case, which was really a nullity case, and not one of divorce at all, was indeed, more than a mere incident in the royal policy. It touched off high-explosive in the King's mind, much as Tetzels indulgence campaign did in the mind of Luther. It is certain that if Henry had

possessed a male heir by Catherine of Aragon, the nullity case would never have arisen, and it is probable that the breach with the Papacy would not have come in his reign, although there are indications that Henry would have pressed for a reform, under the guidance of men like Erasmus and Sir Thomas More, not only of the internal condition of the English Church, but of its relation with Rome. But Reform in England might well have been carried out along the lines of the Counter-Reformation, which began with the first session of the Council of Trent in 1545. The most significant incident for the Reformation in England in the time of Henry was his marriage with the Lutheran Anne Boleyn, and the birth of Elizabeth, who imbibed the religious convictions of her mother's circle. Her half-brother Edward VI was, of course, a far more zealous Reformer than Elizabeth ever became, but the reaction under Mary, and the struggle of Elizabeth with the Catholic party, prove conclusively that the English Reformation owed its success to the more moderate policy of the great Queen, who for over forty years held steadily along the lines of religious reform laid down by Cranmer and Ridley and other scholars of the English Reformation, men, who, while imbibing the theological principles of Luther, looked rather to the organization of the patristic church for the model of the reformed Church in England. Episcopacy, which Luther allowed to slide away was preserved; the door to Genevan influences was finally closed, and Canterbury was established as the head and symbol, comparable with Rome on the one side and Geneva on the other, of a new type and temper of ecclesiastical organization and life in Europe. Hence the abbeys disappeared finally in England, but the cathedrals remained, while in Scotland both abbey and cathedral disappeared.

We have received ENGLAND : BEFORE AND AFTER WESLEY, by Dr. J. Wesley Bready, author of the two admirable "Lives" of Lord Shaftesbury and of Dr. Barnardo. Pressure on our limited space compels us to hold over a review of this new and valuable work. In the meantime we commend it as the most important book on the origin and influence of the Evangelical movement in English life which has appeared since Mr. Balleine's *History of the Evangelical Party*. It is indispensable for any full understanding of the Evangelical movement, as well in regard to its future prospects as to its past achievement.

In a series entitled "Life in Other Lands" the Student Christian Movement Press publishes two volumes by Miss Hebe Spaul. They are written on original lines; one tells the story of France, its government, its religion, and its problems. The other deals similarly with the United States of America, and few books are better adapted to give to people—and especially to young people—a clear and vivid impression of life in these lands.