

CAZENOVE
ON THE
REFORMATION.



Professor Goldwin Smith.

With kindest regards and all pleasant memories
of the Oxford of 1842-46
from the Author

Edinburgh,
30th July, 1889.

SOME ASPECTS
OF
THE REFORMATION.

SOME ASPECTS
OF
THE REFORMATION.

An Essay

SUGGESTED BY THE
REV. DR. LITTLEDALE'S LECTURE
ON
"INNOVATIONS."

BY
JOHN GIBSON CAZENOVE, M.A., OXON.

PROVOST OF THE COLLEGE, ISLE OF CUMBRAE, SCOTLAND.

LONDON :
WILLIAM RIDGWAY, 169, PICCADILLY, W.
1869.

114 665
66 111

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

TO

GEORGE FREDERICK, EARL OF GLASGOW,

This Essay

IS RESPECTFULLY AND GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED,

AS AN OFFERING, NOT ONLY FROM THE PROVOST OF A COLLEGE

TO ITS FOUNDER,

BUT LIKEWISE AS FROM AN AUTHOR

TO A SYMPATHIZING AND SUGGESTIVE CRITIC.

"The Reformation was not the work of a year, or of a generation. Its foundation was laid both in the good and in the evil qualities of our nature. Love of truth, reverence for sacred things, a sense of personal responsibility, a desire for the possession of full spiritual privileges, co-operated with the pride of human reason, the natural impatience of restraint, and the envy and hatred inspired among the nobles by a rich and powerful hierarchy, to make the world weary of the Papal domination, and desirous of reform in things spiritual and ecclesiastical."—*Bishop Harold Browne*, of Ely, (A.D. 1860).

"Toute grande révolution agit toujours plus ou moins sur ceux mêmes qui lui résistent, et ne permet plus le rétablissement total des anciennes idées. Nous le voyons par là commotion religieuse du XVII^{ème} siècle, qui a opéré une révolution très sensible même chez les Catholiques."—*Count Joseph de Maistre*, (about A.D. 1816).

"What undertaking of more importance, and higher interest, can employ the piety and learning of the ministers of Christ than the endeavour to accomplish this truly Christian work [of reconciliation]."—*Bishop Shute Barrington*, of Durham, (about A.D. 1802).

"Nor can a unity be said to be complete which does not assimilate with itself all that is good and pious in the Protestant bodies."—*Bishop Forbes*, of Brechin, (in A.D. 1865).

"Catholics and Protestants will, in great multitudes, one day meet and stretch a friendly hand one to the other. Both, conscious of guilt, must exclaim, 'We have all erred, it is the Church only which cannot err; we have all sinned, the Church only is spotless on earth.'"—*Möhler*, (A.D. 1832).

"He saw that the future junction could not be expected in the form of a simple, unaided, mechanical reunion of the divided confessions. It was also clear to him that there could be no thought of a mere absorption of one Church by the other. He thought that a certain process of purification must be gone through on both sides, and it must be recognized that each of the two bodies, though in an unequal degree, had to receive good from the other, each had to purify itself from faults and one-sidedness by the help of the other, to fill up gaps in its religious and ecclesiastical life, to heal wounds; and that neither could be expected to give up an actual good which it had proved in life and history. Under these conditions, sooner or later, in the heart of Europe, in Germany, the process of reconciliation and union would go on."—*Dr. Döllinger on Maximilian II., late King of Bavaria*, (A.D. 1864.)

CONTENTS.

THE RELATION OF THE REFORMATION TO—	PAGE
I. THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AS EXHIBITED IN LIFE AND PRACTICE	5
II. THE CHARACTER OF THE REFORMERS AND THE MEDIEVAL CURRENT DOCTRINES	43
III. THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY	86
IV. THE RENAISSANCE	111
V. TOLERATION AND POLITICAL LIBERTY	122
VI. THE HISTORY OF THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS, A.D. 1769—1869	149
VII. THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE.	167

NOTICE.

THE words of the title-page are intended to be literally descriptive of the point of view from which these pages have been composed. This Essay *was suggested* by another publication, but is not meant to be considered as a formal reply. It deals more with the Reformation than with the Reformers ; with the movement rather than with its promoters. Originally commenced as an article for a Review, it has gradually been expanded into its present shape.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE REFORMATION.

WHEN a great movement alike of thought and action has swept over the ocean of society and stirred it from its inmost depths; when the storms and tempests to which it has given birth seem but seldom lulled and ever ready to burst forth again with renewed violence; when the shores on every side are strewn with the wrecks it has cast up; it is not an easy task for any man to assume the position of a calm and critical spectator of the scene. On the one hand, to be devoid of all sympathy with the ideas and emotions engendered in the strife is simply to proclaim himself utterly unfit to discuss the very nature of problems, which awake no living interest in the critic's heart. On the other hand, too eager participation in the views and principles of either side, may evoke that temper of the advocate which is so fatal to the character of the judge. And, further, if among the many who have handled the theme, one writer fails from lack of earnestness and religious insight; and another from deficiency of historic knowledge or metaphysical power, or general culture; and a third from sheer prejudice and vio-

lence ; and a fourth from a half-unconscious spirit of reticence or perversion ; then he who attempts even a partial accomplishment of the task wherein they have failed, may well have cause to fear lest he be only adding one more to the list of those who, by reason of one or more of these faults, have done little or nothing for the real edification of their readers. The present writer is deeply conscious that he is in danger of exhibiting, in a more or less marked degree, almost every single one of the disqualifications to which he has just adverted. Nevertheless, it remains true that the thoughts on the Reformation which are here set forth, are not the result of mere haste or passion. Himself a critic of other men's writings he does not shrink from having his own pages criticized in turn. He only asks for them a patient consideration ; *valeant quantum valeant : benedicat Benedictus !*

There are few, if any, who are fitted to discuss so important a subject as the Reformation in *all* its bearings. I propose, as the title of this pamphlet implies, to glance at some aspects only. In many cases the glance may be but superficial, either from sheer lack of space or from the imperfect state of the author's knowledge, or failure of ability to grasp the points at issue. Yet, even in such cases, one may be able to suggest some better sources of information which those, who will, may study at their

leisure. For the present, let us limit our gaze by certain self-chosen boundaries.

I propose to my readers that we should consider the Reformation in its relation to—I. The mediæval Church as exhibited in life and practice. II. The character of the Reformers and the mediæval current doctrines. III. The question of authority. IV. The Renaissance. V. Toleration and political liberty. VI. The history of the last hundred years, 1769-1869. VII. The Church of the Future. Without further preface I launch this little bark on a somewhat bold, if not desperate, voyage of inquiry.

I. To begin by asking the question, "What was the relation of the Reformation to the mediæval Church," may call forth the very natural inquiry, "Why go so far back?" or "Why not go much further?" My answer is, that I do not go further back, partly to save time and space; and, partly, from a conviction that the great movement of the sixteenth century commenced, if it did not conclude, with an attack on certain features of the religion of the day, which were peculiar (at least in their *form*, if not in their *essence*) to mediæval, as distinct from primitive Christianity.* But we must turn our

* Since writing the above, I have met with the following words in a Lecture delivered by a Roman Catholic, Mr. H. W. Wilberforce:—"Hence Müller's remark that 'The Reformation was at first a reaction, *not so much against Catholicism as against its mediæval mode.*'"—*Essays on Religion, &c.*, edited by Abp. Manning, 2nd Series, p. 341.

glance for a few moments upon the great and magnificent structure of mediævalism, because in the examination of an important historical event, it is simply impossible to form anything like a just conception of its nature, unless the annals of at least one previous century be fairly known.

The character of the mediæval Church, as represented by current literature, has passed through three phases during the last hundred and twenty years; the phase of hatred and contempt; the phase of rising admiration and respect; the phase of what must appear to many to be an almost excessive degree of eulogy and homage. It is necessary to comment briefly upon each. The phase of hatred and contempt was probably rendered European by the influence of Voltaire, whose work on the "Manners (*mœurs*) and Character of Nations" appeared about 1757. To him and to his followers on the Continent, to Hume and to his followers in Britain, is specially, we imagine, to be ascribed that temper of mind which could see nothing in Becket but the spirit of priestcraft; nothing but hair-splitting in the philosophy of Anselm, Scotus and Aquinas; nothing but pedantry in the letters of Hildebrand; nothing but insolence in the sway of Innocent III.; little besides obscurity in Dante; and no beauty in the Gothic arch and vaulted cathedral. And, as Archdeacon Churton and Sir F. Palgrave have well remarked, these thinkers never treated the mediæval Church with fairness or even honesty. Acknowledg-

ment of any merit in a Bishop or a saintly Prince was destroyed by some jest or inuendo ; and the very canons of Councils striving to repress vice and immorality were employed with such justice as might be displayed by a foreigner, who should publish the reports of trials at the Old Bailey as evidencing the normal condition of the realm of England.

Before the close even of the eighteenth century, some whispers and murmurs of revolt, were it only on æsthetic and intellectual grounds, against the despotism of Voltairian sway began to circulate in society. Possibly the poet Gray was rebellious in his heart ; and more avowedly perhaps (as Palgrave surmises) Bishop Percy of Dromore with his ballads, and Horace Walpole with his private press at Strawberry Hill. The word *Gothic*, which in the time of Addison was synonymous with intellectual degradation, began to be applied in a very different sense, the sense now implied when men speak of *Gothic* architecture ; that wonderful creation of beauty and sublimity which for nearly two centuries failed to extort a syllable of admiration even from Christian writers in Roman Catholic France.* Charles James Fox, with characteristic independence of thought, declared, if we recollect aright, his distrust of Livy,

* This has been observed by M. de Montalembert ; I think in his *Eloge* upon M. Droz. Certainly Fenelon in his treatise on preaching, praises classic architecture and speaks only with contempt of Gothic. In the same spirit did this exemplary prelate teach his pupil the Duke of Burgundy by the *quasi*-classic tale of Telemachus.

his respect for the good faith of Herodotus, his admiration of mediæval buildings, his deep sense of the intellectual vigour displayed in the letters of Pope Hildebrand, at a time when public opinion ran exactly counter to his views on every one of these subjects. Many, who sympathized with Fox, from time to time prepared the way for the impending change. But it was reserved for a French Protestant layman to be the real initiator of that revolution of sentiment which has taken place with respect to the mediæval Church. And whatever judgment be hereafter passed upon the career of M. Guizot as a Minister of State, he never can be defrauded of the rightful homage due to one, who, in the teeth of the strongest prejudices, claimed and won for the mediæval Church that righteous verdict which the injustice of European nations had for at least two centuries withheld. Guizot displayed the Christianity of the Middle Ages in its true light as the civilizer of Europe, as the one potent influence against the sway of mere brute force, as the harbinger of better times, as the nurse of education, as the consoler of the downtrodden and afflicted.

Almost contemporaneously came the labours of Hurter, Voight, Ranke and others in Germany: and then, in rapid succession, the writings of Palgrave, Hallam, Arnold, Sir James Stephen and many more in England, all more or less fully, more or less avowedly, followed in the track of Guizot. The revived taste for Gothic art, the respect shown to mediæval philosophers by such thinkers as Cousin

and Sir William Hamilton, and the uprising of a fresh school of theology among Lutherans as well as Anglicans, all tended in the same direction; until at length the publication of M. Michelet's earlier volumes on French history, and the animated and generous *critique* upon them from the pen of Mr. John Stuart Mill, may be said to have raised enthusiasm on behalf of the mediæval Church to *almost* its highest point. M. Michelet's line of argument, as set forth by the sympathizing mind of its exponent, runs on this wise. When the rich and great were far more powerful than they are in our time, their tendency was, not only in thought but in practice, to live as if one law existed for themselves and another for the rest of the world. There was in feudal ages a very special need of some organization which should have power and authority to say to kings and potentates of every class: "You shall not deem yourselves to be above the moral law." Such a power, say Mill and Michelet, was found in the Western Church during the Middle Ages. And if in the exercise of that high and sacred office for the good of mankind her claims were sometimes stretched beyond due bounds, let us make all equitable allowance for such conduct; for it is always most difficult in complex affairs to know precisely where we ought to stop. We, of the present generation, try to attain the same end as the Popes did, by our newspaper press; and it may be questioned whether we do it so well. Nor must we overlook other points of difference between the thir-

teenth and the nineteenth centuries. A primate claiming for his clergy exemptions from the sway of civil tribunals in A.D. 1869 would be acting in a manner most unreasonable and absurd. It does not follow that a similar claim was at all extravagant in the year of grace 1169. Becket knew that a priest had not the very slightest chance of a fair trial before a court composed solely of the laity.

How deeply these views have sunk into the heart of continental Europe, and even of Great Britain, might be shown by many illustrations direct and indirect. Let it here be enough to remind my readers of the first chapter of Lord Macaulay's *History of England*. Its entire tone is that of the man of the nineteenth, and not of the eighteenth, century. The rebuke administered to the school of Voltaire, Mably, Henry, Hume and Co., as men who, while condemning monks, exhibited a more than monastic narrowness; the word of palliation (to say the least) on behalf of pilgrimages, crusades, and the general work achieved by the ecclesiastical system of the Middle Ages, all bear marks of the deep furrows sunk in cultivated minds by the ploughshare of M. Guizot's line of thought and argument. Well and justly has a recent Roman Catholic writer,* in an English volume of very marked excellence and ability, paid a hearty tribute of gratitude to the French Protestant layman for the good work wrought by him on the temper and sentiments of Europe.

* Mr. Allies in his work on 'The Formation of Christendom.'

We are all so apt to imagine *our* world to be *the* world, that it is not easy for us to realize the fact, that in Great Britain there are large masses of the population, on whom this revolution of thought has not hitherto produced the very faintest trace of an impression. There are tens of thousands in the three kingdoms whose abhorrence of Popery, mediæval as well as modern, is as vehement, as unreasoning, as grossly superstitious as is the abhorrence of Lutheranism among the Spaniards; with whom, says Mr. Ford, it is almost an article of belief that a Lutheran has a tail. Within the last ten years the most eloquent and attractive of Nonconformist ministers delivered a Lecture at Exeter Hall on "Counterfeits." There we had the old eighteenth century story repeated over once again to the delight of a sympathizing audience. The Middle Ages were one vast "Counterfeit," and nothing more. Murder, incest, perjury, hypocrisy, and blasphemy; such had been the staple food of our forefathers, of the nobles who won for us Magna Charta, of the yeomen who conquered at Cressy and at Agincourt, of the lawyers who made English justice renowned throughout Europe, of the Clergy who bequeathed to us the parochial system and our glorious Cathedrals and the intellectual wealth of our noble Schools and Universities. The "Young Men's Christian Association" seemed delighted to hear of the unredeemed rascality of their forefathers. Be it so. For a time things must remain thus.

The lively little histories of Mrs. Markham still command an enormous sale, and nothing equally successful has yet appeared upon the other side; while a Child's History of England from a novelist, to whom we all owe a deep debt of gratitude for his fictions, can scarcely be called an improvement.

But these influences, it may be said, are confined within a limited range, and must gradually give way before the combined weight of higher authorities. That Guizot and Mill should have written in vain, so far as regards any impress upon the mind of Mr. Spurgeon, is nothing marvellous. That gentleman's *metier* is a different one. By his really remarkable power of adapting the old Puritan divinity to the needs and circumstances of the present age, by his fresh and pointed manner of restating old truths from the pulpit, by his courage, by his admirable delivery, he has effected, and is effecting, infinitely more good than any amount of a momentary misreading of a portion of our history can counterbalance. Some support however to this harsh view of the Middle Ages is lent by writers of an utterly different stamp. It is impossible to read, for example, Mr. Motley's 'Dutch Republic,' without seeing that Michelet's view of the benefit of clerical authority has never for an instant come within the field of that able writer's mental vision. It is almost the same with Mr. Buckle: who, though a worshipper of Mr. Mill's genius, seems scarcely to have caught a glimpse of the large and generous spirit which prompted the composition of the article on Michelet. Other

instances might be given, but it is high time for us to press forward. Let it suffice to remark at present, that something may be due to the reaction against that species of excessive admiration which forms the third phase of the sentiment respecting mediæval Christianity.

Specimens of what I conceive to be this over-praise may be found in the earlier volumes of Mr. Froude's History and in a Lecture on the Scottish Reformation delivered by him in Edinburgh, and (much more palpably) in the course of Lectures previously given in the same place by Mr. Bridges. The last-named writer says of the mediæval Church that "fully to have attained its high ends, the power of that Church should have been not less, but greater. The Church in her best days was the safeguard of spiritual liberty against feudal oppression; *but in its best days it was too weak for the task and those days were far too short.*"*

I propose to comment upon these words. It is part of the exceeding difficulty of an undertaking like the present, that we shall seldom find ourselves in the presence of simple declarations, to one we can give unfeigned assent, or unhesitating

* 'France under Richelieu and Colbert.' By J. H. Bridges, M.B., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.—Edinburgh, Edmonston and Douglas, 1866. Mr. Bridges is a Positivist; but I have not seen a book by any writer of that school so free from asperity and so pleasant in tone. The volume is small, highly suggestive, and replete with condensed information conveyed in an elegant and appropriate style.

denial. Writers on both sides, for and against mediævalism, for and against the Reformation, assure us that a little more knowledge of facts, a little deeper acquaintance with history, would infallibly attach us to the side which they espouse. Such confidence I am quite unable to share. It is a truism that, even on comparatively simple problems, the same evidence does not always lead men to the same conclusions. The last book of Thucydides is placed before two modern historians. It shows us, says Mr. Mitford, the tyranny, the feebleness, the unscrupulousness of a democratic government. It displays, says Mr. Grote, the moderation, the dignity, the strict integrity of the Athenian Demos, even in its hour of weakness and decline. If such can be the differences where the range of thought is comparatively limited, how infinitely more abundant must be the opportunities for making out a case on either side from the store of materials contained in that vast territory, which stretches out before us in the region of mediæval history.

Now we may admit, not only the justice of M. Michelet's view in the main, but also the existence of a considerable amount of truth in the still more fervid pleadings of the writers to whom we have just referred. Where we part company with them will be made manifest in what we are now about to urge.

The ideal set before themselves by mediæval Churchmen seems in some degree to have differed

from that of the Nicene, and still more from that of the Ante-Nicene ages. It is true that, in all three conditions of her lot, the Church aimed at saving souls and glorifying her Lord ; but by the eleventh century, at the latest, we behold the realization of that four-fold supremacy which the eloquent Dominican, Lacordaire, would fain, with questionable wisdom, have coveted for her at all times ; a supremacy at once philosophic, historic, moral, and social. The last-named of the four was probably in itself by many degrees the least important. Still it was no doubt an evidence of the consideration which the Church enjoyed, when a Louis the Eleventh could delight in giving a Cardinal the precedence over Princes of the blood, and grant to the Pope's Legate, Julian de la Rovere, a reception little less than royal :* and both Mr. Disraeli and Dean Milman seem much struck with the *quasi*-democratic element thus intertwined with feudal usages ; when the son of a peasant or a tradesman could thus win for himself a more than princely position, perhaps even the *quasi*-imperial one of being seated on the throne of the Cæsars. The historic supremacy must have been deeply felt in ages which, despite this recognition of new ability, had so keen a

* "Il fut reçu hors de la porte de Saint Jacques par toute la magistrature ; la ville était tendue de tapisseries sur son passage, *comme pour le Roi.*" Sismondi, Hist. des Français XIV, p. 580. This was in A.D. 1480. De la Rovere was known at a later date as Pope Julius II. Perhaps of Louis XI. we may say, that though he loved the Cardinal much, he hated the Princes of the blood still more.

sense of the weight and influence of long descent. Even in our own day it evidently made a great impression upon the imagination of Lord Macaulay.* Nor was her philosophic pre-eminence often disputed; at any rate, the disputants were generally either vanquished or silenced. As in the early Church Arius had found an Athanasius, and Pelagius had called forth an Augustine; so too in the eleventh century Roscelin was confronted by the superior powers of Anselm, and Abelard was, if not thoroughly refuted, at least dominated over by the spirituality and zeal of St. Bernard. Still more supreme for its day was that scholastic philosophy which succeeded; a philosophy which, as elaborated either by Scotus or by Aquinas, has been far more influential than has generally been supposed; and this too among schools of thought which are all but unconscious of their debt. Nor is there much danger of our over-estimating the sum of what we all owe to the mediæval culture of intellect. The student reared on many an old foundation, Eton or Winchester or some humbler grammar school, in Universities, such as Presbyterianized Glasgow or Anglicanized Oxford, must thank the monks and bishops and kings of the middle ages for great and goodly cities which we builded not, houses full of all good things which we filled not, wells which we digged not, vineyards and olive-trees which we planted not. They preserved the only extant manuscripts of God's Word; they cherished the noble studies of metaphysics and of Roman law; they (wit-

* Article on Ranke, *sub initio*.

ness Gerbert, Grostête, Roger Bacon, and others) accomplished a work, even for physical science, which is not to be despised; their very legends found food for the imagination, and soothed the longings of humanity for a brighter ideal than the roughness of their times could grant; they, as for a long period the only men of sufficient culture, were the ambassadors of sovereigns, the chancellors and prime ministers of mighty kingdoms.*

* For obvious sources of proof respecting these statements, we may refer to the remains of Dr. Parr; Hallam's 'Literature of Europe,' chap. i.; Guizot's *Civilisation en France*, (Tome II.); Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' (Book XIV. chap. i.); Maine's 'Ancient Law,' *sub fin.*; and Whewell's 'History of the Inductive Sciences,' Vol. I.; Whewell's extract from Montucla seems worthy of citation:—

"And here," says the French Historian of Mathematics, whom I have followed in the preceding relation, "it is impossible not to reflect that all those men who, if they did not augment the treasure of the sciences, at least served to transmit it, were monks, or had been such originally. Convents were, during these stormy ages, the asylums of sciences and letters. Without these religious men who, in the silence of their monasteries, occupied themselves in transcribing, in studying, and in imitating the works of the ancients, well or ill, those works would have perished; perhaps not one of them would have come down to us. The thread which connects us with the Greeks and Romans would have been snapt asunder; the precious productions of ancient literature would no more exist for us, than the works, if there were any published, before the catastrophe which annihilated that highly scientific nation, which, according to Bailly, existed in remote ages in the centre of Tartary, or at the roots of the Caucasus. In the sciences we should have had all to create; and at the moment when the human mind should have emerged from its stupor and shaken off its slumbers, we

But highest and best of all was that moral supremacy on which Mr. Mill has justly laid so great a stress. And because it seems to us that general assertions, unaccompanied by any evidence in detail, are apt to lose force even when they are essentially true, we proceed to select one or two cases wherein that supremacy of Rome showed itself for the time, even something more than the poet Wordsworth granted, when he called it,

“Not utterly unworthy to endure.”

In A.D. 1329 a guilty Queen-Dowager of England had become liable to public trial for treason and adultery, if not for actual murder. The Pope, John XXII., besought King Edward III. in touching words, that “by the bowels of Christ’s mercy he should have been no more advanced than the Greeks were after the taking of Troy.” He adds that this consideration inspires feelings towards the religious orders very different from those which, when he wrote, were prevalent among his countrymen.” (p. 258.) Similar evidence from Tosti’s *Prolegomeni* might be cited; but Whewell and Montucla may be thought more unbiassed than the monk of Monte-Cassino. For the value of the legends see especially Guizot’s *17ième Leçon*. “Ce fut le mérite des légendes “pieuses de fournir à quelques-uns de ces instincts puissants, de “ces besoins invincibles de l’âme humaine, cette issue, cette satisfaction, que tout leur refusait d’ailleurs.” After giving a specimen he adds: “Peu importe, messieurs, l’exagération des détails; “peu importerait même la vérité matérielle de l’histoire; c’était “un soulagement moral, une protestation contre des faits odieux et “puissants, un faible mais précieux retentissement des droits de la “liberté.” Hallam says of the Benedictines, “Almost all we “possess of Latin classic literature is owing to the industry of “these monks.”—*Lit. of Europe*, Vol. I. ch. i. § 82.

“ would spare his mother’s shame, so far as he could
 “ righteously do so (*quantum secundum Deum poterit*),
 “ and not make public her fall, but study to conceal
 “ it so far as that could honestly be done.” The King
 not only followed the exhortation of the Pontiff in
 respect of the fallen Isabella, but asked for further
 counsel concerning his future career, and received the
 excellent advice “ that he should not entrust the
 government of his realm to one or two favourites, but
 to the general assembly of prelates, princes, nobles
 and commons.” Surely this correspondence reflects
 the deepest credit on the memory alike of Pontiff and
 of King. Nor was it less honourable to the succeeding
 Pope, Benedict XII., that he strove, though unsuc-
 cessfully, to heal the commencement of that breach
 of friendship between France and England which
 ten years later (A.D. 1339) involved the two coun-
 tries in a bitter and bloody contest of 120 years’
 duration.*

We look back to an earlier scene. In A.D. 1194
 the most powerful sovereign in Europe, Philip
 Augustus of France, being then a widower, espoused
 a princess of great beauty and high character, Ingel-
 burga of Denmark. The king conceived a sudden
 and inexplicable aversion to his new wife, and
 straightway sought for a divorce. The prelates and
 nobles of France, to their deep disgrace, showed
 immediate subservience to the wishes of their sove-
 reign and desired to gratify his whim. Only eighty-

* Lingard, Vol. III. Chap. II. (Ed. 1854.)

two days after the wedding, an assembly at Compiègne declared on oath that there existed between Ingelburga and Philip's deceased wife a relationship within the prohibited degrees. They were wrong; most probably in point of fact, most certainly in point of law, for there was no canon against marriage with the cousin of a former wife. Nevertheless this assembly pronounced the marriage to be null and void.

Whither shall this wronged and insulted princess betake herself? Husband, bishops, barons, all are against her. Is the contest hopeless? Must she quietly submit to an intolerable wrong? No. There was still one place whence (as Abp. Trench has said) there often proceeded the only voice that was anywhere lifted up on behalf of truth and righteousness. The brother of Ingelburga, Canute VI. of Denmark, appealed to Rome on behalf of the lady, for whom he felt that, by mere force of arms, he could accomplish nothing. The reigning Pontiff, Celestine III, at once perceived the injustice of the French monarch's conduct, and published bulls against him. The influence of these warnings might have proved sufficient, had not the eyes of the monarch lighted upon one perhaps really more beautiful, at any rate to him more captivating than Ingelburga, Agnes daughter of the Duke de Meranie. Even then Philip hesitated for nearly three years and vainly attempted to negotiate with the Papal court and its legates. But his new passion proved too strong, and in June, 1196, he solemnly married Agnes (or, as some call

her, Mary) de Meranie. In 1198 Celestine died and a new Pontiff ascended the Papal chair.

At what point the Papal supremacy may be rightfully called an usurpation is, we admit with Mr. Mill, a really difficult question. But *if* the correctness of the mediæval theory be once granted, it is almost impossible to conceive a grander realization of that theory, than was exhibited by the successor of Celestine, Pope Innocent III. For breadth and largeness of views, for dauntless courage, for purity of motive, for holiness of life, Innocent stands unsurpassed, perhaps unrivalled in the annals of the Papacy. He embraced with ardour the cause of the injured Ingelburga and ordered a council to be assembled at Dijon to sit in judgment on the conduct of the king of France. The prelates, not unnaturally, preferred to transfer the hearing to what was then an imperial town, Vienne on the Rhone. After some delay the council decided in favour of Ingelburga; and, as a last resource, with the authority of Innocent, placed the realm of France under an interdict. Bells ceased to toll; the churches were closed, no public service was performed: and, save baptism to the new-born infant and extreme unction for the dying, no rites of a sacramental character were celebrated; and even the dead were committed in silence to their graves.

“His arrogance,” exclaims Sismondi. To proclaim an interdict was to punish the innocent for the guilty, say Hallam and Milman; and even Lingard re-echoes the cry. And yet surely if the spirit of

Innocent could be imagined to defend his conduct against the censures of his modern critics, his reply would be swift and ready, and one not easily to be gainsaid. “ You, M. Simonde de Sismondi, you “ the honest narrator, the high-toned moralist, the “ stern republican—is it from *you* that I hear the “ charge of arrogance, because I dared to tell a king “ that the laws of God were made for him as well as “ other men, and that he had no more right than the “ meanest of his subjects to repudiate his wedded “ spouse for the mere gratification of his fancy or “ his passion. Such warning, had it issued from the “ lips of a democratic statesman, would have received “ at your hands the liveliest sympathy and praise. “ But it proceeded from a bishop, and your hopeless “ narrowness and ingrained prejudice prevent you “ from listening to it with the ear of calmness and “ of equity. And you, gentlemen of the nineteenth “ century, who complain of the course which I “ adopted because it entailed sorrow upon the inno- “ cent; have the goodness to inform me which of your “ modern modes of punishment, be it of offences “ great or small, is free from this unhappy feature. “ Here, for example, is a labouring man, the indus- “ trious bread-winner for his family: one evening “ sees him unhappily overtaken with drunkenness; “ he takes part in a riot, he is sentenced to a fort- “ night’s imprisonment. Do his innocent wife and “ children remain unscathed? When you hang the “ murderer, or dismiss the forger to penal servitude, “ do *you* contrive to save his guiltless relatives from

“all shame and loss? Grant that the interdict
 “struck gloom and terror into thousands of pious
 “and loving hearts. The Church, which every-
 “where proclaims that the wish for the hallowed
 “*viaticum* avails to the sick man who cannot obtain
 “it, or whose malady prohibits reception, must also
 “hold that its Divine Head in heaven would not
 “suffer any innocent member of the body to suffer
 “spiritual loss. And I, in part at least, succeeded.
 “I curbed the immoral license of a haughty king.
 “The ultimate result of my measures was the resto-
 “ration of the lawful wife to her true position.
 “Authorities of a later date may have learnt how to
 “manage these things better. No doubt France has
 “abundant reasons to glorify herself on her success
 “in dealing with the court of Louis XV. ; and Eng-
 “land in the amount of check which she contrived
 “to exercise during the reigns of sovereigns of such
 “exemplary life as Charles II., George II., and
 “George IV. No: first heal, or at least assuage
 “your own maladies. It will then be time to
 “pass sentence on my remedies.”*

We might fill pages with similar cases. The mere
 existence of such a life as that of Alfred of England,
 of the canonized Louis IX. of France, of St. Boni-
 face or St. Bernard, and hundreds more, is a great
 fact on behalf of the mediæval Church. Of all that
 is implied by the very presence of such phenomena,

* For authorities, see those to whom we have referred, Sis-
 mondi, Hallam, Milman, Lingard.

we may have something to say further on. But it must not be overlooked that such scenes as those to which we have just referred in the career of our Edward III., or of Philip Augustus in France, would exercise influence of an extent well-nigh incalculable. How many an earl or squire would try to deal gently with an erring relative, when a knightly monarch like the conqueror at Cressy was known to have listened to the exhortations of a spiritual father; how many a rough baron, if tempted to deal treacherously with the wife of his youth, might pause and have time to be won to better thoughts by the memorial of the discomfiture that befel the proud Crusader, the companion in arms of Richard Cœur-de-Lion. The mediæval Church, at its best, was not only a great instructress, but likewise a vast moral police.

But we must with sorrow, and almost with reluctance, turn to the other side of the picture. A great Athenian philosopher once excogitated in his own mind a theory of an ideal state; a theory which, despite many serious blemishes, both moral and intellectual, foreshadowed in its nobler elements some of the best features of the mediæval Church. The sight of a philosopher on a throne, for which Plato yearned, would have been afforded to his longing eyes had they been permitted to gaze upon such an one as Innocent, exercising spiritual rule over Christendom and yet solacing his leisure by theological meditation, and by the composition of treatises on the penitential psalms. The hierarchy,

too, especially the statesmen-bishops, such as a Langton of Canterbury, or a Kennedy of St. Andrew's, * would have been readily acknowledged by him as rightful rulers, more particularly in ages when the lay barons could for the most part neither read nor write.

But concerning that fantasy of Plato's brain the searching question was asked of old, "Who shall guard the guardians?" "*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*" It is, alas, the ever-recurring difficulty, which introduces so much of perplexity and of failure into the best-laid schemes and the most loftily-conceived theories; schemes and theories which (even when greatly aided by supernatural grace) have yet to be carried into action and preserved in their integrity by beings who are after all men, the sharers of our fallen destinies. And it admits, we fear, of only too pertinent an application to the case of the mediæval Church.

That to a large extent her guardians did carry out the grand and magnificent idea which their greatest minds had conceived, we are very far indeed from denying. But I suppose, that even in her most palmy days there was, almost perhaps of necessity, a painfully large infusion of the most common-place mediocrity, which never grasped more than a faint conception of the lofty ideal set before it. Few pieces of writing in the English language are more beautiful than Mr. Froude's picture of what the monastic institutions had in many cases proved:

* See Tytler, Hist. of Scotland, vol. iv. p. 174.

but still the records of an average mediæval monastery are, we think, to some extent disappointing. Perpetual quarrels between the abbot and his monks, disputes about the right of appointment to the headship of the institution, rivalries with the secular clergy:—we fear that we could with little trouble produce abundant evidence of these things. Even about numbers of the schemes of Innocent III. himself there hung an atmosphere of partial failure. And if in the matter of the see of Constantinople, or of the anti-Albigensian war in Languedoc, blame can be more or less directly brought home to the Pontiff; it is probable that the real censure should light less upon the man than upon the system. It was too vast an undertaking for any one human being to carry out satisfactorily and successfully; and where an Innocent III. proved wanting, it was hardly to be expected that any other Pontiff could succeed. It is almost a case of the old *si Pergama dextrâ*. But Troy was not to be saved; neither could the mediæval system last. Nor, while we dwell upon the brightest times of the Papacy, the age between that of Hildebrand and Innocent III. (A.D. 1073-1216) can we in honesty forget that terrible tenth century. Between A.D. 897 and 997, we can reckon up a list of sixteen Popes; and of these several are paramours or base-born sons of the infamous Theodora, or her daughters,—Theodora and Marozia. The often-quoted words of Cardinal Baronius involuntarily recur to the memory. “*Dormiebat tunc alto sopore Christus in navi; una tantum*

consolatio piis, quòd etsi dormiebat, in eàdem tamen navi dormiebat."

We have said that Mr. Bridges and Mr. Froude seem to us to exaggerate the degree of identity between the theory and the practice of the middle ages. But we find ourselves very much at one with Mr. Froude in his impression of the rapid fall of moral tone during the century preceding the Reformation. The entire history of the period looks like one more illustration of the general correctness of Mr. Carlyle's *dictum*, that nothing is crushed from without, until it is ripe to perish from within. And in case these humble lucubrations should fall into the hands of any who are trying to become philosophic students of history, it may be well once more to implore them, *not* to commence their inquiries into the circumstances of any great crisis whatsoever with the period of the actual crisis itself. The result of such a course can hardly fail to be narrowness and one-sidedness. Be it the fall of Athens or of Carthage, the descent of the Barbarians upon Rome, the German Reformation, the partition of Poland, or the French Revolution; in each and every instance, and in all similar ones, we must, before we attempt to pass judgment, have first formed a fair acquaintance with the leading characteristics of the preceding generation, perhaps of the preceding century. In no other way is it possible for us to form even the most shadowy mental image of the true causes of the great and, too often, sad results which have ensued.

The publication of this essay has been suggested,

as its title-page asserts, by a Lecture delivered in Liverpool by Dr. Littledale. That Lecture seems to me bold, vigorous, and learned. I cannot honestly add that I regard it as comprehensive or charitable; though defect on the former score must probably be in part attributed to the brevity necessarily attendant upon such a form of composition. Dr. Littledale's statement concerning the corrupt state of the *pauld-ante-Reformation* Church occupies precisely six lines and a half. Now I do not pretend to lay claim to the vigorous and incisive style of the Lecturer on 'Innovations;' and I utterly despair of being able to give any thing like a notion of my own impressions concerning the state of things at that period in so very brief a compass. May my readers pardon some prolixity of statement! Men can only attempt to do things in the way that comes naturally to them, and which seems to them the most honest and best adapted to the end they have in view.

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? The question again recurs to our thoughts in especial connection with the mediæval Church. We betlink us of the weapon of excommunication. In the ears of Mr. Motley, the very word suggests no other ideas than those of spiritual arrogance and of blasphemy; in the pages of Mr. Buckle, it forms an especial theme for merri-ment. Not such were the notions connected with excommunication in the minds of Christians during the earlier middle ages. They believed it, as we Anglicans for our part believe it, to be a real and awful weapon intrusted by Christ to his Church for

the benefit of the entire flock, by its warning sound to the offender, by its salutary effect on the hearts of the faithful within the fold. How many souls now at peace may owe to it, directly or indirectly, their endless rest, it is beyond the wit of man to judge; but we believe them to be many thousands in number.

But how about the guardians of this sacred trust? With sorrow it must be said, that their discovery of the great powers thus conferred upon them led the later mediæval popes and clergy to constant abuse of them, to an employment for earthly ends of what was meant to be reserved for solely spiritual causes. Excommunications and interdicts in the hands of an Innocent III. may prove truly righteous and truly powerful; for they light upon heads that have brought them on themselves, upon a haughty Philip Augustus, or upon our own miserable John of England. But how often—as Lingard with his usual honesty admits—how often were they abused? Look, not at Innocent in A.D. 1200, but at a Boniface VIII., just a complete century later. There we see the spiritual advantages which had been promised to the champions of the cross in Palestine, held out to those who would help to humble and extinguish the noble but hated house of the Colonnas! To this same Pontiff the Franciscans of England offer forty thousand ducats, if he will give them permission to hold property. The money is deposited with certain bankers; Pope Boniface discovers that the concession demanded will be in direct opposition to the fundamental laws of

the Order, and seizes the treasure for his own. Make all fair allowance for the personal feeling of Dante, and condemn as we will the insulting conduct of Philip the Fair, still the entire history reveals a very altered state of things from that existent under Innocent III.; and it is one which is altered in almost every respect for the worse.

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? These guardians are set to warn men against too great love of riches; but the one universal outcry against them in the 14th and 15th centuries is this: that they themselves are deeply tainted, as a body, with the degrading sin of excessive and unbounded avarice. "A body far too numerous and far too wealthy," says Dr. Döllinger of the later mediæval clergy. A great living divine justly rebuked an opponent, who alleged as authority for a statement a single line of a single satire. But how, if we find 100 separate lines in 100 satires? These gibes cannot all have been wholly baseless, or they would have fallen flat and powerless. Even caricaturists do not venture to disregard all similarity to real features. The *H.B.*, who was so celebrated some thirty years ago, never drew the Duke of Wellington with a *nez retroussé*, or represented Peel or Graham as men of scanty stature. Now turn to any of the satires of the middle ages; take those given in the latest number of the *Christian Remembrancer*, or such as are quoted by Dean Milman, or the one given by Mr. Froude in his first volume; or, again, look at the pictures given by Chaucer:—all sing the same song, all reiterate the same complaint. My

limits compel me to be contented with a single specimen.

Still is thy name in high account,
And still thy verse has charms,
Sir David Lindesay of the Mount,
Lord Lion King-at-arms.

But certainly the following lines from Sir David's pen deserve to be read well and carefully. Let it be remembered that the drama from which our second extract is taken was acted again and again before audiences gathered together from every class, and that its substantial foundation of truth has never been seriously questioned.

Christ did command Peter to feed his sheep,
And sa he did feed them full tenderly ;
Of that command they take but little keep,
But Christ's sheep they spoilzie piteously,
And with the wool they claith them curiously :
Like gormand wolves they take of them their food ;
They eat their flesh, and drinks baith milk and blood.

Pauper.—Gude-man will ye gif me your charitie,
I shall declare you the black veritie.
My father was ane auld man and ane hoar,
And was of age fourscore years and more ;
And Maulde, my mother, was fourscore and fifteen,
And with my labour I did them baith sustene.
We had ane mare, that carriet salt and coal,
And everilk year she brought us hame ane foal.
We had three kye that was baith fat and fair,
Nane tidier into the town of Ayr.
My father was sa weak of bluid and bane

That he dieit, wherefore my mother made great mane,
 Then she dieit within ane day or two,—
 And there began my povertie and woe.
 Our guid grey mare was baitand on the field,
 And our land's lord tuik her for his heryeild;
 The vicar tuik the best cow be the heid
 Incontinent, when my father was deid,—
 And when the vicar heard tell how that my mother
 Was deid, fra hand he tuik to him ane other;
 Then Meg my wife did mourn baith even and morrow,
 Till at the last she dieit for very sorrow,—
 And when the vicar heard tell my wife was deid,
 The third cow he cleikit be the heid.
 Their upmaist claes, that was of raploch grey,
 The vicar gart his clerk bear them away.
 When all was gane I nicht mak na debate,
 But with my bairns passed for till beg my meat.
 Now have I tauld you the black veritie,
 How I am brocht into this miserie.

Diligence.—How did the parson? was he not thy guid friend?

Pauper.—The devil stick him! *he cursed me for my teind:*

And haulds me yet under that same process

That gart me want the Sacrament at Pasche.

In gude faith, sir, though he wald cut my throat,

I have na geir, except an Inglis groat,

Whilk I purpose to give ane man of law.

Diligence.—Thou art the daftest fuill that ever I saw;

Trows thou, man, be the law to get remeid

*Of men of kirk? Na! not till thou be deid! **

If, however, any readers should insist upon plain prose as the sole authority for such pictures as the above, we would refer him to the words of Cardinal Bentivoglio in 1607, and the comments of the Roman

* Cited in Vol. I. of Lord Lindsay's charming 'Lives of the Lindsays.'

Catholic Lingard in our own day. “As to the Catholic
 “Religion,” writes the Cardinal, “its condition is
 “deplorable in Scotland. There never has been seen
 “in the Scotch that fervour for preserving the Catholic
 “religion in Scotland, which was seen (and still is)
 “in England for its preservation in England; and
 “usually the Scotch are not much inclined to em-
 “brace the ecclesiastical profession.” * “Of all the
 “European Churches,” writes Lingard, “there was,
 “perhaps, not one better prepared to receive the
 “seed of the new gospel than that of Scotland.
 “*During a long course of years* the highest dignities
 “had, with few exceptions, been possessed by the
 “illegitimate, or younger sons of the most powerful
 “families, *men who, without learning or morality them-*
 “*selves, paid little attention to the learning or morality*
 “*of their inferiors.* The pride of the clergy, their
 “negligence in the discharge of their functions, and
 “the rigour with which they exacted their dues had
 “become favourite subjects of popular censure.” †

It may, however, be said, that the above passages refer to one country only, and that country the very worst specimen that could by any possibility be selected. Let us turn our eyes southward then, to that important diocese which had once enjoyed the care of St. Ambrose. For about eighty years before the epoch of the Reformation no Archbishop of Milan had been resident in his diocese. The follow-

* Relazioni di Cardinale Bentivoglio, Lib. I. p. 220.

† History of England, vol. vi. ch. 7. 6th Edit.

ing account of the state of things is taken from a recent Roman Catholic biography of St. Carlo Borromeo, who died in A.D. 1584, just twelve years later than John Knox. "The clergy generally exhibited the most unblushing contempt of the requirements of their sacred order; their immorality being, in fact, so public and systematic, that it is to be presumed they had lost all sense of the obligations of their state. They dressed like seculars, carried arms after the fashion of the men of that day, absented themselves from their benefices, and were so totally indifferent to all that concerned the service of God, that the churches were abandoned to the most shameful neglect. . . .

"The same dissolution of morals had more or less invaded the cloister, and even the convents of women had not escaped the infection. Discipline and the rules of their order were quite thrown aside. Seculars entered their enclosure without hindrance, the religious went in and out at pleasure, and these holy retreats were frequently desecrated by parties and balls.

"Ignorance and immorality, with rare exceptions, may be attributed to the whole body of the nation; *and the common people especially were frequently devoid of the bare knowledge of those truths which are necessary to salvation, and lived and died without having even been taught either the articles of faith or the commandments of God.* Holy days were profaned by secular employments and secular gaieties, servile work was performed, and fairs and markets held upon them: so that the very festivals of the

Church seemed to be retained only for the convenience of insulting the majesty of God with the greater freedom and display."

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? The clergy should surely try to be guardians, so far as it may be done without undue interference, of the very amusements of a nation; should strive to foster and countenance all reasonable and innocent pastimes, while they condemn unlawful pleasures or undue attention to even lawful ones. But how does the possibility of such guardianship comport with the following statements?

"It was impossible to repress the eagerness with which the clergy, especially after the barbarians were tempted by rich bishoprics to take upon them the sacred functions, rushed into these secular amusements. Prohibitions of councils, however frequently repeated, produced little effect. In some instances, a particular monastery obtained a dispensation. Thus, that of S. Denis, in 774, represented to Charlemagne that the flesh of hunted animals was salutary for sick monks, and that their skins would serve to bind the books in the library. Reasons equally cogent, we may presume, could not be wanting in every other case. As the bishops and abbots were perfectly feudal lords, and often did not scruple to lead their vassals into the field, it was not to be expected that they should debar themselves of an innocent pastime. It was hardly such, indeed, when practised at the expense of others. Alexander III., by a letter to the clergy of Berkshire, dispenses with their keeping the archdeacon in dogs and hawks

during his visitation. This season gave jovial ecclesiastics an opportunity of trying different countries. An Archbishop of York, in 1321, seems to have carried a train of 200 persons, who were maintained at the expense of the abbeys on his road, and to have hunted with a pack of hounds from parish to parish. The third council of Lateran, in 1180, had prohibited this amusement on such journies, and restricted bishops to a train of forty or fifty horses.”*

I am thus far following in the steps of Dr. Littledale, that I have confined myself to the evidence supplied by authorities which are readily accessible to all. He informs us, however, that he has a friend engaged upon a work concerning the suppressed facts in Reformation history. It will be right to accord a welcome to any such work, provided always that the same inquirer, or one equally zealous, will also concomitantly publish a collection of suppressed facts concerning the *præ*-Reformation condition of the Church. Several Roman Catholic writers, and some of the warmest advocates of re-union, have honourably and wisely called attention to these things. We have already given some brief extracts from a Roman Catholic biography of St. Carlo Borromeo. We must add a few similar complaints from the review in the *Chronicle* of the life of Jacob Wimpheling, a

* Hallam, Middle Ages, vol. iii. pp. 310, 311. Hallam is dry, deficient in imagination, and in breadth of view; and, possibly, less impartial than is sometimes believed. But no one disputes his accuracy and diligence in the collection and statement of facts.

Roman theologian, whose life extended from A.D. 1450 to 1520:—

“His complaints of the existing corruptions refer principally to the clergy and monks. In their hands exclusively the education of the people had lain for centuries; and to their laxity he imputes the whole intellectual, moral, and religious degeneration of the nation. He always appears as a firm adherent of the Papal power, and a warm maintainer of the Divine institution of the Primacy. He defended it against Archbishop Andreas von Krain in one of his earliest writings (about 1482), and he still upheld it in 1520 against Luther. But this did not prevent him from declaring, as Gerson had done before him, that the deplorable condition of the Papacy was the chief source of all evil among the higher and lower clergy. Rome, he said, shows herself indifferent to the true interests of Church authority; to the cultivation and promotion of science, especially theology; to the maintenance of discipline among the secular and regular clergy, especially among the higher classes; to the strict observance of the Canon Law, to the most arbitrary acts, to the numerous abuses in Divine worship, and to the most justifiable wishes of the nations; she only meditates how to increase her means for extorting money. . . . Wimpheling states that the diocese of Mentz alone had been obliged to send to Rome, within one generation, seven times over, the sum of 25,000 florins, in order to obtain the confirmation of the Archbishop. Even Johann Eck acknowledged the truth of these complaints. . . . The prelates imitated and tried to outdo the head of the Church in forgetfulness of their duties. They were for the most part loaded with preferments. Sometimes one man had above a hundred benefices. Many never performed Divine Service at all. Instead of keeping residence, they ran after secular pleasures, and led vicious and dissipated lives. Many prelates had not even a Breviary in their possession, as Albert Ferrari assures us in his *Tractatus de Horis Canonicis*, fol. 20; and some who possessed one were ashamed to be seen with it in their hands. The poor secular and rural clergy were treated by the bishops like helots, and, in spite of their poverty, were burdened with taxes, so that in fact the prelates alone enjoyed the ecclesiastical immuni-

ties. It is characteristic of the deep depravity of the age that theological knowledge was not only no recommendation for preferment, but even an obstacle to obtaining it, especially in the case of canonries. Wimpfeling's information on this point is confirmed by many of his contemporaries, notably by Eck, who says: '*Haud facillè theologis ad præbendas patet ascensus.*' . . . The country priest, to make up to himself in some measure for the contempt with which he was treated by his Bishop, gave full swing to his passions. Sacerdotal concubinage was quite common. The Episcopal sees, the abbeys, and the chapters, were given to the sons of noblemen; and the inferior benefices were given to the sons of poor farmers and citizens."

Then, after a notice of Wimpfeling's views on education, the reviewer proceeds:—

"The third point to which Wimpfeling directed his attention in all his writings was the spiritual and moral elevation of the clergy, and the determination of their position with regard to the laity. The great disproportion between the internal worth and external dignity of the clergy did not escape his notice. He saw that the superior as well as the inferior clergy were, on the whole, spiritually and morally worse than the laymen, however great were the privileges which they enjoyed over them. He did not wonder, therefore, that hatred and disdain should be exhibited towards the clergy, especially by the working classes and the gentry. While, on the one hand, the married life of the citizen was looked upon as imperfect, on the other hand the most shameful vices were practised, and therefore all feeling for a higher life was stifled. Wimpfeling declares that the clergy could purchase licenses of concubinage, and that parishioners entreated their priests to obtain them, in order to ensure the honour of their own wives and daughters. . . . Wimpfeling assures us that monks preached from the pulpit publicly excusing scandals much greater than any of these."

"He was indefatigable in his efforts to call back the thoughts of the clergy to their high dignity, and to warn them against these vices. The true cause of the evil, he said, was that they had

been too highly exalted. The extraordinary grace which the candidate for Orders was led to expect was a supposition seldom realized; but the expectation produced its natural effects, and while some men raised themselves to a sublime height, the rest sank to an unnatural depth. *His zealous efforts to improve the literary knowledge of the clergy resulted not in radical, but only in very moderate measures.* He agreed with Conrad Sommerhard's favourite adage: 'Ecclesiam turbare rationibus Thomae, formalitatibus Scoti, et connotationibus Occami.' He blamed most seriously that haughtiness of the monks towards the learned men of ignoble pedigree which was exhibited in the condemnation of Johann Wessel at Mentz. He demanded that a preference should be given to scholars, in distributing benefices and public offices; and considered that one of the principal reasons for the decline of theology was the intentional exclusion of learned theologians from canonries or places of preferment, so that men who had been professors at a university for twenty years or more saw no way of obtaining a benefice. He lived to see the beginning of Luther's career, *and, like every other German, rejoiced much at first.* On the 1st of September, 1520, he wrote a letter to his friend the Bishop of Basle, *and entreated him, in union with all the other German bishops, to induce the Pope not to condemn Luther, who, although he had gone too far in many ways, was still, he said, inspired with Christian zeal.* But it was already too late. Luther's adversary at Rome had conquered; and Eck, in the very month in which the letter is dated, had begun to fix the Bull of excommunication to the doors of the German churches. The schism was already accomplished."

The task of continuing to bring together evidence of a like nature would, alas! be only too easy. We might appeal to the *Cancionero* of Baena (a Spanish *collection* of poems published about 1443) as a proof of the laxity into which Castilian manners had fallen at that epoch, among the clergy quite as much as the laity.* We

* Cette cour de Castille, si renommée au moyen âge par son

might refer to the very headings of the articles in the Councils of Constance and of Basle; those last attempts at a conservative reform, which should pro-

élégance et sa splendeur, qui, trois siècles auparavant avoit déjà mérité d'être, proclamée la première d'entre les cours par l'Empereur Frédéric Barberousse, un des hommes les plus graves de son temps, avait à peine sous le regne de Jean II., le sentiment de la décence et de la dignité. . . . Ce n'est point là toutefois que se bornent les témoignages que fournit le *Cancionero de Baena* sur l'anarchie morale, qui regnait en Castille dans la première moitié du XVe siècle. Nous croyons en trouver la preuve la plus éclatante dans la naive effronterie avec laquelle des hommes d'église, savans, respectés, et d'un rang considérable, se mêlaient au mouvement d'une poésie amoureuse, très peu mystique, et abdiquaient ainsi la circonspection, imposée à leur ministère sacré. Ici c'est un moine qui, pour répondre à la question d'un poète prête, pour ainsi dire, sa muse, à la jolie maîtresse du Comte de Niebla, laquelle, à ce qu'il paraît aurait été en état de répondre elle-même. Plus loin, c'est l'archidiacre de Toro, qui compose en l'honneur de *su señora* (de sa dame) des vers animés du plus tendre amour. C'est surtout le Franciscain, Fray Diego de Valencia, qui nous offre l'exemple le plus saillant du relâchement ou étoit tombé la société cléricale de l'époque. Fray Diego n'étoit point de ces moines ignorans et mondains, pour lesquels le froc étoit un masque et le cloître un prison. Eh bien, qui le croiroit? ce *muy Conrado y sabio varon*, comme l'appelle Baena, ce docteur vénéré, qui étoit particulièrement versé dans la science Théologique de l'université de Paris, dont il cite les écrivains scolastiques alors si célèbres, Pierre Lombard et Alexandre de Hales, s'oublie jusqu'à se faire le champion d'une courtisane d'infime espèce, la Cortabota, et, il faut le dire, il s'acquitte de sa tâche peu ascétique avec une liberté d'allures à faire pâlir les plus cyniques facéties de Villasandino.

Ce recueil hardi n'étoit cependant pas exclusivement destiné au roi Jean. Baena le dédie également à la reine doña Maria,

ceed from without and not from within. To say nothing of the reproofs against immorality, gambling, simony, and the like crimes urged by the Council of Constance, we would here simply call attention to the language of the Council of Basle. "Errors are arising, and many venture with impunity to assert their own dogmas in matters of faith against the decision of the Church universal; ecclesiastical censures are despised; decrees and canons are lightly esteemed, and hence vices, like steeds with the reins on their necks, revel through the earth; discords, divisions, schisms, flourish without limit, *almost every vacant church has two patrons*. One man is chosen; provision is made for the other by means of reservations. Every form of disobedience and transgression now rears its head on all sides; what the holy Synod ordains, the Roman Pontiff disannuls; whatever it binds, he loosens. The consciences of Christians are led onwards into a mighty labyrinth and to a precipice. And in well-nigh every quarter an abundant multitude of souls is bound by the chains of censures and excommunications, and the whole of Christendom suffers

ainsi qu'aux dames et demoiselles (*dueñas y doncellas*) de sa maison, et il assure, avec une incroyable naïveté que le livre charmera les loisirs non-seulement de ~~ses~~ dames, "mais encore du prince royal Don Enrique, et en général des prélats, infans, ducs, maréchaux, amiraux, prieurs, docteurs, et de tous les autres seigneurs et officiers du royaume."—*Revue des Deux Mondes*, for 15th May, 1853, *Art. on Baena* by M. Leopoldo Augusto de Cueto.

“judicial detriment. And while there is no correction of abuses, faults are dismissed without punishment.”* Those who wish for further evidence may read the life of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who became Pope under the title of Pius II., in Book xiii. chap. xvi. of Dean Milman’s ‘Latin Christianity;’ or that writer’s description of the condition of morality in the chapter immediately succeeding. They may also refer with advantage to Dean Hook’s ‘Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury;’ Mr. Grub’s excellent ‘Ecclesiastical History of Scotland;’ a paper contributed by Mr. Froude to ‘Fraser’s Magazine’ for January, 1857, and one in the ‘Union Review’ for November, 1868.

The relation, then, of the Reformation to the life and practice of the mediæval Church was that of a movement which at least had its noble side, which desired a real change from the worse unto the better. “*We must admit,*” says Dr. Döllinger, “that the anxiety of the German nation to see the intolerable abuses and scandals in the Church removed *was fully justified*; and that it sprang *from the better qualities of our people, and from their moral indignation at the desecration and corruption of holy things, which were degraded to selfish and hypocritical purposes.*” †

* Translated literally from the *Responsio Synodalis ad schedulam protestationis contra processum Papæ*, which protest had been made through an orator sent by the Duke of Milan. The date is A.D. 1442. (Labbe, *Concilia*, &c. Tom. viii. p. 1386.—Ed. Paris, 1714.)

† The Church and the Churches, Introduction, p. 17, Eng. Tr.

II. Enough has been said to justify me in asking the assent of the reader to the position that *some kind of Reformation was absolutely and imperatively demanded in the sixteenth century*. That matters should continue just as they were had become well nigh impossible. One century more of such fatal and rapid declension, and Christianity itself must, humanly speaking, have perished from off the face of the earth. And how many elements combined to spread the idea of change may be seen by the merest glance at the history of the times. The fall of Constantinople and consequent flight of learned Grecians, with their manuscripts, to Italy; the rise of a more subjective and semi-sceptical literature with Ræbelais, and subsequently with Montaigne; the great development of physical science and dawning of the inductive and experimental school of inventors; the discovery (or re-discovery, whichever it was) of America by Columbus, and of the new route to India round the Cape by Vasco de Gama; and last, but not least, the invention of the printing-press in Germany; who can doubt but that all these events, compressed, as they were, into a space of time not exceeding the ordinary term of a man's life, must have powerfully acted upon the mind of Christendom, and pre-disposed it for the reception of change in all that concerned both the outer and the inmost being of the human race? * Justly has a famous essay of our day described, in the vivid and classic English which its

* The juxta-position of the actual dates is not devoid of interest.

author employs so skilfully, how a living idea takes possession of men's minds, how it agitates thought, is confronted with other aspects of truth, and is surveyed in its relation to the varying circumstances of times and places; how it alters the current of public opinion, and at length emerges into a system of government, of doctrine, or of ritual. *

Nevertheless, be the force of ideas what it may, it rarely happens in the history of mankind, that the personal is not intimately interwoven with the abstract, and that the mention of any victory won in the world of art, of philosophy, of statesmanship, is not associated with some famous name or names. Thus, for example, Cæsar has become a title representing the notion of imperialism, and an account of the successes of free trade may call up the remembrance of Fenelon and Adam Smith, of the younger Pitt and

Capture of Constantinople by the Turks under

Mahomet II. A.D. 1453.

Printing (as an European invention) commences

at Maintz 1436.

Copernicus born 1473.

Luther born 1483.

Discovery of America by Columbus 1492.

Rabelais born 1495.

Discovery of route to India *via* Cape of Good

Hope by Vasco de Gama 1497.

M. Guizot is one of many who have called attention to this conjuncture of events; he adds to the list: the use of cannon, and of the mariner's compass; the development of oil painting, and engraving on copper.—(Civilisation en Europe, 11ieme Leçon.)

* J. H. Newman, Essay on Development, pp. 35, 36.

of Richard Cobden. Seldom, indeed, does a cause which affords matter for conflict and controversy triumph until it has found heroes, perhaps even martyrs of its own. And not unfrequently, even when the idea in itself is noble, and the work to be achieved by it most beneficent, it pleases God, in the wisdom of his providence, that the end should be attained through the instrumentality of agents painfully unworthy of the cause which they are permitted to take in hand. It was a real gain to Israel, so far as it went, when the image of Baal was cast down, and the house of Baal overthrown and dishonoured. But he who accomplished these righteous acts was but half-hearted in the service of God ; and, though Jehu received a temporal blessing for himself and four generations after him, yet this agent of a solid step in the way of reformation cannot be numbered with such as Jehoshaphat, or Hezekiah, or the lamented Josiah. It was an unspeakable blessing to the world at large, when the seemingly internecine war between the Roman Empire and Christianity came to an end. Establishments may now be about to disappear from the universe ; but they will not all perish until their work is done ; and that work, with whatever drawbacks it may have been accompanied, has been fruitful of good to a degree hardly conceivable, except by those who have paid great attention to its many modes of influence upon the complex framework of mediæval and modern civilization. But, still, the man who first mounted the Cross upon the summit of the imperial diadem is confessedly,

after all just and generous allowance has been made, one in whose case the contrast between his life and his work has (in the language of his fairest critic) "justly shocked posterity."* The change effected by Constantine, like the change effected by Jehu, was of the highest value; but neither Jehu nor Constantine can be accounted saints. A distinguished historian of our time expressed somewhat similar sentiments with reference to the English Reformation in the sixteenth century. "It was a movement," Dr. Arnold used to say, "in which above all others it was necessary not to forget the goodness of the cause in the badness of the agents, nor the badness of the agents in the goodness of the cause."

We may not be ready to assent to Arnold on all the points wherein his admiration of the movement of the sixteenth century would extend. But we agree with him in accepting the possibility of a certain degree of separation of thought between the movers and the movement, in this as in many another marked crisis of the world's history. And here, too, we believe that we may claim, at least, a partial support from the lofty intellect and generous temper of that great Roman Catholic doctor, to whose words throughout this essay there will be found such constant appeal. Speaking of the time, when there shall arise on both sides vivid and strong conviction that Christ desires the unity of His Church, Dr. Döllinger asserts, in language worthy of himself, that—"On that day also much will be changed on the

* De Broglie.

“ Catholic side. Thenceforward the personal character
 “ of Luther and of the Reformers will be no more
 “ dragged forward in the pulpit. The clergy, mind-
 “ ful of the words, *Interficate errores, diligite homines*
 “ will ever conduct themselves towards members of
 “ other Churches in conformity with the rules of
 “ charity, and will, therefore, assume, in all cases
 “ where there are no clear proofs to the contrary,
 “ the *bona fides* of opponents. *They will never forget*
 “ *that no man is convinced and won over by bitter words*
 “ *and violent attacks, but that every one is rather re-*
 “ *pelled by them.*” *

But, nevertheless, one may earnestly desire to adduce some considerations which seem in danger of being overlooked. It has already been observed that both supporters and assailants of the Reformation are apt to use language of this sort: “ You would
 “ come over to our views if you would but read more
 “ upon the subject.” But is there not in reference to such complicated materials a possibility of a more wavering and discontinuous career of thought? Is it not conceivable, for instance, that a student might in boyhood be imbued with all the popular traditional notions current in England concerning Reformers and anti-Reformers, and the course and effects of the Reformation; might find it impossible in after-life to avoid the surrender of many of his most cherished imaginations, and indeed experience a great revulsion

* The Church and the Churches. Introduction, p. 16. (Eng. Translation.)

from them ; and then might be led by more extended inquiries, and a greater experience of life, to the conviction that his revulsion had been extreme ; and that the case on behalf of the movement of the sixteenth century, and of palliation even for many of its excesses, was a far stronger one than in his earlier manhood he had imagined. The present writer trusts that such a course is conceivable, because it has been that of his own mind, and he is desirous of trying to assign the grounds of such alternations of sentiment.

In a graceful little German fable—I forget its author’s name—a doe warns her youthful offspring to beware, as she skips about the forest, of that dangerous animal, the leopard. “And what is the leopard like?” inquires the fawn. “Oh! it is a dreadful looking monster; its eyes glare and its jaws drop blood.” The fawn goes off to roam the wood, and in the course of her rambles espies, at some distance in the long grass, a graceful creature with beautifully-spotted hide: its movements are elegant and even playful; its aspect betrays no sanguinary stain nor fierceness of purpose. “Well! this *cannot* be the leopard,” says the fawn; “*this* is not the creature which my parent described. I must go and make acquaintance with it.” She accordingly advances to greet the new-found friend, and —— but one need not stop to mention the result.

How often on all sides is the mistake of this well-meaning but most unwise mother repeated! Extremes beget extremes. If people *will* paint their opponents in

the darkest colours, grievous mistakes must necessarily follow : and analogous results ensue from the equally popular practice of representing our friends and objects of admiration as purely angelic. The harsh judgments now being passed on the Reformers are, in part, almost inevitable consequences of the excessive and unwarrantable amount of eulogy, which for so many years was showered upon their memory in popular histories and lectures and pamphlets. By the mass of Englishmen Burnet and Foxe have been accepted unreservedly until within the last few years ; but those years have witnessed a great change ; they have given birth, *inter alia*, to the judicial *critiques* of Dr. Maitland, the honourable avowals of Dean Hook, and the impassioned invectives of Sir Francis Palgrave.

But when history is more largely studied, and more is seen of what passes round us, other thoughts may occur to the reflective mind. Let us turn aside for a few moments to some other great epoch of controversy. Take the story of the contest with Arianism in the fourth century. Alas ! how few came out of that tangled web with reputations perfectly unblemished. To say nothing of the arch-heretic himself, one of the most painful and repulsive characters in history ; what is to be thought of Hosius, of Eusebius of Nicomedia, of Eusebius Pamphili, of the Fathers assembled at Ariminum, of the Emperor Constantine, of Lucifer of Cagliari ? In one way or another they are all, to use the gentlest term, more or less disappointing. Hosius, after taking a leading part, perhaps even presiding at the council of Nice, falls away in

his old age. Eusebius of Nicomedia becomes decidedly Arian, and his namesake the historian employs questionable and ambiguous phrases. Constantine is involved in a miserable domestic tragedy, and is baptized by hands of doubtful orthodoxy. Lucifer, in the excess of a warm-hearted zeal, is unable to understand the wise and generous moderation displayed by the greatest champion of the faith, and thus becomes a schismatic, and founds a sect known as the Luciferians. The prelates at Rimini are misled, and adopt terms which, though not so meant, are in fact a victory for the enemy, and are for ever branded with the lively and far-famed verdict of St. Jerome—*Ingemuit totus orbis et se Arianum esse miratus est*. On the fall of Liberius we need not for the moment dwell. But assuredly the eloquent summary given by Hooker can hardly be accused of exaggeration in those well-known words: “*Only* in Athanasius there was nothing “observed throughout the course of that long tragedy, other than such as very well became a wise “man to do and a righteous to suffer. So that this “was the plain condition of those times: the whole “world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against “it; half-a-hundred of years spent in doubtful trial “which of the two in the end would prevail, the side “which had all, or else the part which had no friend “but God and death, the one a defender of his innocence, the other a finisher of all his troubles.”*

* Hooker's ‘Ecclesiastical Polity,’ book v. chap. viii. § 5. Dr. Newman, in his interesting and excellent work, ‘The Arians of the Fourth Century,’ is quite as emphatic as Hooker on the *solitariness*, so to speak, of supreme excellence displayed by S. Athanasius.

Now the era of the Reformation was a far more complicated one than that which witnessed the rise of Arianism. The state of society was much more artificial and elaborate in the sixteenth, than it had been in the fourth century. Proportionally also were the difficulties of public men increased; and if we are bound, as we most certainly are, to make large allowances for a Constantine, a Lucifer of Cagliari, an Eusebius, in like manner are we called upon by every law of charity and of justice to deal even more gently with the memory of those men in the sixteenth century who were subjected to trials of which we have never yet known more than the very faintest semblances. Sir Francis Palgrave, in a passage of much beauty, implores the student of history to contemplate with those generous sentiments that moderate the rancour of an enemy, the courage, the suffering, the deaths in the field or on the scaffold, the torture, exile, contumely endured on both sides on behalf of loyalty or liberty, of faith or nationality. He believes that a real insight into the hearts and minds of many who have been compelled to take a side in civil dissensions would tend greatly “to allay
 “that miserable and besetting bitterness of political
 “and theological antipathies” which he calls “an affliction to those who entertain it and a snare to
 “their consciences, seducing them into worse errors
 “than the deeds they reprobate.” He asks—and the question deserves our best and most thoughtful consideration—whether “the lacerations of feeling, which
 “the duty of making a choice under such exigencies

“imposes, are adequately appreciated by the fortunate
 “who are spared the pangs.” “Do we,” he continues,
 “sufficiently feel the blessing of not having
 “been Englishmen when the royal standard was unfurled
 “at Nottingham—not having been Scotsmen when Charles
 “Edward landed—not having been Irishmen of the Irish
 “after the battle of the Boyne?”* Well might one, who calls to mind the
 still deeper and more thorny problems attendant upon religious
 controversies, ask whether we are all adequately alive to the blessing
 of not having had our lot cast in the days when Donatism, or Arianism,
 or Pelagianism troubled men’s hearts and consciences; or in the
 times and countries of Wicliffe or Huss, of Savonarola or of Luther,
 of Bonner and of Latimer?

For it is idle, it is worse than idle, it is flagrantly unfair and unjust to assume, as men too often do, that we should necessarily have espoused that side to which our present sympathies and inclinations would lead us. There exist at this moment in some of the most ultra-Protestant communions, men so naturally conservative in their entire temperament, so wholly devoted to the cause of authority, that we can hardly doubt but that in the sixteenth century they would have been found zealous and devoted adherents to the cause of anti-Reform, to the support of the then dominant institutions; while, on the other hand, some of the influences which at present incline youthful minds in the direction of Rome would most probably, in the sixteenth century, have carried them in the path of change

* History of Normandy and England, vol. i. pp. 202, 3.

and reformation. "We have to acknowledge," says Döllinger, "that, in the Church, the rust of abuses
 "and of a mechanical superstition is always forming
 "afresh; that the servants of the Church sometimes,
 "through insolence and incapacity, and the people
 "through ignorance, brutify the spiritual in religion,
 "and so degrade and deform and misemploy it to
 "their own injury. *The right reforming spirit must*
"therefore never depart from the Church, but, on the
"contrary, must periodically break out with renovating
"strength and penetrate the conscience and the will of
*"the clergy."**

Most true. But if the right reforming spirit ought never to perish, then from time to time there must arise living men, who shall prove themselves to be energetic reformers. No cause will prosper without leaders. And for the ideal reformer, more especially for the ideal reformer in the later middle ages, what a vast and varied assemblage of gifts was requisite! There was needed the heart that could feel the miseries around, and yet remain uninfuriated by the oppression that drives the wise man mad; that power of a spiritual *diagnosis* which should be able to detect the real nature and causes of existing ailments, and to indicate and devise the proper remedies; that influence (arising from fervour of spirit, from genius or station, or from all combined), which could effectually make its voice heard amidst the din of public life; that deep conviction of the rectitude of his cause, which alone can induce any one to wage a

* The Church and the Churches, pp. 17, 18.

contest upon such unequal terms; and lastly that undaunted courage which could enable a man to face the prospect of being called upon to end his career by a terrible and painful death. What marvel, if many of those who attempted so mighty an undertaking proved unequal to the task; if they were found wanting in some one or more of the numerous and varied qualifications required; if they showed themselves unpractical in their management of affairs; if they learnt to embrace wild or even heretical notions, or if they shrunk back appalled at the terrorism which raged around them. A famous elegy reminds us of the many unknown patriots and poets whose circumscribed lot forbade them, indeed, to win the bright splendour of renown, but may likewise have saved them from the committal of grievous errors and crimes. Perhaps, had his thoughts run in that direction, the skill of Gray might have added to his list some memorial of the vast numbers of those who would fain, if circumstances permitted it, have stood forth as restorers and purifiers of mediæval Christianity.

It needs a powerful stretch of fancy to bring before the mind's eye the possible effect of such scenes as would have met us, in the ages of which we are speaking. We must try to dwell in thought amidst the Ayrshire peasants in the days of Sir David Lindsay, or to witness with Wimpeling the condition of Germany, or to be present with a Borromeo in the neglected diocese of Milan. We must also earnestly attempt to picture to ourselves,

if that, indeed, be possible for us, the condition of mind which is induced by the consciousness that one's efforts must almost inevitably end in death by fire, probably amidst the execrations of fellow creatures. Dr. Newman tells us that the sight of a Spanish *auto-da-fe* would, he thinks, have been the death of him.* But how if our lot had been cast in times when we ran the risk of not merely seeing these things, but of being numbered among their victims? How anxiously, even with the few who had grace to cherish the martyr-spirit, would the question be agitated in their hearts, whether this or that conviction was an article of faith worth dying for. Many a recantation has probably arisen, far less from cowardice than from lack of settled fixity of conclusions upon this point; a point often profoundly difficult of determination even where the mind is calm and the inquiry comparatively disinterested, but how infinitely more difficult under such circumstances as these. Dwellers ourselves in the Britain of the nineteenth century, we ought surely to recognize the need of the deepest humility and charity in judging of any, upon either side, who were subjected to such an ordeal as this.

That rich and genial imagination which has created for us, as has been truly said, a gallery of portraits second only to that of Shakespeare, has not wholly neglected the task of limning such traits as would be needed to produce a reformer in the earlier middle age. Though inclined by temperament to

* *Apologia*, p. 118.

sympathize rather with the worshippers of the past than with the introducers of any form of innovation, Walter Scott has sketched in the person of Clement Blair, some of the salient points of the reforming temperament with his usual power and felicity of touch. “And now, brother Simon, since
 “you think it perilous to own me and my opinions,
 “I must walk alone with my own doctrines, and the
 “dangers they draw on me. But should your eye,
 “less blinded than it now is by worldly hopes and
 “fears, ever turn a glance on him, who soon may be
 “snatched from you, remember, that by nought,
 “save a deep sense of the truth and importance of
 “the doctrine which he taught, could Clement Blair
 “have learned to encounter, nay, to provoke the
 “animosity of the powerful and inveterate, to alarm
 “the fears of the jealous and timid, to walk in the
 “world as if he belonged not to it, and to be
 “accounted mad of men, that he might, if possible,
 “win souls to God. Heaven be my witness, that I
 “would comply in all lawful things, to conciliate the
 “love and sympathy of my fellow-creatures! It is
 “no light thing to be shunned by the worthy as
 “an infected patient; to be persecuted by the
 “Pharisees of the day as an unbelieving heretic; to
 “be regarded with horror at once and contempt by
 “the multitude, who consider me as a madman, who
 “may be expected to turn mischievous. But were
 “all those evils multiplied an hundred-fold, the fire
 “within must not be stifled, the voice which says
 “within me, speak—must receive obedience. Woe

“unto me if I preach not the Gospel, even should
 “I at length preach it from amidst the pile of
 “flames.” *

That the ideal Reformer may never have appeared is very possible. But it should be carefully borne in mind, that the anti-Reformer is at least almost equally hard to find, that he too has to be sought for, rather in the realms of fancy, than in the annals of fact. We can imagine indeed a ruler, or even a set of rulers, who should strive to check the fervour of an innovator and yet feel and display an earnest sympathy with the good features of his character and career; who should be deeply convinced of the truth of that important principle that it is vain to attempt the conservation of anything that is not true nor just; who should attempt in short by righteous means to exercise precisely that proper and fair degree of repressive force which is in reality, in the long run, rather an aid than an obstacle to all true progress. Now in estimating the temper and behaviour of reformers, it is highly important to ask ourselves this among other questions, *How were they met?*

In the case of Wicliffe, the treatment was kind and reasonable. But what shall be said of the termination of the career of Fra Dolcino and his sister Margarita, of Savonarola and of hundreds more? What must be declared concerning the Council of Constance in relation to Huss and Jerome of Prague?

* ‘Fair Maid of Perth,’ chap. xxvii. Compare the preface to the Abbot, where Scott speaks of his desire to do justice to both Reformers and their opponents.

That in this last instance all milder means were first tried may gladly be acknowledged. But the damning fact remains, perhaps the deepest blot upon any assemblage of clergy ever congregated, that deliberately and in cold blood the "Fathers of Constance" made provision for the possibility of what actually occurred; that they, priests of the Most High, resolved beforehand to treat as of no avail the safe-conduct of the Emperor, and to examine and punish those who but for this breach of all truth and honour, would never have been brought within their grasp.*

Luther was, it is true, more fortunate. The dauntless courage with which, despite the deeds enacted at Constance, he went to Worms, must for ever, even in the judgment of his keenest adversaries, enrol him in the rank of heroes. But as regards any approximation to ideal treatment of the German reformer at the hands of authority, what do we find? It has been seen that Wimpheling, *like every other German*, was greatly rejoiced by the commencement of Luther's career, and exerted what influence he possessed to save one, who, "although he had gone too far in many ways, was still," said Wimpheling, "*inspired by Christian zeal*." But that "elegant Pagan," as a satiric pen has only too justly termed Pope Leo X., for at least two years bestowed no attention whatever on the course of the fervid Augustinian monk. Wholly unable to appreciate the gravity of the situation, Leo seems to have regarded the internecine duel

* For my authority for this statement, see Appendix.

between Tetzels and Luther as an interesting piece of sword-play, from which a cool spectator, like himself, might derive a new fund of lively and pleasurable excitement! A similar barrenness was displayed in Scotland. With the exception of Wingate and Abbot Kennedy of Crossraguel, men both deserving of deep respect, scarcely a single Scottish opponent of the Reformation can be named who opposed it with other than earthly weapons of warfare.* And just as, in Germany, Martin Luther met with no adversary in the slightest degree fit to be matched against him, so neither in France nor Switzerland was any man discovered, at all competent to enter the lists against the hard, but powerful logic of Calvin. This lack of any approximation to the ideal of *anti-Reformers* was most probably a very real misfortune both to the cause of the Reformation and the character of its chief promoters. At any rate it deserves a very special consideration at the hands of him who would form a fair estimate of the Reformers.

I have said that a gentler view of the shortcomings of these remarkable men has been suggested to me, not only by the study of history, but likewise by increased experience of life. In connection with this latter source of materials for forming a judgment, let me specially refer to the rarity of what may be respectively termed the judicial-faculty and the advocate-faculty being equally developed in the same

* See Dr. Grub. Eccl. Hist. of Scotland, Chaps. xxxiv. and xxxv. He gives Wingate's name in its older form, Winzet.

mind. ONE indeed there is, the Head of our race, who, combining in His own Person graces without measure, and all the possible gifts of a perfected humanity, concentrates in Himself these, along with all other endowments of the soul. *Advocatus noster in cælis; Judex in throno sessurus*, Christ is here, as everywhere else, emphatically all in all! But we, His creatures, with our fallen nature and broken lights, can seldom attain to more than a partial and imperfect conjunction of these seemingly antagonistic offices. And though the decision, which places the ermine of the judge above the pleader's gown is right and just, yet must it be owned that the calmness of the judicial mind is not the only state of feeling that is needed for this work-day world; and that many a noble cause would have lain unheeded and unfought for, but for the existence of that more one-sided, more impassioned, but more earnest temperament, which makes the advocate defend an oppressed society or nation, vindicate the claims of people that have no earthly helper, or strive to propagate ideas that have long been buried in the dust.

But while we recognize the special excellencies of either temper, we may also well be called upon to make allowances for the characteristic defects of each. Without dwelling on those of the judicial mind (with which, at this point of our inquiry, we are less concerned) it is little more than a truism to observe, that the genius of the advocate is almost necessarily liable to the faults of one-sidedness, over-statement and exaggeration. And if this assertion hold good, as it

surely does, with reference to the leaders engaged in contests attendant upon politics, upon philosophy, nay even upon physical science, how much more applicable must it be to the case of theology, in proportion as religious controversy agitates the hearts of men more deeply and more keenly than any dispute concerning secular affairs. Religious leaders, from their very earnestness, almost inevitably become partial. They desire to recall attention to some neglected truth, or to uproot some injurious and superstitious practice, or to withstand some rising error, or to implant in the mind of Christendom some living idea which possesses and dominates their own entire being, and which they conceive to be the panacea for all existing ills. Before long the special truth on which they would insist is represented by them as the centre and pivot of all other truths; the superstition they would fain abolish becomes in their eyes so noxious that they scorn, in their zeal to gather up its tares, any peril of uprooting the wheat of truth along with it; the error which is the object of their most vehement denunciation is treated as the sole fount and origin of all the possible calamities which afflict humanity; the one pervading idea which soars loftiest before their uplifted glance is erected by them into an *articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*.

But are the Reformers alone to be severely censured for a fault which is common to almost every zealous advocate of a cause? Have not nearly all religious leaders in some degree been liable to such fascination? Is there not a growing conviction among

thoughtful and learned men that even St. Augustine himself, in his energy against Pelagius, has pressed his arguments too far; and that it is impossible to accept the Augustinian positions unreservedly, unless we are prepared to subscribe the dogmas of Calvinism afterwards? Certainly, on at least one point, as Mr. Oxenham has justly observed, the sense of modern Christendom has decided against the teaching of St. Austin.* For him and for other great doctors of the Church, even at moments for St. Athanasius himself, historians and editors feel constrained to use something like the language of apology.† By all means, on every ground of justice and of charity, let it be accepted: but then such treatment cannot be restricted to a single age or country; it must needs embrace a far larger circle than that of the divines of the fourth century.

Will its *ægis* be needed to ward off at least *some* attacks from the Reformers only? Do the Jesuits, do the Jansenists, do the awakeners of religious fervour in the England of the last century, stand in no need of its aid? Nay: must not its application come nearer to our own times? We, of this present generation, have seen religious leaders, to whom thousands (not by any means among their disciples only) owe a debt of unspeakable gratitude. Even a journal, which is utterly antagonistic to the authors of the *Tracts of the Times*, has spoken of them as men

* See Appendix.

† See Thilo's preface to his selections from the works of St. Athanasius.

who have made an idle priest in the English Church to be a difficulty, and an idle bishop an impossibility. On the place which impartial history will assign to them I will not venture to speculate; though one may well believe that it cannot but prove a highly exalted one. But will the critic pronounce that they have wholly been free from the operation of that all but universal law, which causes that the religious teacher, who benefits others, should but too often attain this end, at the cost of some injury to the balance of his own mind? I cannot think it. In speaking thus, I am referring mainly, though not quite exclusively, to some among those who have left the English Church. Nor do I suppose this result to have been produced merely on the minds of some men of ardent piety but of inferior intellectual power, such as Archbishop Manning, or the late Dr. Frederick Faber. With all possible thankfulness and respect let it be said, it seems to me to have reached even the heart and mind of John Henry Newman.

There are many other considerations which need to be taken into account when men attempt to discuss the leaders of the Reformation. Several must of necessity be passed by, or only glanced at. But on one, which stands in special connection with the theme of one-sidedness, it is necessary to dwell with some degree of detail. I refer to the *doctrines* of the Reformers.

The line of argument pursued on this head by Bossuet is well known. Compelled to admit, at the very outset of his famous "Variations," that *some*

reformation of the Church had been long desired, he labours to prove that such need of change, however deeply felt and loudly proclaimed, had reference to *discipline* only, and in no wise to *doctrine*. The correctness of this position I shall try to test by a brief examination of the teaching upon three points,—(a) on the Papal supremacy; (b) on indulgences, and (c) on the mystery of the Holy Eucharist,—which was current at the time of the Reformation. Not that I am about to enter upon the defence of Lutheran or Calvinistic, or even of Anglican doctrine on these heads; for such a task would of itself require an entire treatise. My present question is, *firstly*, Was erroneous teaching so spread abroad as to need a protest? and, *secondly*, were the errors of such kind as were naturally calculated to produce a violent reaction in the opposite direction?

(a) Firstly, as regards the supremacy. It has been my earnest desire to avow ungrudgingly the benefits which, in its better day, had been wrought by that central authority;

“Age after age, to the arch of Christendom
Aerial keystone haughtily secure.” *

But what had it become to Europe, what specially had it become to Germany and to England, by the middle of the sixteenth century? There are two conditions under which, if existent singly (much more if combined), men will long reconcile their

* Wordsworth.

spirits to the endurance of a harsh and oppressive rule. Either its claims may rest on a strong and unimpeachable foundation of legitimacy; or else, though its title-deeds may be unable to endure a very searching examination, the advantages accruing from its exercise may be so vast and palpable, that the subjects of its sway are glad to repose beneath its shadow, and decline to inquire too curiously into the state of the soil on which it rests, or the manner in which it was originally planted. But the Papacy could not at this epoch take its stand upon either of these grounds. The most explicit documents alleged on its behalf were falsities; the forged decretals of Isidore. Its benefits,—they *had been* deep and varied, and it ill behoves us to forget them; but *now* the dominion of Rome was chiefly felt in the exaction of tithes, of first-fruits, of Peter's pence, of annates; in the introduction of foreigners into English sees and parishes; in the withdrawal of the great tithes from parishes; in the sort of corruptions described by the councils of Pisa and of Constance, by Dante, by Savonarola, by Gerson, by Cardinal d'Ailly, by St. Bernard, by John of Salisbury, by Wimpeling. That the rejection of the supremacy in England was the act of the entire nation, and by no means of the Reformers merely, is asserted not only by Hallam and Arnold and Dean Hook, but no less emphatically also by the Roman Catholics, Pugin and Charles Butler. Nor, indeed, does any other conclusion seem consonant with the fact, that the

rupture took place under the primacy, not of Cranmer, but of his predecessor Wareham. And if the view of the supremacy taken by Lingard, by Renouf, by Pascal, above all by Bossuet himself, be a tenable one; it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that even on the showing of Roman Catholics (and to this I at present limit myself) the popular doctrine on the supremacy was deeply in need of reformation, and that Mr. Ffoulkes is fully warranted in declaring that, "if ever there was a justifiable revolt from authority, it was the revolt we call the Reformation." *

(b) Next as regards indulgences. Just as, for argument's sake, I have assumed that the Gallican view of the Papal authority may have much to say on its own behalf, without committing myself or my readers to its acceptance; † so let me suppose that a

* 'The Church's Creed, or the Crown's Creed?' London: Hayes, 1839.

† *Dublin Reviewers* would of course tell me that Gallican views, and indeed all views short of their own, respecting Papal authority are effete and moribund. I reply, that Dr. Newman declares that very few Roman Catholics hold the extreme views advocated by the editor of the *Dublin Review*; that a member of the Oratory at Birmingham has lately combated these modern theories; that a good deal of Gallicanism is apparent in the *Encyclopédie Théologique* published by M. Migne; that I am assured, on high authority, that much sentiment of the same sort is latent in France; that even Bp. Dupanloup of Orleans seems to fall short of the highest Ultramontaniam; that the Munich school utterly rejects the hyper-Papal theory supported by the Jesuits; and that one of the most learned of living Roman Catholics, a convert to Rome, says of it, "Time will show whether it be wise or not to

moderate statement, such as that of Lingard, on the subject of Indulgences may be defensible; although to many minds (and my own is one) the entire subject has always been one of the greatest difficulties in the Roman system. But has any historian of credit been able to disprove the general accusations alleged against Tetzels and his brethren? "They even taught," says Lingard, "*if we may credit the interested declamation of their adversary*, that every contributor, if he paid on his own account, infallibly opened to himself the gates of heaven; if on account of the dead, instantly liberated a soul from the prison of purgatory." * The historian's reservation is no doubt a highly important one: but Lingard, with his usual honesty, proceeds to cite in a note the language, not (as one would expect) of Luther, but of Erasmus. And what does Erasmus declare concerning these celebrated Dominican friars? "De indulgentiis sic loquebantur, ut nec idiotæ ferre possent. Hæc, opinor, moverunt animum Lutheri, ut primum auderet se *quorundam intolerabili impudentiæ opponere.*" To what extent the Church is responsible for popular belief is a question by no means easy of solution. But *Tetzels was not disavowed*, and the common mistake was one of long standing. As Dean Milman remarks, "Chaucer's Pardoner is a striking illustration of the popular notion and popular

identify Christianity with a system of theology *which is demonstrably untenable.*"—Renouf's Pope Honorius: Longmans, 1868.

* Chap. vii. vol. iv. pp. 220, 221. Ed. 1854.

“feeling in England.”* Was it a time for devout men like Staupitz to stand by, and leave the avaricious collectors of the tax unopposed and unrebuked?

(c) I pass on to a more difficult, a more delicate theme; the then current doctrine concerning the Holy Eucharist. Some thirty years ago, Sir William Palmer, in his well-known treatise on the ‘Church of Christ,’ called attention to the existence of two schools among our Roman Catholic fellow-Christians; one, which with Aquinas, Bellarmine, Bossuet, Veron, and others, taught a lofty, ethereal, and highly spiritual doctrine on the nature of the Presence vouchsafed to us in that hallowed mystery; the other, which with Soto and (I grieve to add) with Suarez, proclaimed a doctrine gross, carnal, repulsive—one might almost say, Capharnaite. Now concerning the first-named view, I agree with those who regard the distinction between the teaching contained in Bishop Jeremy Taylor’s *Life of Christ* (as also in passages of Thorndike, Bishop Andrewes and other Anglican divines), and the Tridentine doctrine, as being metaphysical rather than strictly theological. But as regards the Reformers, more especially the English Reformers who suffered under Mary, the question inevitably arises—to which of these expositions were they called upon to subscribe?

The treatment of this question by Dr. Littledale has caused me very great surprise. Without a word

* ‘*Latin Christianity*,’ Vol. ix. bk. xiv. chap. x. pp. 343, 344. Edit. 1867

of inquiry or of argument, he seems to take it for granted, that the doctrine which *he* holds and teaches would have satisfied the judges who examined Latimer and Ridley. *I see no proof of this whatever.* On the contrary, I would maintain that these English Reformers were called upon to admit a *modus* of Christ's Presence, which would not have been required from them by the authorities congregated at Trent, nor by that nobler school of Roman divines of which mention has just been made. Their judges may not have absolutely employed such language as that of Suarez; nor, perhaps, did their own statements resemble the Tridentine ones so closely as those of several later English theologians; but in the main I agree with the conclusion of a friend who called my attention to the subject some two years since, and with those of the author of 'The Kiss of Peace,' that the popular opinion respecting the teaching of Ridley is decidedly incorrect. Consequently I hold that on this particular, as also on the general question, Dr. Littledale has not meted out to the English Reformers a fair measure of either charity or justice.

To return, however, to the general question, whether reform was or was not needed on this subject. The author of the remarkable volume just named writes as follows:—

"It may interest you to learn that I have never yet met with any of these 'Romanists' who did not admit that in the period before the Reformation gross abuses existed, arising partly from a want of proper dogmatic instruction, and partly from the laxity

of ecclesiastical discipline. He will further tell you, that amongst these were superstitions and abuses connected with the sacrifice of the Mass. These, he will tell you, were divisible into two classes:—1st, false views of the nature of that sacrifice, and of its connection with the only one Sacrifice, regarding it in fact as a bloody sacrifice, and as a repetition in like manner of that one Sacrifice; and, 2ndly, coupled with these false views of the sacrifice, and arising out of them, a superstitious use of it, as if by the payment of a set sum of money a man could simply buy so many masses for the salvation of his soul, independently of the one Sacrifice of the Cross, and independently, too, of that personal faith, on the part of those who offer it, which is necessary to make the application of the Sacrifice effectual for the remission of sins.”*

It is a real satisfaction to find that any Roman Catholics are prepared to make such large and important admissions as these; though I am not personally acquainted with the books in which they are openly and frankly granted. But then what becomes of Bossuet's primary principle, that it was in *discipline* only and not in *doctrine*, that the mediæval Church stood in need of reformation?

It is necessary to pause for a moment upon the great and weighty name of Suarez. That a theologian so profound, still appealed to as so high an authority on so many questions by leading Roman Catholics of our day, and justly treated with respect by Grotius, Mackintosh, and other members of reformed communions, should prove so material in his treatment of this most solemn and central act of Christian worship is truly painful and astonishing.

* ‘Kiss of Peace.’ First Edition, p. 35. London: Hayes, 1867.

He has not even the excuse of having lived in the pre-Reformation period. His language shall be given in the Appendix to this Essay; to be compelled to cite it is a melancholy necessity. But nothing should induce me to translate his words, lest to do so promote irreverence and profanity: What marvel if our controversialists have employed strong terms upon this subject? Extremes, I must repeat, beget extremes; writers like Soto and Suarez become indirectly the parents of the most sheer and utter Zuinglianism.*

Concerning men who have so deeply influenced the religion of Christendom as the Continental Reformers, it is natural to ask ourselves—not, do we believe them to have been faultless in conduct or in doctrine; for, as students of history, we must negative the one query, as members of the Anglican Church by our very position we deny the other; but whether, on the whole, we can respect their motives, whether we believe them to have sought in the main the glory of God and the highest welfare of their fellow-men. Now throughout these pages I am trying to appeal to what may be termed the counter-authorities upon either side; that is to say, Protestant or Anglican, or Roman Catholic admissions respecting the faults and demerits of their own co-religionists, and praise in like manner from each quarter, when bestowed on those of the opposite camp. On the present topic there is a deep satisfaction and pleasure in calling to mind the

* Compare Mr. Ffoulkes's pamphlet, p. 58: "low views were precipitated by the audacity that centuries ago was not afraid to say of the Eucharist, '*Sacerdos creat Deum.*'"

language of the greatest among modern Roman Catholic divines, Möhler, in reference to Luther and to Calvin. It shall be quoted in a later section: at present let me only say how completely it answers these queries in the affirmative.

Let me now call attention to another very curious feature connected with the Reformation and its promoters. The great majority of Roman Catholics still persist in classing the names of Luther and of Calvin with those of Arius and Nestorius. Yet surely, even from a Roman point of view, an immense dissimilarity must be recognized. One element of difference is peculiarly striking. The early heretics never seem to have influenced the minds of their opponents, save in the way of bringing out in a more explicit and definite form the truth which the Church had from the first implicitly believed. Thus Arius caused the formation of the Nicene creed, and Pelagius brought out the Augustinian doctrine of grace. It is far otherwise with the leading Reformers. Not only did the movement produce (as Robertson, Macaulay, and others have remarked) a prodigious and most elevating effect upon the tone and morals of the Roman Catholic clergy from the occupant of the Pontifical chair down to the humblest brotherhood of friars; but it likewise in some respects directly, in some indirectly, affected their frame of thought and doctrine. Rightly does Döllinger describe Martin Luther as “the mightiest democrat and most popular character that Germany has ever possessed—a leader and eloquent orator—the greatest of his age—the very core and

“kernel of a period of national life, the centre of a
 “new circle of ideas, the most condensed expression
 “of that religious and ethical mode of thought
 “peculiar to the German mind, *and from whose*
 “*mighty influence even those who resisted it could*
 “*not wholly withdraw.*” * Did not Pole, Contarini,
 Catharinus, even Bellarmine himself, experience some
 pressure of that influence? Are the Tridentine
 decrees wholly untouched by it? Partly from the
 effect of race, and partly from continuous intercourse
 with Lutherans, the average Roman Catholic in
 Germany is a very different being from the average
 Roman Catholic of Spain and Italy. German con-
 verts to the Roman system, such as Stolberg and F.
 Schlegel, have often avowed, even after their change
 of creed, their respect and affection for their great
 fellow country-man; and only last year was witnessed
 the sight of the Mayor of Worms, himself a Roman
 Catholic, inaugurating the statue erected to Luther
 with words of admiration and of gratitude.

Nor has the influence of Calvin upon his opponents
 been by any means slight or trivial. It may well be
 questioned, whether the Augustinian tone of certain
 Roman commentators (as for instance Estius) on the
 Epistles of St. Paul is not an indirect product of the
 impulse given by Calvin. But, however this may be,
 there can be no dispute respecting the important
 part which Calvin played in the production of
 Jansenism. Let him who would question this state-

* The Church and the Churches, p. 26, 267. (Eng. Tr.)

ment, look at De Maistre's treatise *de l'Eglise Gallicane*. That the case is overstated is highly probable; it was not in De Maistre's nature to do otherwise; but few candid students of history will deny that he has some foundation of truth, when he speaks of the parliament of Paris having been deeply protestantized, "*an moyen de jansénisme, qui n'est au fond qu'une phase du calvinisme.*"* I do not write as a worshipper of the Jansenists. In the fundamental principles of their theosophy, they seem to me entirely in the wrong, and as much opposed to the teaching of Hooker, Butler, Dr. Johnson, as to that of Aquinas, Suarez, or Bossuet. Even their opposition to the casuistry of their opponents, though it was deeply needed, may be reasonably excepted to at some points, on the score of fairness; and the conclusion of their career at the tomb of the Abbé Paris is a painful and humiliating scene. But for that, in a land overshadowed by despotism alike in Church and State, they caused some breath of freedom to vibrate through a stifling and oppressive atmosphere; for that they exhibited in the persons both of men and women of their school rare and precious models of purity, sincerity, and courage, of disinterestedness and ardent piety; for these their gifts their names are

* F. Schlegel, though usually far more moderate than De Maistre, is here entirely on his side. "The essence of Jansenism was the rationalism of Calvin, combined with feelings of pietism, and covered over with a deep varnish of Catholicism!" (Philosophy of History, Lect. xvi.)

justly celebrated, and that deserved celebrity is one of the indirect results of the Reformation.*

Now this mighty movement of the European mind must be viewed as one great whole ; deeply modified, however, by the circumstances of each particular country, such as the greater or less degree of practical corruption, the national character, the aid or the opposition of sovereigns and of statesmen, the temper of individual reformers. Scotland, as we have seen, had become one of the worst specimens of mediævalism ; in Scotland the change was proportionally violent, and the turn of events was greatly influenced by the fact of its being an uprising of the middle and lower classes, and by the character of its leader, John Knox. Nor would it be in anywise inconsistent with a defence of the Reformation, considered as a whole, to admit that in this or that country the agents may have been below the standard of their fellow-Reformers, and that the larger amount of respectability may have been ranged upon the opposite side. Such phænomena are not unusual in the course of secular history. We do not consider Mr. Grote unreasonable, because he allows the solidity and moral excellence of Phocion and of the set gathered around him, and yet holds them to have been thoroughly mistaken in their opposition to the policy of Demosthenes ; nor do we charge Dr. Merivale with inconsistency, when

* It was not until some time after this section was completed that I met with the passage in De Maistre, which is one of my mottoes. See *Revue des deux Mondes*, for 1 December, 1858. *Art.* by M. Binaut.

he favours on the general issue the cause of Cæsar, and yet grants that the adherents of Pompey were the more respectable. It would not be impossible for a man to estimate the characters of Pole, of Gardiner, and even of Bonner, as men, more highly than those of Ridley and of Latimer; and yet to maintain that the Reformation was absolutely needed. Indeed it may be argued, without any danger of being unduly paradoxical, that the inferiority of mental and even moral stature in the English Reformers was one reason, though only one, why the changes were so far less sweeping and destructive in England than in Switzerland or Germany. The Anglican leaders had not the genius and courage, the fascination or the sway of Luther; they lacked the systematizing and logical powers of Calvin; in rough power and energy, and perhaps in boldness, they were decidedly inferior to Knox; but their very deficiencies in such gifts made them cling to the humbler, but far safer task of attempting to lop off excrescences and purify corruptions, without breaking the links of connexion with the past, without essaying to build up a new religion. Other elements no doubt concurred; the less imaginative and more conservative temper of the race; that appeal to primitive antiquity, which subsequently struck Casaubon as the peculiar and salutary feature most prominent in the English Reformation; the very checks and reverses, which at different epochs seemed likely to overthrow it utterly, but which were in fact overruled to its ultimate purification and improvement.

That the historical researches of the last forty years have lowered our estimate of the English Reformers, is undeniable. The character of Cranmer, more especially (though neither Fuller nor Strype had concealed his faults), has been rated far less favourably ever since the publication of Hallam's 'Constitutional History' in 1827, and of Macaulay's review of the work in the year following. To a reader brought up in the beliefs nurtured by the biographies of Cranmer formerly current among us, the deeply interesting and valuable volumes of Dean Hook must give a shock almost as intense, as the unmeasured attacks of Dr. Littledale. It is true that the charge of taking up a brief for Cranmer, which is urged by the Dean of Chichester against some of his predecessors is now in turn alleged against him by the author of the Lecture on 'Innovations.' By all means let the evidence be fully sifted and (so far as is possible, in a case where documents are scanty and passions still most keen) let it all be duly weighed. But in the meantime it deserves to be well pondered whether it be possible for any writer of name to take up the case *for* the Reformers in a more prejudiced spirit than Dr. Littledale has employed *against* them. What allowances has he made for their temptations and difficulties? What kind and measure of condemnation has he passed upon those who put them to a terrible death? Condemnation far less vigorous and emphatic than we find in the writings of those truly English Roman Catholics, Lingard, Tierney and Dodd.

Nor must it be forgotten that for some of the saddest

events of the Reformation-epoch, both parties must, in equity, be recipients of the blame which we award. The execution of Bishop Fisher and of Sir Thomas More took place, as Mr. Pugin has justly remarked, while the ancient services were undisturbed, and while the Houses of Parliament contained none but Roman Catholics. Similarly too as regards the divorce of Catharine of Arragon. I write as one of those who regard that divorce as an odious business from first to last, and one from which none who meddled with it came out with perfectly clean hands; always excepting that royal and noble lady herself. And among the many debts of gratitude which we owe to Shakspeare, let not this be forgotten; that living under the sway of the daughter of Catherine's rival, he had the nobleness and the courage to give honour where honour was due; to paint Catherine as she really was, with all her consciousness of injured innocence, in all her dignity and grace. But approbation of the divorce was not a mere counsel of the Reformers. There was one man who remarked, that even if there had been any irregularity about the marriage at first, it would be a still greater enormity to disturb it after so many years of wedlock. Dean Hook, who cites this testimony, is surely right in recognizing in it a sound and true-hearted sentiment. But it proceeded from the lips of one, who is not usually regarded as a supporter of the Papacy. His name was Martin Luther. On the other hand, among those, who aided and abetted the divorce with all their power, were the three Roman Catholic

prelates, Gardiner, Bonner, and above all Cardinal Wolsey.

And further it may be asked, whether in regard to revocations of Church property and destruction of Church buildings the countries which rejected the Reformation have in the long run fared better than those which accepted it. The annals of Spain and Portugal, of France and Austria, will surely tell a tale which enables us to answer this question in the negative. Far more blame has been imputed to the Reformers on this score than they deserve. In "the land debateable" between England and Scotland, the border wars consumed many a sacred building, whose destruction was afterwards imputed to John Knox.* So again, if learning was for a season imperilled by the Reformation; if the Bodleian and other noble libraries have a miserable and disgraceful tale of havoc to relate, yet it must not be forgotten that learning has also suffered, though in another way, in the countries of the Roman obedience. "*The*

* An article in the *Quarterly Review*, published in 1845, has proved this. The lamented antiquary to whom this excellent paper was ascribed (the late Joseph Robertson, Esq., LL.D., of the Register House, Edinburgh) informed me that in the age succeeding the Reformation it was thought the correct thing among Presbyterians to have had an ancestor who had destroyed a mediæval chapel; and that the vaunt was often made without any strict inquiry as regarded the fact. Only a few years since, a candidate for a Scottish county boasted that one of his forbears had pulled down such a building on a Western loch. The statement elicited loud cheers. It is unfortunate that there is an utter lack of proof that any chapel ever existed in that spot.

“*decay of theological studies in the [Roman] Catholic countries of Europe,*” says Perfetti, “*is a notorious fact.*”* “In Spain,” says Döllinger, “where Protestantism has been entirely excluded, theology languished. *Night and darkness followed on this, learning perished under the Inquisition, and has not yet revived.*”†

We are indeed bound by every tie of descent and of gratitude not to forget all that the mediæval Church achieved in Europe, and more especially in Britain; particularly between the epoch of the Conquest and the accession of the House of Lancaster. We ought to call to mind the benefits already here recounted, particularly those on which it is here impossible to enlarge, such as her development of the parochial system, and her noble cathedrals, schools, and universities. Still less should we forget the victories won for us at the cost of toil and blood by the primitive Church.

The second temple could not reach the first,
And the late Reformation never durst
Compare with ancient times and purer years,
But in the Jews and us deserveth tears.‡

Yes! but tears that it should have been needed, not that it actually came to pass; for, (as has already been implied) matters could not have stood still, could not possibly have rested in their then existent state. It was “a necessary evil,” says Coleridge. He is

* *Il Clero e la Società.* Firenze, 1862.

† Address delivered at the Munich Congress in 1863.

‡ George Herbert.

right: it was and is an *evil*, and a sad and mournful one, that Christendom should be divided at all; but a *necessary* evil, for even disunion and rivalry are better than death. The men who brought it about were not faultless, any more than their opponents. But even Dr. Littledale, who sums up the evils of mediæval Christianity in six lines, devotes four lines of his lecture to the good deeds wrought by the Reformers; mentioning the Bible thrown open to the laity, the chalice restored to them in the Holy Eucharist, and the translation of the services into their own tongue. On each of these one might say much, for they are not light nor trivial blessings. But my limits forbid this, and I would fain speak of a few other things which the Reformation achieved. More especially would I name that wonderful improvement in the Church of Rome to which Robertson, Macaulay, Stephen, and many more, have borne ample and generous testimony; the deep impress upon the mind of Christendom of those undisputed truths which both sides have continued to teach, such as the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; the formation of a new language in England, and a new literature in England, in Germany, nay, even in France; the fresh spirit breathed in so many quarters into the heart and mind of humanity. That writers like Dr. Littledale are able to criticize the Reformation so freely, and in such safety, is one of the many benefits won for us by the Reformers. Such a publication as his or mine would be impossible in Rome,

or in any country where the sway of Rome is undisturbed. Even the mild censure that the Marian executions were "a bad business" would not be tolerated in the Papal dominions, as the Count de Montalembert learnt a few years since, when he ventured to express such sentiments even at the Mechlin congress. The crisis of the 16th century was indeed a judgment, which "has had an improving and salutary effect. The great intellectual conflict has purified the European atmosphere, has impelled the human mind on to new courses, and promoted a rich scientific and literary life."*

And at this point I have a question to put to the assailants of the Reformation amongst ourselves, which seems to me to demand a plain, simple, and intelligible reply. We, who regard the Reformation as a necessity, must yet most fully admit the grave and solemn nature of the responsibility entailed upon themselves by the Reformers. But there would have been, in our judgment, one other form of responsibility more grave and solemn still; I mean the responsibility incurred by keeping silence; by saying nothing and doing nothing in the face of the existing condition of Christendom. "Surely," says Lord Bacon, "every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator; and if time of course alter things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, *what shall be the end?*" My question is

* Döllinger, 'The Church and the Churches,' *ubi supra*.

this: "Would Dr. Littledale, and those who agree with him, prefer that the Church should have remained (so far as that was possible) in the state described by Wimpfeling, rather than run the risk incurred by the Reformation?" Of course my own answer is evident: It has been already given, but it is not one invented for the occasion. In a sermon preached and published more than three years since, I said that, "humanly speaking, without some such "shock, Christianity itself would have been in "danger of perishing." *

But when they have made answer to my query—not, I think, until then—they have a perfect right to ask of me in turn a twofold question, which I will here endeavour to anticipate. They may say: "You evidently consider the conduct of Spain and "Italy in stamping out the Reformation to have been, "to say the least, a great and grievous blunder. "Would you seriously have desired that all lands "should at that date have accepted Lutheranism "or Calvinism, or even Anglicanism; or, failing that, "what would you have liked to see?" To the first part of this inquiry I answer emphatically, *No*: I do not regard even our own Reformation as that perfect and ideal standard to which all other countries were bound to conform; far less, of course, can I so regard any kind of Presbyterian organization. But what I should have wished was some real and free Council, wherein saintly men like Carlo Borromeo and our own Bishop Andrewes could have met. Of

* 'Possibilities of Union.' London: Mozley. 1865.

the degree of guilt involved in the great rupture by either side One Being alone can be the fitting Judge. I can have no wish to forget what an eloquent Protestant writer has called "the worldliness of spirit displayed by the patrons of the Reformation, the secularity of its arrangements, the rigidity of its forms, the scorching intellectualism of its spirit, the paralyzing influence of its furious hatred against those who a few years before had been recognized as fellow-Christians."* Nor do I desire to overlook the special guilt of England in her treatment of Ireland, a subject emphatically summarized in the writings of Mr. Goldwin Smith and the forcible pamphlet of Mr. MacColl.† But the responsibility incurred upon the other side must not be overlooked. When Pope Clement VII. excommunicated Henry VIII., when Pius V. excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, a lamentable amount of such reprisals as those just named was, as human nature goes, the all but inevitable consequence. And if the views here advocated be taxed with narrowness and insularity, I must call to my aid those striking words of Pope

* *Contemporary Review* for October, 1867, Art. by Mr. Peter Bayne. The above phrases are Mr. Bayne's, though they are a little stronger in his paper. The 'scorching intellectualism' I should confine to Calvinism. It would not, in my judgment, be justly applicable to Lutheranism or to Anglicanism.

† Goldwin Smith—'Three British Statesmen' and his 'Essay on Ireland.' Mr. MacColl—'Is there not a Cause?' I am not here concerned with the political bearings of this pamphlet, but its Statements concerning the Irish Reformation need a reply, if any can be given.

Urban VIII. (uttered within half a century after the defeat of the Spanish Armada) whose authenticity has never, I believe, been questioned. "We know
 " that we may declare Protestants excommunicate,
 " as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth, and before
 " him Clement VII. the King of England, Henry
 " VIII.—but with what success? The whole world
 " can tell; *we yet bewail it in tears of blood. Wis-*
 " *dom doth not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement*
 " *VII.*" •

It may however be said, that matters were by no means at the worst when the crash of the Reformation came; that in some departments of life and thought a very sensible amendment could be observed. That assertion is probably correct, and it is singular that an identical statement has been made, though by very different men, in respect of the French Revolution. But before we condemn revolutionists, political or ecclesiastical, on this score, it were well to consider whether, both as regards judgments on communities and on individuals, this order of events may not be almost a law in the dealings of God's providence. If the storm always burst when men were at the lowest depths of guilt, its benefit, as a chastisement tempered with mercy, could not be properly appreciated. Writers on the spiritual life, Anglican and Roman, all agree in describing the sweetness of conversion to God and

* Cited by Mr. Ffoulkes in 'Christendom's Divisions,' p. 230. London: Longman. 1865.

the subsequent sorrows resulting from difficulties and disgusts : and if it seem hard that, in the life of a man or of a nation, the judgment should fall when some real amendment was in progress, let us rest assured that this dispensation is also guided by unerring wisdom and love. He who ordained the trial, has sounded its hour, as fitly as He has fixed its nature.

III. The relation of the events of the sixteenth century to the question of authority is next to be considered : though, on a problem so vast and difficult, I can only try to indicate the merest outlines.

It will probably be granted by all reasonable thinkers that human life, if it rises above the condition of satisfying merely animal wants, must imperatively demand the exercise of *some* kinds of authority. The child finds itself under the rule of parents and of nurses ; in a few years he comes under the authority of the schoolmaster. When he learns to look into the recesses of his own heart, he becomes sensible of the authority of conscience ; if he examines the processes of his intellect he must recognize some limitation to its freedom in those intuitions which he holds in common with all mankind ; while in the outer world he finds himself at once thwarted and protected by the policeman and the magistrate, and the general authority of the civil government. Nor is he able to undertake any single branch of study

without trusting in some degree to the authority of others.

If as child and man, as citizen and student, every one acknowledges the pressure of authority, he can hardly hope to escape from it, even were it desirable, when he tries to learn anything about religion. Buddhist and Bramin, Mahometan, Jew, Christian, —all look up to some species of authority, whether it be conceived to reside in books or in living men, or (as is most commonly held) in a combination of both. We are here only concerned with the authorities recognized among Christians; and this too only so far as it bears upon the subject of the Reformation.

I have said that all men are compelled in some shape to feel and admit the pressure of authority. It is no less true that they are equally compelled, by the very necessities of their moral and intellectual nature, to set some bounds and limits to its exercise. That there is a lawful degree of self-assertion, that man must exercise his own private judgment, that he is fully warranted in refusing obedience to *some* species of control, is the dictate of reason, is a lesson enforced on us by history, is sanctioned, (no less than the idea of authority is sanctioned) by both example and precept in the pages of Holy Writ. Hereupon immediately arises one of those questions of *degree*, which open the door to so vast an amount of perplexity and of self-deceit, which are at once the groundwork and the justification of men's attempts to form systems of casuistry; which, by reason of our limited intellect and the defects inherent in a

fallen race, render life so extremely difficult. Just as it is impossible to say where strict justice ends, and oppression begins; where mercy becomes weakness, where true tenderness passes into morbid sentimentality; even so, too, does it surpass the faculties of human wit to lay down the line, at which obedience becomes a crime and revolt a justifiable act. A glance at a few epochs in the history of the Church will serve to illustrate this position, and to shew its bearing upon my present theme.

The primitive Christians appealed to reason, to the voice of the Church, to the Scriptures of the elder Covenant. To the Scriptures of the New Testament they could not refer for some years, for the simple reason that these Scriptures did not exist. The rise of controversy necessitated a change from a simple faith to a more formal statement of doctrine. "Gnosticism," it has been truly said, "transformed Bishops into Doctors, and believers into *savans*." * To the imperial mind of a layman, the Emperor Constantine, the Church is probably indebted, under God, for the first idea of a General Council; and the extraordinary success of the assembly gathered at Nice, the enduring acceptance of the Creed which it drew up, make an epoch in the history of authority. On the effects of the other truly Ecumenical Councils I must not pause to speak; but there came a time, when the individual teaching of great doctors and their interpretation of those Canonical Scriptures to which they

* De Broglie, 'L'Eglise et l'Empire,' Tome I. p. 116.

appealed as being infallible, began to rule with an almost unbroken sway over the mind of at least our western Christendom.

I have recently had occasion to study the writings of one of those Gallican divines, who flourished between the death of St. Gregory the Great and the rise of the scholastic philosophy. Ambrose Autpert, a Benedictine monk, who died in A.D. 779 is probably a fair specimen of a class who lived in a time of comparative repose, and who were eminently good, if not eminently great men. His devout and interesting commentary on the Apocalypse is remarkable for the spirit of peacefulness which breathes throughout its pages. The rising authority of his friend and patron Charlemagne secures great liberty for the preaching of the Gospel; Arianism seems to him all but dead; Pelagianism is crushed; the attempts of the early Alexandrian school to found a *philosophy* of religion have not seriously won a hold upon his mind. The books of Holy Scripture, diligently searched and compared, and interpreted after the mind of an Augustine, a Jerome, a Gregory, and some kindred spirits among Saints and Doctors, are for him the great resting-place of the soul. He cares little for the classics; with the Greek fathers he has small acquaintance; he does not foresee the impending rupture between East and West; the problems which are to occupy the minds of S. Anslem and of Abelard have for him no charms, or (to speak more correctly) no existence. It is an age of devout repose beneath the shadow of authority. Such an age displays graces and beauties

peculiarly its own ; but stagnation and decay of vital piety may easily ensue, if it be too prolonged.

The age of the schoolmen arrives. There is one large class of modern authors which usually speaks with unmeasured contempt of the schoolmen ; I mean that class which is almost entirely unacquainted with their writings, except at second-hand ; and, perhaps, not always even that. Far different is the verdict of men who have really studied the scholastic authors, such as Coleridge, Sir Wm. Hamilton, Sir G. C. Lewis, Victor Cousin, Schwegler, Bishop Hampden. The last-named, though far from sympathizing with their general tone and spirit, justly recognizes "the extraordinary penetration, amazing compass of thought and admirable skill displayed by them" in the prosecution of their difficult task.*

Exhibiting a combination of free inquiry with submission to the ruling of the Church, the scholastic philosophy culminates in a book which for a long period stood forth as almost the incarnation of authority, the famous *Summa Theologiæ* of S. Thomas Aquinas. It was at one time *the* ruling book ; and it may be doubted, whether any theological proposition in the first great and enduring work of modern literature can ever be said to be at variance with it ; for Dante, with all his originality of speculation, looked up to the

* 'Bampton Lectures,' p. 100. Compare 'Schwegler's History of Philosophy.'

Angelic Doctor as his theological, and even as his philosophical, guide. And although many of the inferences drawn by Aquinas from Holy Scripture may seem to us far-fetched and untenable; yet his work might, perhaps, have stood its ground, provided that the mind of Europe would have consented to observe three or four conditions. These conditions were: that it should rest content with the *dicta* of Aristotle, as if they were so many axioms; that it should not evoke from its own consciousness any novel inquiries respecting the spiritual life; that it should pass on one side all discoveries in physical science, and keep them from intruding into the domain of theology; and possibly also, that it should not only cultivate mental science in the manner in which it had been studied for the last four centuries, but that it should continue to prefer an abstract treatment of questions to one dependent upon historical research.

It need hardly be said that the observance of such terms was an utter impossibility; that it would have been as easy to stay the course of mighty rivers, or to banish earthquakes and volcanoes from the fabric of the material globe, as thus to arrest the march and progress of the human mind. No one of the conditions was observed, and it would have been a real misfortune for mankind if they could have been observed; it would have led to a decay of earnestness and of devotion no less than of intellectual power. The supreme authority of Aristotle was rightly shaken in various ways by Roger Bacon, by Ramus,

perhaps above all by Descartes; the anxious questioning concerning the justification of the individual soul and its realization of its justified state was at least a partially novel question, which the schoolmen had not gone into with sufficient fulness for the rising generation of the fifteenth century; the discoveries of Kopernik and Galileo could not be preserved from collision with the popular religious belief; and while psychology began to be studied in a new manner, historical inquiry gave minds a bias different from that of Aquinas; which, despite all its rich and varied culture, had never been historically trained.

That the shock thus given to the repose upon authority was a severe and painful trial to faith and morals, is not for one moment to be denied. Those bad elements, of which Bishop Browne so justly speaks in the passage selected as one of my mottoes, naturally and inevitably came into full play, side by side with the nobler grounds of action. In such great convulsions of thought and action, distressing phænomena will ever be seen, analogous to those which occur in actual war.

“Think, Macrinus,
When civil war’s afoot, whate’er the cause,
And whosoe’er the leaders, in the fray
How many a beast breaks loose and roams abroad
In shelter of an honourable name.” *

These facts ought, I conceive, to be seriously taken into account, when writers like Sir Wm. Hamilton,

* Hy. Taylor’s ‘Isaac Comnenus.’

Dr. Littledale and others, call our attention to the many expressions of bitter disappointment uttered both by foreign and by Anglican reformers within a few years after the rupture with Rome had taken place. To me they look like natural complaints, and such as we might expect; and further to be such as bear testimony to the honesty of those who uttered them. For there never yet was religious leader, but was more or less of an enthusiast; and enthusiasts (as has already been remarked) will inevitably deem their own special remedy to be *the* panacea for all the evils under which mankind at large is labouring. And when they discover that the old Adam is too strong to be expelled by means, which they fondly hoped would all but ruin his influence; then are they apt to be proportionally disappointed, and to draw even darker pictures of society than the facts of the case justly warrant.

Reference has been made in an earlier section to the number of events occurring in the age of Luther which tended to impress on the human mind the idea of extensive changefulness. Let it be added that the succeeding generation was not less fruitful in such sources of movement. In connection with my immediate subject, the relation of the Reformation to authority, I would refer more particularly to the influence of such writers as Montaigne, Bacon, and Descartes. There can be little doubt but that the writings of these men undermined the principle of authority in many quarters, where the voice of the Reformers would have of itself had scanty power, or

even means of access. The eminently subjective character of the Cartesian philosophy fostered a very different tone of mind from that inculcated by the teachings of the schoolmen. Metaphysical theories, at first accepted by the few, become popularized as time goes on, and insensibly affect the general current of thought. Moreover, just because their agency is subtle and imperceptible, they do not in an equal degree provoke that counter-agitation, which almost inevitably results from the undisguised and avowed assaults of an opponent. When a great orator has spoken, there arises, says Lord Brougham, a craving in the mind of his hearers for a reply. The sledge-hammer blows of a Luther invariably call forth a reaction.

Καὶ τύπος ἀντίτυπος καὶ πῆμ' ἐπὶ πῆματι κείται.

The wonderful figure of Loyola (in which Isaac Taylor, Sir James Stephen, and others amongst us, have so justly recognized the conspicuous elements of grace and dignity, as well as of ardent piety and power) is in some sense almost a creation of the German Reformer's work. But the famous *Essais*, (the first so-named) and the *Discours de la Methode* operated in a different manner. That, despite opposition, Luther and Calvin influenced opponents has already been admitted. But if the greatest genius among the Jansenists was in part affected, however indirectly, by the temper of the gales wafted from the Lemman Lake, it is no less important a part of Blaise Pascal's training, that his favourite literary recreation

lay not in the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, but in the *Essais* of Montaigne; that his chief guide in philosophy was not S. Thomas Aquinas, but René Descartes.

But was not some such shock to the principle of authority deeply needed? We shall probably see reason, as we proceed, to think that this was most certainly the case. Yet undoubtedly the Reformers never dreamt of shaking off all authority in religion, and leaving each man to the dictates of his own intellect and conscience. They trusted, some of them to their own personal influence, to their power of systematizing theology and winning for their followers the acceptance of their own interpretation of Scripture; some to the authority of primitive antiquity and of a hierarchy not severed from the past; some to the power of the civil magistracy; and most to a combination of one or more of these various elements. That any of them ever really dreamt of the later formula of "the Bible and the Bible only," I imagine to be a position quite incapable of proof. Dean Hook justly repudiates the idea of any such tenet occurring to Luther, Calvin, or Melancthon.* The inventor of that plausible but hollow watchword (who was at one time a convert to Rome and died a Semi-Arian) had not yet arisen to suggest a cry, on which no body of Christians really acts, and which is utterly untenable in the face of modern scepticism. Most justly did the late Isaac Taylor, as well as Edward Irving

* 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.' New Series. Vol. I.

denounce the *dictum* of Chillingworth as hopeless and mischievous.*

It would be a subject full of interest, but it is one too vast for this Essay, and moreover one which far exceeds my powers, to trace the history of the varied species of authority, the Lutheran, the Calvinist, the Gallican, the Anglican, which rose out of the rejection of the mediæval form of Christianity. I can only glance at a few salient points.

Lutheranism appears in our own day to have become sadly enfeebled in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, and to be far from successful in Berlin. But not only is there cherished among a large number of its adherents a very lofty view of the functions of the Church ; but a rising school among German Lutherans, including the names of their most illustrious theologians,† desires to make the Holy Eucharist once more become the centre and staple of Christian worship. Nor ought it to be forgotten that if Germany has combatted on behalf of rationalism, she has often, like the spear of Achilles, been the means of healing the wounds which she has made : a truth of which the profoundly learned work of Dr. Pusey upon Daniel exhibits, if I am not mistaken, remarkable evidence. It may have been a necessity or at any rate the want of a convenient illustration of Dr.

* See their language, as cited in pp. 250-2 of the Appendix to an interesting and remarkable volume, entitled *Ecclesia Dei*, (London: Strahan. 1866.)

† Such as Hengstenberg, Kahnis, Kliefoth, Sartorius, and many more.

Newman's theory of Development that led him to say, "Lutheranism, *as is well known*, has by this time become almost simple heresy or infidelity." Assuredly *no such thing is 'well known'* to those who have even the most superficial acquaintance with the works of Olshausen, Neander, Hengstenberg, Stier, Julius Müller, Kahnis, Martensen, and numbers more. If sanctified intellect be a precious thing in the sight of God and man, Lutheranism has not yet lost that evidence of blessing from on high, that claim to respect from all the baptized of Christendom. Even the late Dr. Faber, extravagant as he was in many of his speculations, felt it right to refer to this school of thinkers in his work on the 'Creator and the Creature.'

Of Calvinism, I (unlike Dr. Littledale) am inclined to think less favourably than of Lutheranism. Undoubtedly its idea of authority is, *in theory*, far more complete and logical than that of the rival systems. But this compactness of form seems to be gained by ignoring one set of facts in human life, and one class of texts in Holy Writ; and at the present moment the reaction is so extreme, as to involve very serious peril to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. That Calvinism has also had its heroes and great teachers, its saintly and mortified men, is undeniable: but the existing state of Switzerland,* and

* The testimony of a Scottish Presbyterian witness, Mr. Laing, is well known. "Geneva has fallen as Rome never fell. Rome has still superstition: *Geneva has not even that semblance of religion.*" (Notes of a Traveller.) This, however, was written in 1844, and there has, I believe, been real improvement since that date.

still more of Holland, is surely worse than that of Lutheran countries. Who, among foreign Calvinists, since the death of Alphonse Vinet, can be named, except perhaps Pressensé, of any high repute as a theologian? If it be said that Scotland exhibits the fairest specimen of the working of this system, this may be conceded: but then the position of Scotland is a very peculiar one. For in the first place, until the present generation, Scotland had scarcely any divines of her own, but lived upon Anglican theology; and, secondly, though the Westminster Confession is signed by the Presbyterian ministers, its harsher features are very seldom preached, and are all but practically ignored. So much is this the case, that there seems real danger, lest the recoil from Calvinism should warp the Scottish mind in the direction of Universalism.

Of the three schools of thought which exist in the Anglican Church, each with a certain *status* and claim for standing-room within its pale, I need not here speak particularly. It is enough to state that neither loyal attachment to her communion, nor heartfelt thankfulness for privileges enjoyed therein, nor deep conviction of the advantages *retained* by her and *resigned* by other reformed bodies of Christians, need induce her children to defend her from the charge, that she is deficient in the matter of discipline and authority. M. Guizot is probably right when he regards this as the weak side of the movement; when he accuses the Reformation of not having recognized all the rights of human thought, of not having

learnt how to measure in the sphere of intellect the rights of authority, nor to reconcile the claims and needs of tradition with those of liberty.*

That this want is deeply felt, that in Holland and Switzerland, in Germany, in England, in America, the lack of spiritual authority has again and again been acknowledged as a defect, would probably be admitted by the great majority of calm and impartial observers. It is no less true, that such absence of control leads to undue license of thought, to anarchy and unbelief. The countries, where the Reformation took the most extreme forms, have given birth to a painful amount of irreverence, of scepticism and Pantheism. Boston, in particular, once the home of Puritanism, has been conspicuous first for Socinian, and then (not illogically) for Pantheizing doctrines. Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Toland, Chubb, Tindal, Bayle, Hume, Rousseau, Gibbon, Strauss, were

* “[La reforme] n’a pas connu ni respecté *tous les droits* de la pensée humaine—elle n’a pas su mesurer dans l’ordre intellectuel, *les droits de l’autorité* ; je ne dis pas de l’autorité coactive—mais de l’autorité purement morale, agissant par les esprits seuls et par la seule voix de l’influence. On n’a pas su concilier les droits et les besoins de la tradition avec ceux de la liberté. C’est là, je pense, dans la lutte de l’ancien ordre spirituel contre l’ordre nouveau, le côté faible de la reforme.”—(La Civilisation en Europe, 12ième Leçon.) This important chapter needs to be read throughout that it may be appreciated. The corresponding Lectures (xv. and xvi.) in Schlegel’s *Philosophy of History* are valuable. The amount of agreement between a candid Protestant like Guizot, and a candid Roman Catholic like Schlegel, is instructive.

all nurtured in lands which had accepted the Reformation.

And yet before we draw any hasty conclusions arising out of these admissions, it is necessary to consider for a moment the state of matters upon the other side. Let us glance at the three leading countries in Europe, which rejected the Reformation, France, Italy, and Spain.

It is a real advantage for the members of the Reformed communions that in such books as Bossuet's 'Variations' and Dr. Döllinger's 'The Church and the Churches,' they can learn from the lips of opponents all the worst that can possibly be said of them. Now Bossuet appears to have been so well satisfied with the condition of things as he witnessed it in his native land, as hardly to have been capable of conceiving a finer ideal in Church and State, than that which was presented by France under the sway of Louis XIV. And yet how did that system end? The idea of spiritual authority as taught by Bossuet is, though not extinct, yet crushed and silenced in France. Of the means taken to uproot Protestantism, which Bossuet thoroughly approved of and even eulogized, I must speak presently. Here let it only be remarked, that while in England the infidel writers met with solid and triumphant antagonists, in France no such apologists arose. The common stories thoughtlessly adopted by many without examination, which would represent the *mass* of the French clergy in the eighteenth century as immoral, do not seem to be founded in

fact; but the charges of an earnest Roman Catholic, Count de Carné (I know of few more philosophic and religious critics on the features of that age) remain unanswered and unanswerable. He complains that the French episcopate became, like the *cordons bleu*, a mere privilege of birth; that life and genius withdrew from that Galliean Church, which had sold her birthright for miserable gains and placed her eternal youth under the shelter of a decaying dynasty; that no protest was made against the *dragonnades* of Louis XIV.; that no murmur arose at the consecration of the infamous Dubois; and that the lamp of knowledge, one of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, was permitted to pass entirely into the hands of the enemies of the faith.

Yes! it will be rejoined by Ultramontanes: Bossuet was, after all, *only* a Gallican; and to some such consummation as this, sooner or later, was Gallicanism sure to come. To take a fair example of the working of *our* system of authority, you should look at some land where the Papacy has really had its own way. Be it so. Let us turn then for a moment to Italy.

Some twenty years since, Dr. Newman delivered in Birmingham a course of eloquent lectures, in which he maintained that the great bulk of the charges adduced against the Roman system derived their origin—in England from the Elizabethan tradition—in other countries from some cognate source. If the volume containing those Lectures had fallen into the hands of the present writer at the time of its publi-

cation, it would probably have made a deep impression upon his mind. But it did not fall to his lot to read it until 1867; and in the interval he had become acquainted with several works concerning Italy, written by men whom no one could possibly accuse of being nurtured in the trammels of the Elizabethan tradition, or any similar set of prejudices. Cantù, Balbo, Giusti, Massimo d'Azeglio, Giorgini, Perfetti, Bartolommeo, and other Italians, are neither Calvinists, nor Lutherans, nor Anglicans. I have elsewhere given evidence from these writers concerning the state of Italy.* In this place extracts only can be given from one or two of the above-named, and those of the briefest; but first let us listen to some admissions from the lips of that great and devout genius, whose theory, as set forth in those Lectures, I find myself wholly unable to accept.

“Not that I would deny that there are sincere Catholics so dissatisfied with things as they are in Italy, as they are in Rome, that they are brought to think that no social change can be for the worse.”

In the sermon from which these words are taken,† Dr. Newman declares that there are more Roman Catholics who are loyal and energetic, in word and deed, in England than in Italy. Now, as the great majority of those who are not Roman in Italy are simply indifferentists, this is surely an admission in terms that the number of earnest Christians who be-

* Christian Remembrancer for January, 1867. *Art.* The ‘Papal Temporalities;’ and ‘Scottish Guardian’ for May, 1866.

† ‘The Pope and the Revolution.’ Longmans; 1866.

lieve in those fundamental dogmas, the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, must be much greater in England than in Italy. Of a few other complaints, on second thoughts, I will only state the substance. Bartolommeo, a very anti-Protestant writer, complains that in Italy the Episcopal sees are filled by non-entities and mediocrities, and that a Bishop fit for his station is an exception; that hence religion languishes, although until 1860 there was no freedom of worship, nor any pulpit in the hands of rival sects. He quotes the pious Rosmini, recording it as "a prevailing opinion, that the clergy have their hands ever open to receive and ever shut from giving." He declares, that there have been in his day four Archbishops of Messina, not one of whom ever gave a single sermon, nor pronounced one syllable of religious instruction; and that of the feminine monastics in Sicily, all live in ease and comfort, and many (in the wealthier monasteries) in luxury. He adds, that the Sicilian monks deliver no sermons, nor even simple explanations of religious doctrine. Perfetti dwells, amongst other things, upon the gulf made between clergy and laity by the training of the seminaries.* I pause, but not for lack of material.

The truth seems to be that, if authority is too lax with us, it has been thoroughly overstrained in the countries which rejected the Reformation. And these

* Bartolommeo, himself a respected Sicilian priest, has published '*Elemosina e Ricchezza*' (Messina, 1864), and a *Discorso contra il Protestantismo* (Ibid.). Perfetti's tract is called *Ricordi di Roma*.

extremes too often tend, by different paths, to the same results. We all know this well in the ordinary course of domestic training. There are some families, where the children (to employ the pointed language of a living novelist) are 'not growing up or being brought up, but are simply tumbling up.' They will, in all human probability, go astray. But how does the case stand with respect to these homes where all is gloomy and strict and dull, where even innocent recreation is frowned down and individuality of character sternly repressed? Are not the falls as least as sad, is not the recoil to the full as dangerous, as in the case of those 'who have felt the weight of too much liberty?'

Mention has been made of unbelievers brought up among Protestants. Let it be remembered that two of the most celebrated, Bayle and Gibbon, both submitted to Rome for a season before they renounced their faith. Moreover, Voltaire, Leopardi, Renan, Comte, were all brought up Roman Catholics; and in the case of the two first-mentioned, it is not difficult to establish a real connection between the state of things around them and their deplorable lapses into unbelief.

Concerning Spain, it shall only be said here, that the statements of Mr. Ffoulkes could not take by surprise any one who had made inquiry concerning that country. The cold and scantily-attended services at Seville, the low moral standard, were features already familiar, I believe, to all impartial investigators into the condition of the Peninsula.

This is one of the many questions on which both sides have something to learn from each other. That the cry of 'the Bible only' is untenable, has been already admitted. But we are not to forget those many patristic utterances concerning the duty of *all* Christians to read the Holy Scriptures, and the declarations against ignorance of the Bible as a source of heresy; more especially those which proceeded from St. Chrysostom. The announcements of the Roman See on this subject have been singularly varied and contradictory.* But the fact unhappily remains, that the mass of Frenchmen are sadly ignorant of the Bible, and that Perfetti, in speaking of Italy, calls it one of the gravest faults of the Roman clergy to have effected this withdrawal. How indeed can it be otherwise than a most grievous injury to the spiritual life?

Extreme Roman Catholics—*maximizers*, as they are sometimes called,—try to persuade themselves and others, that their religion is more or less injured by contact with Lutherans, Anglicans, and other members of reformed communities. *I believe this conviction to be the very reverse of fact.* On the contrary, it is precisely in those countries where she has had everything, as the saying is, *her own way*, that Rome is weak and languid; while, contrariwise, in the regions where her claims to sole authority have been

* Evidence of this discrepancy may be seen in Mr. Gladstone's 'Church Principles considered in their Results.' (London: Murray, 1842.)

confronted by Reformers and their descendants, she has constantly shown to the best advantage. It might not be fair to dwell on Chili and Peru, where wild native blood and a semi-civilization may be partly credited with the evils prevalent; but it seems capable of proof, that in Europe also, Rome has fared most badly, precisely where her power has been most unlimited. Feeble, unlearned, and undevout in Spain, and very languishing in Italy; she displays great strength in Belgium, and is singularly zealous, intellectual, and even popular in entire districts of Germany. This is only what we might expect from the general analogy of human affairs. "It would often," says Mr. Mill in his attack upon a pseudo-philosophy of politics current in France—"it would often be a "much stronger recommendation of some practical "arrangement, *that it does not follow* from what is "called the general principle of the government, than "that it does. Under a government of legitimacy, "the presumption is far rather in favour of institu- "tions of popular origin; and in a democracy, in "favour of arrangements tending to check the popular "will."* It has been remarked by both Sismondi and de Carné, that the statesmen reared up under the system of Louis XIV. proved far less able and successful, than those brought up in the comparative freedom of the reign of his father Louis XIII. Similarly, men who have been nurtured under a hierarchy have often proved the

* *Logic*. Vol. II. Concluding Chapter.

most powerful to arouse a different line of religious thought; and we now hear of men trained in Anglicanism throwing life into the decaying zeal of French and Spanish Roman Catholics. It is indeed difficult to read with becoming gravity some of the language of the late Dr. Faber, when he speaks precisely as if *he* had been brought up in the Roman system from infancy, and could simply by an act of will obliterate all the influences of his past freedom. This can never be: either by the half-unconscious presence of former elements of thought, or by exaggerated revulsion from them, he who has changed will constantly betray his former convictions. We are continually reminded of the jar, long preserving, as Horace has it, the odour with which it has once been imbued; or the hound, in the lively imagery of a later satirist, still visibly dragging about with her many a link of the chain that she has snapped.*

It is germane to this branch of our subject to look at the condition of those centres of culture and national life, the Universities. Of the two which have hitherto been connected with the Anglican Church it is enough to say that after a trial of 300 years, they are still eminently vigorous; and can point to important services in physical science, in classics, in theology, in literature, in the press and in public life. At Tübingen and Bonn, where Rome has been confronted

* Nec . . . 'Rupi jam vincula,' dicas.

Nam et luctata canis nodum abripit: attamen illi,

Quum fugit, à collo trahitur pars longa catenæ.

Persius, Sat. v. 158.

with Lutheranism, "the union," says Döllinger, "has been productive of unmistakeable advantages." But "in Spain, Universities (like many other things besides) have been long sunk in the lowest depths of degradation."* In Italy their state is said to be such as to require complete reorganization, and to have been a main cause of that gulf of separation between the clergy and the laity which is so prevalent; that feeling of alienation and contempt which the laymen feel toward the seminary-trained priesthood.†

Nor is it alien from this topic to observe, that some of the greatest English preachers of this generation, who have become Roman Catholics, such as Dr. Newman and Archbishop Manning, are said to have fallen off in the freshness and spontaneousness of their sermons. Their discourses are charged with having become artificial, and devoid of the moral weight which they formerly carried with them. ‡ This is not surprising. The constraint arising from an undue pressure of authority is no less injurious, than the possession of unchartered liberty.

There is now a prospect of an authority being claimed for the Papal chair greater than anything from which our forefathers revolted. If, despite the traditions of Gallicanism, the efforts of the Munich school, and the recalcitrance of the Birmingham Oratorians,

* Universities Past and Present. (Engl. Trans.) Rivingtons, 1867.

† Ibid: supported as regards Italy by the unimpeachable authority of Massimo d'Azeglio in his *Questioni Urgenti* (1861).

‡ Ffoulkes' Letter. Pp. 47,48.

the views of the Jesuits at Rome and of the *Dublin Reviewers* should really prevail at the forthcoming Council, it is by no means an impossible contingency that so violent a stretch of the principle of concentrated authority might be found to work its own cure. Either the attempt, if it succeeded, might produce a new Reformation; or a Reforming Pontiff might arise, the *Papa Angelico* of Italian dreams, who should use the power attributed to him for the unification of Christendom. That the great Head of the Church may overrule this gathering to His own glory and the good of His worshippers, must in any case be the prayer of thousands, who can in no other way hope to affect its issues.

Yet, that I may not seem to rest in negatives alone, I would fain, in concluding this section, say something on the authorities recognized, if I mistake not, by a considerable portion of the members of the Anglican communion. We revere then (I venture for the moment to constitute myself the spokesman of a class)—we revere the dictates of that universal conscience of which Sophocles and Aristotle, Cicero and Lactantius have spoken; we see in the word of God a republication of natural religion with fresh sanction imposed on it thereby, and a revelation of truths (and consequent duties) which could not otherwise be known to man, more especially those great and fundamental dogmas concerning the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Eternal Son. We behold in the Church universal the pillar and basis of the truth, the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, the *arbiter* in

controversies of faith. That in a certain sense, like her Lord, she may grow in wisdom and stature we fully admit: but, as in mathematics the discoveries of Descartes and Leibnitz do not affect the axioms nor the conclusions of Euclid, so too we hold that developments in religion cannot affect the truths enshrined in the Nicene creed. With the Lutheran Dorner we say, “that it is such an equilibrium of the fixed and the alterable as this, that renders progress possible in the Church.” * We accept provisionally the authority of the decisions of our own Anglican communion, until East and West can be joined again, and a really Œcumenical Council called together. With Mr. Liddon we affirm, that we have not intentionally contravened the clear sense of Holy Scripture, or any formal decision, whether of the Undivided Church or the Church of England.† And taking the Church before that division and in the six accepted Councils, with Bishop Ken and a host of great Anglican divines, we bow to her determinations, and (as the Canons instruct us) desire to teach nothing that is contrary to the ruling of her greatest doctors. With Döllinger, provided it be understood of the Church universal, we hold that never could “a truth once thoroughly acknowledged and believed in the Church be lost, or sink from the dignity of an article of faith to a mere tolerated opinion.” ‡ And with the same

* On ‘The Person of Christ.’ Sect. ii. ch. i. (Div. i. vol. ii. p. 105. Eng. Tr.)

† Preface to ‘Bampton Lectures’ for 1866.

‡ ‘The Church and the Churches.’

proviso, we would fain adopt as our own the simple, but thrilling words:—

“ Firmly I believe and truly
 God is Three, and God is One ;
 And I next acknowledge duly
 Manhood taken by the Son.

And I trust and hope most fully
 In that manhood crucified ;
 And each thought and deed unruly
 Do to death, as He has died.

Simply to His grace and wholly
 Light and life, and strength belong,
 And I love, supremely, solely,
 Him the Holy, Him the Strong.

And I hold in veneration
 For the love of Him alone,
 Holy Church as His creation,
 And her teachings as His own.

Sanctus fortis, Sanctus Deus
 De profundis oro Te :
 Miserere, judex Meus,
 Parce mihi Domine.” *

IV. We have now to glance at the relation of the Reformation to the movement known as the Renaissance.

Just as the Alexandrian school, in the primitive Church, had tried to conciliate the claims of Greek, and especially of Platonic, philosophy with those of

* Newman's ‘ Dream of Gerontius.’

revelation, so too had the schoolmen of the middle ages attempted a similar task, substituting, however, Aristotle for Plato. At first, as Bishop Hampden and as Schwegler justly observe, these new thinkers were regarded as rationalists; and when (about A.D. 850) Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, had engaged Scotus Erigena to answer the predestinarian Gottschalc, he became alarmed lest, in thus inviting the aid of a professed philosopher and layman, he had acted the part of the horse, who sought human aid against the stag.

“Imploravit opes hominis, frenumque recepit:
Sed postquam victor violens discessit ab hoste,
Non equitem dorso, non frenum depulit ore.”*

The schoolmen won the day. For a long period the chief pursuits of European intellect were the study of Roman law and of the metaphysics of theology. Of physical science there was little; of history not much more; of anything like general literature very few samples indeed in any land, unless Italy be admitted as an exception. The writings of the schoolmen became everything; to Peter Lombard, to Scotus and Aquinas succeeded, as has often been

* Horat. 1 Epist. x. 37. Dr. Hampden remarks, that two Councils condemned the work of Scotus as containing “hæreses plurimas, ineptas quæstiunculas, et aniles pœne fabellas, pluribus syllogismis conclusas, Scotorumque pultes puritati fidei nauseam inferentes.”! Now, it is the Munich theologians, among Roman divines, who slight the schoolmen, while Perrone and the Court of Rome uphold them.

seen in the history of letters, a set of smaller imitators, who commented on the works of the great masters, and again others who wrote comments on the comments.

The criticism of Lord Bacon has but too much truth in it, that these men, "knowing little history, "either of nature or time, did, out of no great quantity of matter and infinite agitation of wit, spin out "laborious cobwebs of learning, admirable for the "fineness of thread and work, but of no substance "or profit."* In this, as in other matters, some change was imperatively needed. It came. It came, as often happens, from a most unexpected quarter; and in a way which, while it bore striking witness to the manner in which God overrules evil to good, yet also displayed that painful mixture of alloy which persistently clings to the gains and advantages of earth.

" For rivers twain are gushing still,
And pour a mingled flood ;
Good in the very depths of ill,
Ill in the heart of good." †

More than 1800 years had then rolled away since the Persian general, Megabazus, had been asked what he thought of the position of Chalcedon, and had replied by calling it "the city of the blind." ‡

* 'Advancement of Learning.' Book I. Compressed from two well-known sentences.

† J. H. Newman.

‡ Herodotus, lib. iv. cap. 144. Tacitus (Annal. xii. 63) records a substantially identical censure on the Chalcedonians, but makes it proceed from an oracle.

Standing, as he spoke, in the metropolis then rising upon the opposite shores of the Bosphorus, he had intuitively seen that *there* was the real site for a foundation, if men who had eyes were to make their choice. Ever since has the judgment of the nations ratified the wisdom of the ancient warrior's speech. Byzantium still remains the prize of the world; the city between east and west, which Napoleon and Alexander of Russia dared not mention in their conference on the raft at Tilsit; the city which (as Napoleon had prophesied) has for once, at least, united England and France, lest it fall into the hands of Russia. As the imperial seat of Constantine, it became the home of Roman law; and thence, too, in the fifteenth century sprung that revival of ancient learning which we commonly call the Renaissance, or, as a modern author proposes to anglicize the term, the Renascence.

The capture of Constantinople by the crusaders in A.D. 1204, inflicted a fatal blow upon the culture and progress of Greek learning. But the torch did not expire. Petrarch and Boccaccio endeavoured to master the language with the aid of Byzantine scholars; and in 1395 Emanuel Chrysoloras became the preceptor of a band of Hellenists, who soon spread through the Italian universities. Now, the first visit of Chrysoloras was undertaken solely in the character of an ambassador to solicit aid against the encroachment of the Turks. But the jealousy of European nations allowed Constantinople to fall; as the same jealousy has ever since allowed it to remain

in the hands of an anti-Christian power. Humanly speaking, its capture by Mahomet II. ought never to have been allowed; but the flight of learned men, with Greek manuscripts in their possession, not only introduced into Europe the revival of Greek learning, but by a cognate impulse placed the study of Latin on a new foundation.*

How this movement penetrated the heart and mind of Christendom is evidenced in a hundred ways. In editions of classics, in art, in architecture, in literature, in philosophy, it created a thorough revolution. With its intellectual bearings we are not here directly concerned; the only question before us is,—What was its relation to the Reformation?

I know of few historical problems more complex and difficult than this. That the mere effect of the change of thought, produced by the revived culture of the classic languages, was at first favourable to the Reformation seems undeniable. Moreover, that ultra-classical enthusiasm which gathered around the house of Medici soon travelled from Florence into Rome itself. The future Leo X. was trained by Politian, who regarded the Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible simply in the light of a mass of un-Ciceronian Latinity, and complained of the waste of time, which the young Giovanni's mother expended in making him daily read the Psalms in that famous and

* See Hallam, 'Literature of Europe,' Vol. i. chap. ii., and compare Gibbon, chapters liii. and lxxi.

(in its own way) eminently beautiful version.* The Humanists, as they were called, at the court of Leo remained for years indifferent spectators of the dispute which was being waged in Germany; and only became aware of their own imprudence when it was too late to arrest the progress of their formidable adversaries: while, in Germany itself, the classicists cherished enmity against the theologians, and especially against the Dominicans, whose office as censors of books brought them into constant collision with the fresh and ardent students of antiquity. One of them, though in his later years he receded from the Reformers, had been in several ways a pioneer of their path; by his edition of the Greek Testament, by his annotations and paraphrase, as well as by the incisive irony of his *Colloquia* and *Encomium Morice*. I refer, of course, to Desiderius Erasmus.

What may be called classic sentiment spread far and wide. I have already observed that for two centuries no Gallican divine uttered a word in praise of those glorious Gothic cathedrals with which the soil of France is so richly covered; and that when Fenelon would inculcate lessons of wisdom on the mind of an heir to the throne, he looked back—not to an Alfred or a St. Louis, but to the ‘tale of Troy divine,’ and gave the world his *Telemachus*.

And what in an ethical and religious point of view is the value of classic sentiment? Is it unreasonable

* Sir F. Palgrave, in ‘Murray’s Hand-book for North Italy.’ (1st edit.)

† Lingard, Vol. iv. chap. vii. (page 225 in Edit. of 1854.)

to compare it to some product of chemistry, such as iodine? In certain combinations, a valuable dye; in others an excellent medicine; in others an explosive mixture; under the influence of warmth a beautifully tinted vapour; it remains in and by itself an irritant, and a deadly poison. So far as the Renaissance awoke and sustained a rich literary and intellectual activity, so far for a season its cause ran parallel with, and aided the cause of, the Reformation; but wherever it so deeply engrossed the mind as to saturate it with Pagan ideas, it became a foe to every form of Christianity; as hostile to Calvinism as to Ultramontanism; probably even more so, for the sons of Loyola displayed extreme ability in laying hold of the newly-forged weapons and in many ways availing themselves of their aid. Whereby, says Lord Bacon, not without a just sentiment of admiration, "we see what notable service and reparation they have wrought the Roman See."*

Happily this subject is not one on which the more reasonable divines of England or of Rome have any serious ground of controversy. The extremes indeed here, as in many other departments of thought, are found to meet. The fiercest attacks upon classical education which this century has seen have proceeded from a French priest, the Abbé Gaume, and from an English dissenter, Mr. Forster. The volume of M. Gaume has met with replies from Prince Albert de Broglie and Dr. Newman. Excellent comments upon the question may be found in the late Isaac Wil-

* Adv. of Learning, Book i.

liams's 'Christian Scholar.' Mr. Keble's *Prælectiones Academicæ*, together with Mr. Gladstone's Address on the position of Ancient Greece, have likewise a direct bearing upon the subject.

When this fervour for classicalism began to abate a little, when Horace Walpole (a strange instrument for such a change) and Bishop Percy of Dromore* were led to reawaken men's interest in mediæval art and poetry, a re-action rapidly set in. The general tendency of the English Church movement in 1833 encouraged a love of Gothic Architecture and other developments of mediæval tastes; a re-action powerfully aided by contributions (some prior, some subsequent) from quarters unconnected with the ecclesiastical bearings of the agitation. The revived interest, chiefly on æsthetic grounds, which arose in France and Belgium for their national buildings; the poetry of Wordsworth, the poetry and prose of Scott, the re-issues and translations of Froissart and Joinville, the renewed fancy for illuminations of books and manuscripts, a fresh interest in the logic and metaphysics of the schoolmen, and in the works of their contemporary mystics, all testified to the same change of thought and sentiment. At length the one writer among us who, more than any other man, has popularized a knowledge of the *principles* of art, employed all his eloquence to denounce, in unmeasured terms, the entire tone of mind associated with the Renaissance movement. Nor did Mr. Ruskin stand alone. He

* See preface to the first volume of Sir F. Palgrave's 'Normandy and England.'

reminded his readers that a most original poet had anticipated him. By implication, Mr. Browning's verse is as severe as the prose of the "Stones of Venice."*

But will they hold their ground—these fierce assaults? Will they in the long run win and convince the mind of England and of Europe? I cannot think it. Not all our gratitude for service wrought, nor admiration of great powers, often righteously and nobly used, should ever induce us to accept the short and simple verdict of those who, confronting with a steadfast gaze some great and complex phenomenon, stand before it and simply cry,—‘*anathema!*’ Thus does Dr. Newman with a wave of the hand denounce the Reformation, as merely “the great Protestant revolt”—“which has bred infidels to its confusion.” Thus, by the mouth of Count Joseph de Maistre, was the character of the French Revolution summed up in one brief word—*Satanic*. Thus, in the judgment of Mr. Ruskin, is the Renaissance all but wholly damnable. To all three of these distinguished authors I pay the tribute of due homage and admiration; towards the first-named that of an earnest and un-sleeping gratitude; but in no such case does it seem

* “I know no other piece of modern English prose or poetry, in which there is so much told as in these lines [The Bishop orders his Tomb in St. Praxed's Church] of the Renaissance spirit—its worldliness, inconsistency, pride, hypocrisy, ignorance of itself and love of good Latin. It is nearly all that I have said of the central Renaissance in thirty pages of the ‘Stones of Venice’ put into as many lines, Browning's being also the antecedent work.”—Ruskin's ‘Modern Painters.’ Vol. iv. p. 378.

to me possible to accept such trenchant and sweeping verdicts. I should not know how to reconcile with these decisions my belief in the Providential governance of God's world.

Quodcunque ostendis mihi sic, incredulus odi.

I have said that this question is (happily) not one at issue between the Churches. But let it not be thought that it is therefore an unimportant or unpractical one. On the contrary, it requires at the hands of Christian philosophers an immediate and most serious attention. A tide of thought highly favourable to the Renaissance is again setting in. A case is being made out on its behalf. This is to some extent good and desirable; for it *has* a case, and it is right that we should hear it. But I wish that I could add, that it were possible to repose implicit confidence in the wisdom and intentions of its champions. MM. Michelet and Renan, especially the latter, are probably doing good service, when they call upon us to believe that this re-awakening of classic culture must have been designed to perform a real and vital office in the economy of the world's history; but many must still be inclined to view such advocates with mistrust, and to regard them as *Danaos et dona ferentes*. Of the reference to the question in the poem of the 'Spanish Gipsy,' I will only say that it must jar painfully on Christian ears. Concerning Mr. Swinburne's advocacy of the same cause the less that is said, perhaps the better. But there is one other English writer, who at least *attempts* to balance the case judicially.

In the gifts of wide and varied culture, in power of literary discrimination, and in the charms of a style replete with passages of a subtle and highly-finished eloquence, the ex-Professor of Poetry at Oxford has no superior in Britain, and few, if any, in Europe. But I interpret his criticism by his latest volume of verse; and it is with the sincerest regret, but most calmly and deliberately, that I decline to receive Mr. Arnold's ruling on these matters as final, or even as thoroughly sound and trustworthy in tone. I cannot believe that a true philosophy will land us in the conclusion, that the Renaissance was the larger and grander movement, and that the Reformation was only a portion of it: although we may willingly admit the justice of Lord Bacon's *dictum*, that together with the Reformation, "at one and the same time, it was ordained by the divine Providence, that there should withal attend a renovation, and new spring of all other knowledge."*

With what varied temper and habits of mind, profoundly Christian or thoroughly paganized, the impress of classic culture may co-exist, will easily be seen by calling up the names of distinguished poets, statesmen, theologians, and men of letters, who have been specially attached to the study of the remains of Greece and Rome; those two literatures so unapproachable in their own special sphere of excellence, so incapable of being replaced by any substitute as means of intellectual culture.† To the

* Adv. of Learning.

† Among those who have displayed a marked impress from

Humanists, who revived this interest we must ever owe a deep debt of gratitude; though the judgment which has just excluded them from a place on the pedestal of Luther's statue at Worms was most probably a just and right one.* And now *hunc locum sagacioribus commendo*. The critic who shall attempt to follow up the subject will need to refer to all the writers whom I have named. It may be well to add to the list Mr. Peter Bayne, in his very beautiful piece of criticism on 'Mr. Swinburne and Mr. Arnold,'† and Prince Albert de Broglie in his interesting reply to M. Michelet.‡

V. The relation of the Reformation to toleration and political liberty. The *primâ facie* case against the Reformation on this head is exceedingly strong.

classic culture may be named: poets as Petrarch, Milton, Gray, Bp. Heber, Keble, I. Williams, Leopardi, Tennyson, M. Arnold; statesmen as Algernon Sidney, Lord North, Pitt, Fox, Wyndham, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Derby, Sir G. C. Lewis, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Lowe, Sir R. Palmer, Sir J. D. Coleridge, Lord Carnarvon; among critics and men of letters, Muretus, Addison, Boileau, Lessing, Johnson, Bp. Copleston, M. de Broglie; among theologians, Origen, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, South, Bishop Taylor, John Henry Newman, Hugh James Rose, Bishop Charles Wordsworth, with the majority of the greatest Anglican divines. A list of artists might be added.

* For a statement on the other side see the *Fortnightly Review* for January 1, 1869; *Art.* 'The Luther Monument at Worms,' by Karl Blind.

† *Contemporary Review* for November, 1867.

‡ 'Questions de Religion et d'Histoire.' Paris: Levy, 1860.

By none has this been admitted more fully and generously than by M. Guizot, and by the present Dean of Chichester. I venture to think that these eminent men, in their earnest desire to be fair, have slightly overstated the case against the side which they espouse. Let us look for a moment at each point by itself.

The question of toleration is one of the most difficult of all problems, alike in theory and in practice. The law of nature in the material universe is intolerance. Standing, as Coleridge has said, implies *withstanding*: to occupy a given place is to prevent other things from occupying it. The patriarchal system was intolerant; idolatry was an iniquity to be punished by the judge. The Mosaic system was intolerant: death was the penalty for the worship of false gods. Paganism, too, had its own somewhat wayward outbursts of intolerance; as was proved to their cost by Æsop, Phidias, Anaxagoras, Socrates and many more, to say nothing of the ten terrible persecutions of Christianity by the Roman empire. And if the divine Founder of Christianity seemed to have intimated that judgments like those invoked by Elias were at variance with the genius of His milder and more merciful dispensation, yet Christendom was long in learning the lesson; and many of her noblest teachers and brightest examples of life were led, by what they conceived a logical deduction from the existence of certain saving and generally necessary *credenda*, to become active persecutors: as (to pass by earlier instances) St. Ferdinand of Spain and

‘the noblest and holiest of monarchs,’* St. Louis of France.

How far did the mediæval system of repression succeed? I will answer in the words of a Roman Catholic writer:

“There will be, I say, in spite of you, unbelief and immorality to the end of the world, *and you must be prepared for immorality more odious and unbelief more astute, more subtle, more bitter, and more resentful, in proportion as it is forced to dissemble.* . . . The heresies of the East germinated in the West and in Catholic lecture-rooms with a mysterious vigour upon which history throws no light. . . . The acutest intellects became sceptics and misbelievers, and the head of the holy Roman empire, the Cæsar Frederick the Second, to say nothing of our miserable King John, had the reputation of meditating a profession of Mahometanism. It is said that in the community at large, men had a vague suspicion and mistrust of each other’s belief in Revelation. A secret society was discovered in the Universities of Lombardy, Tuscany, and France, organised for the propagation of infidel opinions; it was bound together by oaths, and sent its missionaries among the people in the disguise of pedlars and vagrants.

. . . The University of Paris was obliged to limit the number of its doctors in theology to so few as eight, from misgivings about the orthodoxy of its divines generally. . . . Amaury of Chartres was the author of a school of Pantheism, and has

* Dr. Arnold.

given his name to a sect; Abelard, Roscelin, Gilbert, and David de Dinant, Tanquelin and Eon, and others who might be named, show the extraordinary influence of anti-Catholic doctrines on high and low. Ten ecclesiastics and several of the populace of Paris were condemned for maintaining that our Lord's reign was past, that the Holy Ghost was to be incarnate, or for parallel heresies." *

It must be fully and frankly admitted, that the Reformation at its first commencement in no wise altered this state of things. Calvin, Cranmer, Melancthon, Knox had no hesitation whatever upon the subject. It is at least an open question, whether the Pilgrim fathers did not establish in New England a tyranny fiercer than that from which they had fled. In most ultra-Protestant communities, witch-burning became more rife than ever. Locke was one of the earliest promoters of toleration. The soundness of his arguments is however a much-mooted point. The names of Bayle and of Leibnitz have been joined with that of Locke. But none of these men flourished before the latter part of the seventeenth century.

That members of the Reformed communions occupied, in this respect, a worse and more inconsistent position than those of the unreformed, is generally admitted by impartial critics and historians. Nevertheless it seems to me that the former may fairly argue thus. Few authors of a great movement can be expected to perceive at once the whole of the principles involved in the change which they have

* Dr. Newman. 'Lectures on University Subjects,' pp. 298—304. London: Longmans, 1859.

brought about. The history of Christianity itself exemplifies this principle. The Gospel has by degrees abolished polygamy; and has certainly been the main, if not the sole, instrument in the abolition of slavery. But the passages of the New Testament which denounce polygamy, except indirectly and by implication, are hard to find; and as for slavery, we all know that the mere letter, apart from the spirit of the sacred volume, makes rather for it than against it.

So has it fared, as I conceive, with the Reformation. At first we see little, if anything, to choose betwixt the contending parties. The Huguenots, for example, made violent outbreaks, murdered priests, offered insufferable insults to the religion of their countrymen, and were as intolerant and as reckless on the subject of assassinations as their opponents; provided always that the murder favoured, or seemed to favour, the Protestant cause. Dr. Littledale is fully justified in calling attention to these facts, and in appealing to Mr. White's account of the 'Massacre of St. Bartholomew' and Mr. Prescott's narrative of the 'Nones of Haarlem.' But what I would claim for at least the leading Reformed countries, for Holland, England, Switzerland, Prussia, is this—that they were far quicker than the lands of the Roman obedience in learning the lesson of toleration and likewise in the honesty of confessing the real state of the case and the truth of history.

The implied praise of St. Ferdinand for carrying faggots to the stakes of heretics still stands untouched in the Roman Breviary; a *quasi*-censure from Rome on M. de Montalembert for his denunciation of such

doings is, I fear, an historical fact of our own time. Compare the Spain and the Great Britain of 1868. Or go back a century and think of the earthquake of Lisbon in 1752. How powerfully that terrible event affected the mind of Europe is known from the writings of Voltaire and of Goethe. But how did it respectively influence the governing bodies of Britain and of Portugal? Great Britain immediately voted £100,000 for the relief of the sufferers, and despatched, without a moment's delay, a portion of her glorious navy to convey money and food to Lisbon. But the authorities in Portugal conceived, that this fearful calamity might be a judgment upon them, for having neglected the due punishment of heresy. They accordingly got up an *Auto-da-Fé* and burnt some persons who had been condemned as heretics.* I suppose that most of us will, in this matter, think the conduct of England the more eligible.

It has long been a much-mooted question whether the famous 'St. Bartholomew' was the result of a sudden outburst or of a deliberate plot. But it is curious that the earlier Roman Catholic eulogists of Queen Catherine rejected with scorn the idea of its being anything but an organized massacre. They held, that the admission of the opposite (and probably truer) view would be lowering to the character of so great a princess.† Now I trust that it would be

* Sismondi is my authority for these statements. He is eminently trustworthy on questions of fact.—*Hist. des Français*, (Tome xxix. p. 70.)

† Sismondi, *ubi supra*, xx. p. 93. Among these would-be flatterers of Catherine are Capilupi, Davila and Adriani; *all, like the Queen herself, Italians.*

difficult to find in Anglican or in any Reformed historians even of that earlier date, a parallel to this strange ground for a vaunt. Nor do I think, that we can easily match that eulogy of the Massacre by Muretus (delivered, be it observed, before Pope Gregory XIII.) wherein he declares that he could well imagine that the stars on that night shone brighter than their wont, and that the Seine ran fuller in its course so as to carry off more speedily to the ocean the corpses of these impure Huguenots.* And though it is hardly possible to exonerate Coligny from being privy to the assassination of the Duke of Guise, yet I do not find the French Reformers setting up in other lands memorials of *their* risings. But Gregory XIII. did do this. He struck a medal in honour of the *Ugonotorum Strages*, and had a picture of it by Vasari placed in the vestibule of the Sistine Chapel.

Then, again, though English and continental persecutions of Roman Catholics have been prolonged and bitter, have there been any (after making all fair allowance for the provocation given by the Calvinist side in Holland) equal in intensity to those carried on by the Duke of Alva and by the Inquisition in Spain?† Or is there any case on the Reformed side

* *Mureti Orationes*. Hallam has given this passage in a note. —Lit. Europe, Vol. ii. chap. i.

† Archbishop Manning says that the English persecution of Roman Catholics has been far worse than anything recorded of the Spanish Inquisition. But it may be reasonably doubted, whether this distinguished prelate is really *capable* of making a fair statement on matters of historical controversy.

precisely parallel to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes? It is true that the *Memoirs* of the Duke of St. Simon, written at the time, contain the most emphatic condemnation of the cruelty, the wickedness, and the utter folly of the entire proceeding; of the bitterness and mutual treachery and compulsory hypocrisy which it occasioned.* It is also true, that no finer pages—and this is saying a great deal—have been penned by Prince Albert de Broglie than those in which, looking back upon the scenes which St. Simon witnessed, he condemns from a still loftier ground the whole of this breach of faith committed against a community, who had kept their own promises with truthfulness and honour.† Let it be granted also, that the retaliations for this act on the part of Reformed nations were in many instances conceived and carried out in a spirit only too similar. Let it be admitted, that it was far more in the spirit of a haughty potentate who desires to see his subjects of the same creed with himself, than from a spirit of zealous but mistaken enthusiasm, that Louis XIV. acted. Still the saddening fact remains, and it should be a warning to us of the Clergy (for in these matters all ministers of religion have but too much resem-

* St. Simon, *Memoires*, Tome xiii. The main statement, though without the details, is given by Smyth, 'Lectures on French Revolution,' Vol. i. p. 30, and re-quoted by Alison, 'Hist. of Europe,' Vol. i. chap. i., who also gives the words here cited from Bossuet's *Oraison Funebre* on the Chancellor le Tellier.

† De Broglie, 'Questions de Religion et d'Histoire,' Tome ii. pp. 79—95.

blance to each other) that not only did no remonstrance worth speaking of proceed from any of the Gallican Priesthood, but that the greatest orators among them, Flechier and alas! Bossuet, gloried in, and beatified this deed of cruel and sanguinary perfidy. *Ce triomphe de la foi—un si brave monument de la piété du roi—le plus bel usage de l'autorité.* Such is the language of the great Bishop of Meaux. What marvel that the profound and pious Leibnitz, till then favourably inclined towards Rome, from that date never advanced one single step further in the path of conciliation.* What wonder that this so-called *triumph* armed all Europe against Louis, and rendered the closing years of his long reign one continuous epoch of decadence and calamity!

Somewhat analogous seems to be the connection of the Reformation with political liberty. To talk, indeed, as is sometimes done, of our mediæval forefathers as if they were all slaves, is mere party spirit and contempt of the truth of history. The barons who won for us *Magna Charta*, the schoolmen, the grand old English lawyers (such as Bracton and Fortescue) had quite as correct ideas of the due limitations on the power of the Crown as Hooker or even Blackstone, far more correct ones than the Lutherans of the seventeenth century, than our own Caroline divines, or than Bossuet and the Gallican school of theologians. Nor did the Reformation, at the first outset, in anywise aid the cause of civil liberty. On

* De Broglie, 'Questions de Religion et d'Histoire,' Tome ii. p. 54.

the contrary, for a season, much was lost in England ; and in Germany, the Hobbist maxim (if one might so term it by anticipation) *cujus est regio, ejus est religio* produced very similar results. Indeed, it may be fairly questioned, whether the connection between certain views in religion and in politics, which usually go together, is in reality of so logical and binding a character as is commonly supposed. For surely Christians of the most strongly dogmatic convictions, Presbyterians of the Free Church of Scotland, Anglo-Catholics, Roman Catholics, and others may say with perfect sincerity and consistency : “ I “ hold firmly such and such religious tenets, because “ I believe them to be revealed ; but this and that “ political question I regard as perfectly open, “ because I do not recognize the existence of any “ divinely-sanctioned utterance upon the subject.” Thus, for example, it is easy to conceive two men accepting the truths enshrined in the creed of Nicæa as matters removed beyond dispute, and discussing as open questions the wisdom or erroneousness of the Salic Law, of absolute or of limited monarchy, of oligarchical and democratic government, and a thousand analogous problems. Nor, indeed, in the middle ages did a yearning for intellectual license necessarily betoken sympathy with struggles for political liberty. There is, for once, something like a touch of humour in that page of M. Guizot’s *Civilisation en Europe*, wherein he points out the utter alienation of thought between Abelard and the contemporary citizens, who were struggling for the enfranchisement of their

boroughs. "Here," he says, "were *bourgeois* passionately desirous of liberty; and yet, if they were told of men who were maintaining the cause of human reason and the right of examination, of men whom the Church regarded as heretics, they were prepared at a moment's notice to stone or burn them: as Abelard and his friends were more than once in danger of discovering. Meanwhile, the students who made protests on behalf of human reason, spoke of these efforts to win municipal freedoms as a hateful disorder, an utter overthrow of society."* Whether the two causes had in reality quite so much in common as M. Guizot thinks, may perhaps be questioned. But the mutual dislike is at least intelligible. A mayor could understand the meaning of freedom from vexatious imposts levied by a neighbouring feudal lord, without being able to perceive why any man should desire to put his own genius above the faith;† while, on his side, Abelard had an overweening idea of the license due to intellect, and a contempt for worthy citizens, who were unable to comprehend the differences between realism and nominalism, and were consequently in his eyes regarded as utterly unfit for the possession of political power.

* *Civilisation en Europe*, Leçon Gième. I have not translated quite closely.

† "Ita omnia usurpat sibi humanum ingenium, fidei nil reservans." St. Bernard, Epistle 188, addressed to the Bishops and Cardinals of the Roman *Curia* concerning the errors of Abelard. (p. 118, ed. Benedict.)

It is probable that we are far from having yet witnessed all the combinations, which the two kinds of authority and liberty may enter into, in the separate spheres of politics and of religion. It will be, for example, a curious question for posterity to determine, how far De Tocqueville may prove right in his surmise, that in free countries (such as the United States) the struggle will lie between Rome and Pantheism.* But, whatever may be in store for the future, it seems hardly to be doubted but that, soon after the Reformation, the Roman Court, forsaking the tenets of schoolmen and the old Guelphic traditions, began in a most unwise, and (for its own ends) fatal manner, to ally itself with arbitrary power against the cause of political liberty. Look at the history of the Dutch Republic; at the sanction and encouragement given to the Spanish Armada; at the course pursued by the House of Austria, the power in closest alliance with the Papacy; at the influence of Henrietta Maria at the Court of Charles I. in England; at the subsequent career of the House of Stuart after the Restoration and, at a later epoch, after their dethronement. One great and noble feat, for the safety of Europe, Rome did indeed help to achieve, during this period, in the repression of the Turk at the sea-fight of Lepanto, and the subsequent deliverance of Vienna through the arms of Sobieski. But however admirable was the conduct of Pius V.

* Democracy in America, vol. iii. chaps. v.—vii. If De Tocqueville had said between Catholicism in its larger import and Pantheism, I should have been inclined to think him right.

and of Innocent XI. in these matters, it did not affect the general relations of post-Reformation Roman policy. It cannot possibly have arisen from a merely fortuitous combination that, by the year 1700, the countries where the Papacy is strong, Spain, Italy, Austria, France, are all found to be under despotic governments; while the leading countries where that influence is weakened or overthrown, Holland, England, Switzerland are at the same period in the enjoyment of freedom. Of the many grievous blunders that the Roman See has made, her entire policy in the events to which reference has just been made is certainly among the greatest. If it be said that the Anglican Church has erred in the same direction; this, in so far as it is true, has likewise been a misfortune for the cause of religion. But the difference in degree is unspeakable, and in such matters the amount of intensity is very important.

To turn to the question of truthfulness. Here very large admissions must in fairness be made on both sides. "Oh! the one-sidedness of Protestantism," cries Dr. Newman in one of his Birmingham lectures. "Oh! the one-sidedness of Ultramontaniam," it were easy to retort; but it is surely more generous and more honest to exclaim, "Oh! the one-sidedness of humanity. Oh! the one-sidedness of those prepossessions which birth, station, circumstances, country, education, profession, sinfulness, party-spirit, affection and other influences inflict upon us all in turn." Perhaps, at the very best, all human attempts at impartiality must prove to be only a

matter of degree. But if a line *is* to be drawn at all, we must try to draw one between the partiality of him who wishes to tell the truth, but is unconsciously warped by his prejudices ; and that of the man whose errors can be shown to have arisen from inexcusable carelessness, or deliberate wilfulness.

Now concerning unconscious bias little need be said. The essay which the reader has in his hands is probably as obnoxious to it, as any of the writings on which its author has commented so freely. It exists, as has just been said, on every side. We are all tempted to find that which we desire to find. "Can't you see the *deevil* in his *ee*?" said a young Scotchman, on being shown the photograph of a candidate for Parliament, whose religious convictions he held in especial abhorrence. Unfortunately for the justice of the comment, the exhibitor of the portrait had designedly produced a representation of another person, who had scarcely a point in common with the object of the speaker's indignation. But he had determined beforehand what to look for ; and 'the wish was father to the thought.' The signs and tokens of unconscious partiality meet us at every turn. Lingard is essentially honest, a man of very English and straightforward mind ; yet in the matter of Henry II.'s conquest of Ireland does he deal out a fair and impartial measure of censure alike to Pope and to King ? In his chapter on the state of the English monasteries before their fall, is there anything like an adequate admission of the amount of evidence producible against them ? Would his account of Queen

Catherine's divorce leave on the reader's mind the impression that Bonner and Gardiner took part in it, as well as Wolsey? Mr. Motley's 'Dutch Republic' is a work of remarkable and most conscientious research; but it is still the work of an advocate, not of a judge. Again, Dr. Littledale seems to me strangely prejudiced, but at the same time most desirous to be candid. Yet, in comparing the number of victims in Queen Mary's reign with those put to death by her successor, was it a light matter that he should forget to remind his audience, that Mary reigned for little more than *four* years, while Elizabeth reigned *forty-five*?

More marked examples of that want of equity which is the besetting sin of controversialists, are to be found on all sides but too easily. Instances could be produced from Bingham and, I fear, even from Beveridge. Hallam declares that Bossuet is too determined a partizan to be trusted by those who seek the truth; and adds that he has often been unable to verify that prelate's references to Luther's works. But in the following page he is compelled to speak of Isaac Milner's "disingenuous trick of suppressing all passages in certain treatises of Luther, which display his Antinomian paradoxes in a strong light."* The same historian furnishes us with a lamentable instance from Dr. Henry, in the matter of Edwy and Elgiva. Dean Stanley, we are aware, maintains that the marriage of that hapless pair has been proved, and Hallam himself inclines to this view. But Dr.

* 'Lit. of Europe,' Vol. i. chap. lv. p. 416 and 417, (note.)
Ed. 1837.

Henry, not content with calling Elgiva queen, supplies references "to William of Malmesbury and other chronicles, *who give a totally opposite account.*" Well may Hallam declare: "Such a practice, when it proceeds, as I fear it did in this instance, not from oversight, but from prejudice, is a glaring violation of historical integrity, and tends to render the use of references, that great improvement of modern history, a sort of fraud upon the reader."* And not to prolong this list of specimens, I will only here refer to that famous quotation from the works of St. Eligius, first atrociously garbled by Mosheim, copied from him in the same condition by Robertson, copied again by Hallam, again by Dean Waddington of Durham; until the last-named writer inquired into the matter, and corrected this long-standing abuse.

Nevertheless, as has been intimated, the balance in this matter seems to incline against the Roman side. I do not wish to forget that Bale and Foxe are at least as untrustworthy as the Jesuit Parsons,† nor do I desire to put out of sight the examination of the Book of Homilies by Isaac Taylor. But can any list of false *data* so interwoven with a system, as those Roman ones pointed out by Mr. Ffoulkes in his recent pamphlet, be alleged against Anglicanism? Have we, in our later literature, anything to be compared with the fraudulent translation of Ranke into

* 'Middle Ages,' Vol. ii. Notes to chap. vii. (Vol. ii. p. 260 in Ed. 1853.)

† The language of Dean Hook on this subject reflects (if I may venture to use such language) the highest honour upon him.

French, wherein that admirable writer is represented as saying the very reverse of what he has really said? Or is there ⁱⁿ a work aspiring to be the *vade-mecum* of our Clergy anything resembling that volume in M. Migne's Encyclopædia which quietly intimates that English persecutions against Roman Catholics raged under Edward VI, *ceased under Mary*, and re-commenced on the accession of Elizabeth; without one word or hint that Mary had in four years put to death nearly two hundred persons? * Have we ever given way to that strange desire to claim for ourselves men of genius, which made Italians assure Goethe that Frederick of Prussia was a concealed Roman Catholic, and which invented a death-bed recantation for the unfortunate Leopardi?

Far be it from me to ignore the unsurpassed candour and gentleness of Möhler, the generous outbursts of Döllinger in his numerous admissions towards opponents, the noble equity of M. de Broglie, or the large concessions made of late years by M. de Montalembert. These writers we have perhaps on our side barely equalled, certainly not excelled. But it

* This case seems to me a peculiarly painful one. M. Migne conceived the really grand idea of furnishing French *Curés* with an exhaustive Encyclopædia of theology in all its bearings, for about £15. So far as my acquaintance with the 60 volumes goes, I could subscribe to the tolerably favourable estimate given some three or four years since by Mr. Matthew Arnold in the 'Cornhill Magazine.' But a statement such as the above (which that gentleman points out) is a very serious offence against honesty. For the average French clergy read little, I am told, except the *Monde* or the *Univers*, so that the chance of their gaining correct views of historical truth must be lamentably small.

remains as a great glory to English literature, that he who knows no other tongue can read such honourable testimony to the merits of post-Reformation heroes and heroines on the Roman side as is contained in the works of Isaac Taylor, or (still better) in the eloquent sketches of Sir James Stephen. It will be found, I think, that in this race of generosity the priority in point of time was slightly in favour of the English, or at any rate the Reformation, side.

Nor is this all. It was my fortunate lot to be one of those, who even in boyhood were disabused of that most false impression, that all persecution had been exercised on one side only. But then I must most thankfully add, that I owed this healthful and important knowledge *entirely to authors of Reformed communions*, Anglican, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Calvinist. Let me mention with special gratitude and honour Professor Smyth, who in his 'Lectures on English History,' not only denounces that pleasant fiction, saying, "*This is not so, and Protestants should know it;*" but also throws together, in a few pages of text and notes, convincing evidence of his correctness. Let me speak with like recognition of Robertson and of Hallam; and of a more recent writer, Dr. Grub, the author of that excellent 'Ecclesiastical History of Scotland,' to which reference has already been made. Mr. Froude has, on this topic, striven to be just and generous, and has narrated at length the story of that grievous blot upon the character of Latimer, his behaviour in the matter of the dreadful death inflicted upon the friar Forrest for denying

the royal supremacy. Nor let Sidney Smith be forgotten; especially that memorable passage wherein he gives a long list of the provisions against Huguenots embodied in the laws of Louis XIV. We read it, and feel at each sentence our indignation and our anti-Roman sentiments waxing stronger and stronger; until at its close we come upon the words: "My dear reader, will you forgive the little stratagem which I have played upon you; this is *not* the code drawn up by Louis XIV. against the French Protestants, but that which *we ourselves* made against the Irish Roman Catholics." The stratagem is a just and righteous one: it is an excellent thing for all of us to be compelled, from time to time, to view things from the opposite side to that, in which they are ordinarily presented to our minds. In no other way are we so likely to be able to realize the aspiration of the poet:

"O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as others see us!"

Among books on this subject which strike me as eminently fair, I would also name Principal Tulloch's 'Leaders of the Reformation.' Nor must it be overlooked that at least two of our great masters of fiction have striven earnestly to hold the balance fairly between Rome and the Reformation—Mr. Thackeray and Sir Walter Scott. As regards the Huguenots, although I believe that there is a lying history by M. Felice, which ignores the whole of the crimes committed on their side and recounts those alone which were committed against them; yet it must be

remembered that they can show in Sismondi an historian who, if he has not done justice to the mediæval Church, has displayed an extraordinary spirit of candour towards both sides in all the annals of the post-Reformation period.* And as for that garbled quotation from Eligius, the fraud has, I believe, been exposed by Dr. Maitland in his 'Dark Ages.' But it was not there that I first became acquainted with it. I was one of a circle of undergraduates who, in the halls of our much-loved *Alma Mater*, heard it upheld to our reprobation as 'a memorable warning' in the manly and emphatic tones of Dr. Arnold.

The unconscious bias which is common to most of us, though faulty, has its origin in some of the best principles of our nature, in the natural gratitude and affection entertained towards those from whom we believe that we have derived great benefits. Let us treat then with indulgence, upon either side,—

“ The instinctive theorizing, whence a fact
Looks to the eye as the eye likes the look.” †

But for deliberate unfairness the case stands far otherwise. We ought to deplore and to condemn it, whensoever and wheresoever it is met with ; but most especially and most deeply when it occurs upon our own side. *We*, above all, who have enjoyed the

* Few things display more vividly Sismondi's superiority to *some* popular prejudices, than the fact, that in at least three cases out of four, in which he has to judge the worth of charges against the Jesuits, he gives a verdict of either 'not proven' or else of entire acquittal.

† Robert Browning. 'The Ring and the Book,' Vol. i. line 862.

advantages of good education under the shadow of a Church, which, without severing the links that bind her to the past, has won so much of freedom in the present and for the future,—*we* ought to try to show ourselves, in love of truth and fearlessness of consequences, superior to the meanness and the littleness which believes that its cause can possibly gain by anything like wilful reticence or studied perversion of facts. In Spain, where the breath of freedom has been jealously shut out, in many an ultra-Protestant home, whence all but partizan literature has with equal care been carefully excluded, the atmosphere becomes so charged with prejudice, that it is well-nigh impossible to escape from its influence. But we have no such excuse.

“ . . . By the common cry the common mind
Is buoyed aloft ; be it not so with us :
Whatsoe'er possible evils lie before
Let us sincerely own them to ourselves
With all unstinting unevasive hearts,
Reposing in the consciousness of strength,
Or fervent hope to be endowed with strength
Of all enduring temper—daring all truth.” *

It has, however, been urged that any superiority in love of truth, on the side of the Reformed communities, must be attributed rather to difference of race than to difference of creed. There is real force in this consideration. The Teutonic races have from an early date exhibited a keener yearning for truth than the Latin and Celtic ones. Tacitus, in his *Germania*, contrasts

* Henry Taylor's 'Isaac Comnenus.'

the truthfulness of the wild races of that northern land with the deceitful habits of his own civilized countrymen; and to this day, the evidence of *German* generals and war-critics, on the facts of a campaign, is all but universally preferred by impartial judges to the evidence of *French* witnesses. So, too, in theology, there has been displayed in the works of German writers on both sides, Ranke, Kohn, Hurter, Schlegel, and many more (besides the great men previously named) an amount of impartiality hardly known in France. Such books as the historical romances of M. Audin could scarcely have won even a passing attention in Germany. And it is, to say the least, a curious coincidence that the most candid and prominent lay writers in the Gallican Church, MM. de Montalembert and de Broglie, are both of Teutonic blood upon the mother's side.

It were easy to name some counter-facts, and to show that undue weight may be assigned to the element of race. Nevertheless, it is too prominent a feature to be wholly ignored. The acceptance of the Reformation in the main (except in Southern Germany) by the Teutonic races and the rejection of the Reformation in the main by the Latin races, is a curious and important fact.*

But after making all fair allowance for this factor in the production of certain results, we shall perceive

* A cognate one may be found in the great weakness of Anglicanism, in those parts of the United Kingdom where Celtic blood predominates. The Celts are generally Wesleyans in Cornwall, members of the Free Church in the Scottish Highlands, Methodists in Wales, Roman Catholics in Ireland.

that the original question is only thrown one step further back. The Pontiffs, who determined to break with the Reformers, knew how richly their own Italy was endowed with all the precious gifts of mind, and imagined that they could dispense with the aid of the less cultivated north. And in very truth Italy is a wondrous land. That country, which has twice issued its mandates to the listening world, from the Rome of the Cæsars and from the Rome of the Popes ; which sent to England such saintly intellects as Augustine, Lanfranc, Anselm ; which imparted to us the benefits of its school of medicine at Salerno ; of its school of law at Bologna ; which, through Dante, Petrarch, Boccacio, and other of her sons created *modern* literature, and revived the taste for that of antiquity ; which has produced, probably, the greatest Christian sculptors, most certainly the greatest painters ; which, through Guido of Arezzo and Palestrina, wrought so powerfully for the divine art of music ; which gave us the first treatise on algebra, the first great work on anatomy ; which was the birth-place of da Vinci, Raphael, Michael Angelo ; of Galileo, Torricelli, Galvani, Volta ;—that country, in the splendour and versatility of individual genius, in the way in which she has at certain epochs led the van of civilization, is perhaps the very first among the nations. But not upon any one land and people, however richly dowered, does God bestow all the wealth that is imparted to humanity.

“ Nonne vides, croceos ut Tmolus odores,
India mittit ebur, molles sua tura Sabæi,
At Chalybes nudi ferrum ? ”

The north has also its own special powers. If inferior to the lands beyond the mountains in brilliancy and plasticity, in sense of beauty, in largeness of conception, yet not only does she possess, in one or other of her families, seriousness, hardihood, perseverance, deep love of freedom, keen desire for truth, a poetry and a mysticism of her own, and a profound and invigorating culture of the reasoning faculty; but she had it in her power to have supplied with these endowments, her glorious heritage from on high, precisely that in which Italy was most deficient. Even Dr. Newman grants that the 'loss of the English, not to say the German element, has been a most serious evil,'* and the accents of Pope Clement VII. still resound: "We yet bewail it in tears of blood."

Before we quit this portion of the subject, it may be right to say something concerning slavery. The Primitive Church was obliged to proceed with some caution in this matter; for, as De Broglie justly observes, so completely was agricultural labour deemed beneath the dignity of a freeman, that immediate emancipation, had it been possible, would have endangered the safety of the Roman empire. No one would have consented to till the fields, and a general famine must have ensued. It is possible, however, to trace from the fourth to the seventh century of the Christian era a series of acts, all tending to ameliorate the lot of these unfortunate beings. Balmes has rightly called attention to

* *Apologia*, p. 412.

Canons of this nature enacted by the Councils of Eliberis (A.D. 306), of Orleans (the fifth in 549), of Toledo (675), of Worms (868). St. Ambrose and St. Cyril laboured honourably in the same cause; and at length the monastic bodies, to their eternal honour, gave freedom to all serfs labouring on their property.

“ — Mark how gladly through their own domains
 The Monks relax or break these iron chains ;
 While Mercy, uttering through their voice a sound
 Echoed in Heaven, cries out, ‘ Ye Chiefs, abate
 These legalized oppressions ! Man—whose name
 And nature God disdained not ; Man—whose soul
 Christ died for—cannot forfeit his high claim
 To live and move exempt from all control
 Which fellow-feeling doth not mitigate.’ ”

It is to be feared that the discovery of the New World caused a reaction against the sentiments so justly glorified by Wordsworth. Post-Reformation divines among the Roman Catholics have, if I am not mistaken, directed their efforts, not towards the emancipation of slaves, but to the acquisition of some minor advantages which should render their lot less deplorable. Organs of this religion declared while the American war was raging, that members of the Roman Church were hardly at liberty to denounce slavery in the abstract; and this feeling led their writers to throw their sympathies with the Southern States. It was argued on their side, (and not it would seem without some solid basis of fact) that the treatment of slaves in Roman Catholic countries, such as Brazil, had been decidedly better than that

which they experienced in Protestant ones, such as the United States. This difference was attributed to the influence of religious books, more especially to the writings of Spaniards. Hallam confirms this opinion. "The whole relection," says that critic, speaking of a Lecture by Francis à Victoria,—“the whole relection, as well as that on the Indians; displays an intrepid spirit of justice and humanity, *which seems to have been rather a general characteristic of the Spanish theologians.* Dominic Soto, always inflexibly on the side of right, had already sustained by his authority the noble enthusiasm of Las Casas.” *

I do not suppose that the question of slavery is a perfectly simple and easy one; and I rejoice to be able, despite my antipathy to the internal polity of Spain during the last three centuries, to bear witness to one of her many high and noble qualities. Even in the matter of foreign rule and conquest she, like all the great European powers, has much to answer for. Still I am by no means sure that, if the question of achievements in the way of Christian colonization were fairly investigated, it might not be our duty to assign the first and loftiest place to *ultra*-Catholic Spain, the lowest and worst to *ultra*-Protestant Holland. But for all that, a still bolder line concerning slavery has been adopted in certain lands of

* 'Literature of Europe,' Vol. ii. chap. iv. § 88. Victoria was a professor at Salamanca. Grotius was probably indebted to his *Relectiones Theologicæ*.

the Reformation : and whether we regard the teaching of the mediæval Church, the facts of human nature, or the way in which the Almighty seems to have sanctioned its progress, it does not seem too much to assert that the Roman line of conduct in this matter, though well intended and far from being wholly unblest, must yield in value, as it does in breadth and simplicity, to that which is associated with the names of William Wilberforce, Clarkson, Stanfield, the poet Cowper, Channing, and Harriet Beecher Stowe. Bishop Dupanloup has come over to this side, and the comments made upon his advocacy show how completely such a view was deemed alien from that of his co-religionists. The Greek Church may now allege the generous action of the Emperor Alexander II. ; and the Imperial ruler of Brazil is also reported to be anxious to put an end to slavery in his dominions. But it must, I believe, be held, that in a race creditable to both sides, the moral victory has remained with a school who are children of the Reformation ; and that herein at least the flag of Britain has sheltered no ignoble cause. Her statesmen of the most opposite political schools,—Liverpool, Castlereagh, Palmerston, Peel, Aberdeen, Clarendon,—have been thoroughly imbued with the tenets, which Wilberforce and Cowper, on the most religious philanthropic grounds, infused into the national mind. And if her flag is now to be partially withdrawn from this service, it is only because the work is well nigh accomplished. May it ever

be promptly reared again if needed for a like exalted duty!

“Thou sun, shine on her ^{joyously;} ~~gloriously~~; ye breezes, waft her wide,
Our glorious SEMPER EADEM, the banner of our pride.”

VI. The relation of the Reformation to the history of the last hundred years.

By the date of the peace of Westphalia (A.D. 1648) according to Lord Macaulay; by the commencement of the eighteenth century, according to others, a new epoch began: an epoch, in which the contending parties, weary with the bitterness of the struggle, not only literally sheathed their swords, but sat down, as if contented with their respective possessions; and proceeded to exercise what might be called, at least by comparison, something akin to a mutual toleration. I prefer to take the later date, as the time when this new era may be fairly said to have been inaugurated.

With the greatest and most loveable of modern Swiss theologians, the lamented Alfonse Vinet, I had long felt (before I saw the same confession in his pages) that my dislike of the last century was so great, that it was necessary to be watchful lest one should be betrayed into injustice towards it. But it would surely be hard to make out a case for it, which should extort from Christian judges anything like a hearty admiration. It achieved, indeed, great triumphs in physical science; it opened up a

new world in music; in the intervals of peace between its dynastic wars, intercourse among the nations of Europe was much cultivated; more especially the influence of English literature and English political life upon the mind of France became prodigious. The age produced too some first-rate generals and admirals, some excellent orators, and a few statesmen of a very high order. But that great power, without whose aid reason languishes and enthusiasm dies away, the power of imagination, waxed faint and feeble. Till towards the close of the eighteenth century no great poet arose in Europe; the inductive philosophy was indeed winning fresh victories, but there was a want of depth about most of the speculation of the day; and its religious toleration,—so excellent, if springing from a large sense of mutual charity,—too often ended, if it did not actually begin, in mere indolence and want of earnestness on behalf of any doctrine whatever, in a lack of faith concerning the very existence of objective truth.

This decline of religious earnestness seems to have been almost European in its extent. Evidence of laxity prevalent during the third quarter of the eighteenth century may be adduced from notices of Italy, Switzerland, France, Scotland, and, I believe, of Spain and Austria.* Nor had England any

* This evidence is not far to seek. I will content myself with a reference to the Preface to the 'Epistolario of Giusti,' by Frassi (Florence, Le Monnier, 1859) for *Italy*; for *Switzerland* to Voltaire's well-known boasts, and the admissions made by Coleridge in the 'Friend,' that though exaggerated, they con-

cause to vaunt herself, though it seems strange to hear men speak, as they sometimes do, as if our own Church and country had earned a sad pre-eminence in lukewarmness. England can at least declare that her most excellent Church societies were mainly founded in this century; that even the less able Apologies for Christianity produced by her sons were decidedly superior to the publications which called them forth; and that the 'Analogy' of Bishop Butler, the *Horæ Paulinæ* of Paley, and perhaps Lord Lyttleton's 'St. Paul,' are works of permanent and undying value. Nevertheless it remains an undeniable fact, that it was an age in which infidelity became powerful, and waxed far stronger in the matter of literary skill, and of a certain kind of even moral weight, than had perhaps been ever known in the previous history of Christendom.

And here it is necessary to take notice of the insinuation of Dr. Littledale, that infidels, as such, will be found, as a matter of course, to favour the cause of the Reformation rather than that of its opponents. To me this view seems to be a grave and serious error, and one calculated to create a multitude of tainted but too much truth; for *France*, to the career of Voltaire, and the remarkable fact (noticed by Macaulay, Buckle and de Carné) that no Pascal, no Bossuet, came forth to encounter him; for *Scotland*, to the 'Autobiography' of Dr. Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk (Edinburgh, 1860). Concerning England there is of course abundance of similar testimony. It may suffice to allude to any fair biographies of Whitfield and John Wesley, and to Lord Stanhope's excellent 'History of England from the peace of Utrecht to the peace of Versailles.' (London, 1853).

false impressions upon the minds of many who may unthinkingly adopt it. Surely the real fact is, that (waiving the somewhat rare case of those unbelievers who are truly and honestly indifferent) the object of a sceptic's special dislike is *religious earnestness*. In proportion as the events of his life, or the course of his literary studies, bring him more into contact with one form of pious zeal than another, his *animus* against that particular form will be intensified. Nor is it even limited to the display of bitterness against Christian or Jewish examples of piety. An unbelieving critic or historian may very probably be found to underrate and misunderstand the character of a Nicias or of a Marcus Aurelius; just as, to turn to annals of a later date, Voltaire has exhibited the greatest injustice and prejudice in his estimate of the character of Mahomet. And in Voltaire's eyes, the offence of Mahomet was the amount of sincerity and of religious enthusiasm, which he displayed.

Let us look at a few other instances. I have already shown my recognition of the many and serious faults of the Huguenots; such as, their extreme views, their insulting intolerance, their too frequent unscrupulousness in word and action. These, their demerits, are set forth by many historians; but I only know of *one* writer who treats the Huguenots as if they were a sort of hypocrites, who did not really believe what they professed; and that writer is the anti-Christian Mr. Buckle. Another author of our day who, though quite incapable of the uncharitable bitterness of Buckle, evinces considerable intellectual

contempt for the French Protestants, is Mr. Bridges.* Indeed a survey of the general estimate of Reformers and anti-Reformers formed by Voltaire, Rousseau, Gibbon, Goethe, would, if I am not mistaken, leave a balance of opinion decidedly hostile to the Reformation. It is of course true, that Voltaire's wrath was specially directed against Rome, for the simple reason that he lived in a Roman Catholic country; and that in the grievous misdeeds, past or present, which brought out the really noble elements of his strangely mixed character (the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the war of the Cevennes, the case of Calas, the case of de La Barre) the Gallican Church was more or less an accomplice; and that for these great crimes, until she frankly confesses them as such and humbles herself, she must be content to accept the sad and inevitable consequences. And yet I am unable to perceive, that Monsieur Arouet de Voltaire in reality cherished one whit more love for the Reformers, than for the authorities of the Roman Church. No more absolutely cynical and contemptuous account of the Reformation has ever been put forth than that well-known one, wherein Voltaire declares that a mere jealous grudge of one set of Monks, the Augustinians, against another, the Dominicans,—because a little farm usually managed by the latter had been transferred to the former,—first kindled the wrath of Luther and brought upon hapless Europe all the misery of the Thirty Years' War.

* In his 'France under Richelieu and Colbert'—the work referred to in a previous page.

Even Mr. Carlyle himself, but too often a cynic, is unable to accept this absurd and shallow misreading of history, 'this sorrowfullest of theories,' as he terms it.* Has Rousseau any more love for Reformers than Voltaire had? I greatly doubt it. In the presence either of Calvin or of Loyola, Rousseau would have been equally ill at ease. It is of deism, not of Protestantism, that he strives to make himself the Apostle; the great teacher of his *Emile* is the Savoyard vicar, an apostate Roman priest. As for Goethe, his tone is essentially artistic and pagan; the tone of a man who delights to view matters *ab extra*. Yet his sceptical pages, in so far as they touch at all on the questions at issue between the rival communions, tend rather Romewards than in the opposite direction. Roman Catholic writers have acknowledged that no member of their own communion has written so beautiful a statement of the relation of the seven ordinances (which they call all alike *sacraments*) to the different ages and phases of man's life, as Goethe has done in his *Autobiography*. Nor were the sentiments of this great literary genius confined to a positive admiration of certain elements in the Roman system. He also cherished, on the negative side, a profound dislike for some features of the movement, which had arisen

* "We will say to the people who maintain it, if indeed any such exist now; Get first into the sphere of thought by which it is so much as possible to judge of Luther, or of any man like Luther, otherwise than distractedly; we may then begin arguing with you."—Carlyle's 'Heroes and Hero-Worship,' Lecture IV.

in the sixteenth century. He avowed himself unable to pardon Luther for having thrown broad-cast before the many, deep problems, which demanded for their solution the most mature and ripened judgment of the enlightened few. Well, indeed, might Luther have rejoined, that to have acted thus would have been to postpone the Reformation indefinitely; that the plan had already been attempted at Basle and at Constance with but painfully little result; and that he, Martin Luther, had more confidence in the spiritual instincts even of an untutored but earnest peasantry, than in the cold egotism and frosted-silver culture of a Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. To the judgment of Gibbon I shall have occasion to recur presently. Let it in this place be enough to say, that the summary contained in the fifty-fourth chapter of the 'Decline and Fall' must, on the whole, be pronounced unfavourable to the Reformation. I do not profess to attach great weight to the judgment of *any* of these sceptics, although (for reasons to be given further on) some exception may be made in favour of Gibbon. But Dr. Littledale apparently wishes to make an insinuation of the following kind. Infidels *always* sympathize with Reformers and the Reformation; judge, then, of what character a cause must be, which invariably attracts to itself such support. But the fact is not thus wholly on his side; any more than it is in the case of his single and infelicitous reference to contemporary history. Even the one infidel, to whom he rightly appeals as approving the Reformation, David Hume, is a

questionable partizan. Hume hated Becket rather worse than he hated Knox, and that was about all. Dr. Arnold justly calls attention to Hume's "abhorrence of puritanism, alike repugnant to him in its good and in its evil." "His subtle and active mind could not bear its narrowness and bigotry, his careless and epicurean temper had no sympathy with its earnestness." *

And now we arrive at a topic which to many minds is fraught with a deep and peculiar interest. The power of connecting ourselves with the past has been justly called one of the very divinest parts of our nature; but it is apt to be singularly influenced by the state of things which we find existing around us. Consequently any great change in the polity of Church and State is almost immediately reflected in the ordinary histories of the day. This result is indeed only natural. For if, as Arnold and Palgrave maintained (and as many an author has shown in practice), a keen and earnest interest in the fortunes of his own age and country is the leading feature

* 'Lectures on Modern History' (Lect. V. p. 192). As a specimen of Hume's affection for the Reformation in his native country, the following passages may suffice: "We may here see that these new saints were no less lofty in their pretensions than the ancient hierarchy; no wonder they were enraged against the latter as their rivals in dominion. . . . With these outrageous symptoms commenced in Scotland that cant, hypocrisy, and fanaticism, which long infested that kingdom, and which, though now mollified by the lenity of the civil power, is still ready to break out on all occasions."—Hist. of England, chap. xxxviii.

which distinguishes the historian from the mere antiquary; then the events of the day must almost inevitably colour such an one's estimate of the past: for a crisis in the eighteenth or the nineteenth century may at any moment disclose some hitherto unsuspected good, or evil, in a movement which took place some fifty or a hundred or three hundred years ago.

Illustrations of this truth are plentiful. I will here content myself with one. As soon as the alliance with France and England in 1854 was duly formed, English books turning upon the history of the former French empire underwent a marked and significant change. The complete recognition of Napoleon III., and the *entente cordiale* between the two countries, cast a different hue over the popular estimate of Napoleon I. In like manner, to come back to our immediate subject, the historians of the Reformation who wrote before 1789, and those who have written since that date, must almost inevitably approach their subject under a different set of thoughts and sentiments. For the one wrote before, and the other after, one of those events which (with the descent of Barbarians from the north, and with the Reformation itself) makes the third great epoch in the annals of Western Christendom, the outburst of the French Revolution.

My present section necessarily involves some brief reference to the question, 'What is the relation of the Reformation to the French Revolution?' The reply of Dr. Littledale is clear, simple and definite.

“It is,” he remarks in a letter to the *Guardian*, “a common-place of history, that the one event is only a continuation of the other.” Nor can it be denied, that in speaking thus, Dr. Littledale carries with him the convictions of a large number of men of highly cultivated minds; and of many, too, occupying a conspicuous place in the rank of historians and historical critics; most notably, M. Michelet, Lord Macaulay and Mr. Carlyle.

Nevertheless, I must venture once more to own my deep distrust of these simple resolutions of very complex phænomena. That such men have not wilfully conspired to palm a lie upon the world may be readily conceded: but the point demanding discussion is this, whether they have not set forth a view which, just because it combines truth with falsehood, is the more difficult to disentangle, and therefore of necessity the more likely to mislead. Any attempt at an analysis of the entire subject is far beyond me: enough if I can indicate some points, which others may be able to subject to a fuller and deeper examination.

Both, then, of these great movements were revolts against established authority, both arose out of indignation against oppression; an indignation sullied with a keen, though but too natural, desire for revenge; both passed for a season into the region of wild and fanatical excess; both involved almost the whole of Europe in long and desolating wars; both sorely tried the spirits of good men as well as of the bad on either side, and too often involved the inno-

cent in a common doom with the guilty; both evoked from the very depths of human nature the whole of all its wonderful resources, its passion, its genius, its capacity for crime and error, its capacity for endurance and devotedness; and both, when the fury of the storm was spent, left behind them an amount of loss and gain, of benefit and injury, of which we have not yet witnessed the final issues; and which in its strangely-chequered area still forms the battlefield of contending parties, who weigh in so different a balance the results that have been hitherto attained. But here the resemblance ceases. We do not observe in the authors who helped to bring about the French Revolution, or in the leading Revolutionists themselves any of that zeal for Christian truth, that desire to free it from superstition, that self-sacrifice even to death for a religious cause which, despite all faults and shortcomings, certainly distinguished the greatest leaders of the Reformation. Not that I am prepared to regard even the revolutionary leaders, as being what Dr. Littledale calls certain ecclesiastical Reformers, ‘unredeemed villains.’ This essay has throughout been traversing ground, which shows us at every turn

“The weakness of the great, the folly of the wise;”

which reminds us again and again, that we are all children of a fallen race. It is, therefore, with something of delight that I touch upon one of those signs which testify that it is *only* lapsed, not ruined; a nature which has wandered from the ‘city of peace,’ and fallen amongst robbers who wounded it

and stripped it of its glorious raiment, but who left it *half* dead only, not utterly crushed and slain. Seldom, indeed, in the world's history has great influence over mankind been obtained by any man, or by any set of men, without the presence of some really noble and conspicuous virtues. Rousseau's love of nature, Voltaire's burning hatred of oppression, Robespierre's incorruptibility, sincerity and moral courage, Danton's capacity for personal generosity towards vanquished foes—these do not redeem the errors, the vices, the crimes for ever associated with their names; but (when the times in which they lived are also taken into account) they make us at least understand some portion of the secret of their influence. But the Reformers, however wrongly they may have yielded to the influence of fear, never slew their thousands on the scaffold for the maintenance of the cause they were upholding. Lest, however, I should seem to be entering into a comparison merely on the strength of my own statements, let me summon into court two witnesses who will probably be accepted as unimpeachable by all who know them. As regards the *tone* of Luther and of Calvin, I will cite a few words from Möhler's 'Symbolism'; while for that of the three great revolutionary chieftains I will translate a passage from the pen of Count de Carné; a writer who (though little known in England) must, I conceive, be ranked as second only to De Tocqueville in the philosophic character of his reflections upon the events with which the eighteenth century came to a close. Here are some of Möhler's com-

ments on what he, as a devout and sincere Roman Catholic, held to be the errors of the German and of the French divine.

“An obstacle, which makes the Lutheran view more pardonable, since it shows *that it sprung out of a true Christian zeal*. . . . The Reformers, *in the excess of a pious zeal*, rejected all exertion on the part of man. . . . It would be in the highest degree unjust if we did not show that according to the Lutheran system, the renovation of sinful man, the moral change—in a word, *sanctification*—must attach to the confiding reception of the forgiveness of sin. . . . Who knows not the brilliant description of faith in his [Luther’s] preface to St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans? . . . Here the Reformers were evidently misled by the most vague, most confused, *yet withal honourable feelings*. . . . At all events, *it is highly honourable to his* [Calvin’s] *perspicuity, as well as to his Christian spirit*, that he saw, or at least felt, that by means of mere learned investigation, the believer could obtain no satisfactory result.” *

The mental filiation, so to speak, of the Reformers comes from Wycliff, from Huss and Jerome of Prague. But the parentage of the three great leaders in the Convention is assigned by M. de Carné (and I believe justly) to Rousseau, Diderot and Voltaire; whom he conceives, though no longer alive in the flesh, to have been present at its gathering in the spirit.

“In the dark precincts where so many passions roar, where hatred alone dilates men’s souls, and sorrow contracts them; on the benches of *that formidable Convention which strikes with death whatever it touches*, do you not distinguish three figures which in

* ‘Symbolism’ (English Translation), Vol. i. p. 130—133, 159, 185, 208; Vol. ii. p. 208.

the preceding age have already received, and, indeed, as it were, exhausted, the homage and the untiring admiration of the world? Who is that man, of studied speech and pitiless laugh, who uses his wit as a dagger, and prepares by *bons mots* the work of the murderers? It is, perchance, Camille Desmoulins, but assuredly it is also Voltaire; it is Voltaire grown young again, come down from his pedestal in the wall, and speaking to the people his elegant and cruel language; it is Voltaire covering his work of desolation with the rich, cold ornaments of his style. In that powerful demagogue, with his rugged figure, with his sensual imagination and habits, whose head and heart drag him from the extremity of crime to the extremity of pity: in that man who at the peril of his life bends beneath the benediction of a priest at the entreaty of a young girl, to return the next moment to the fanaticism of annihilation, do you not recognize Diderot as well as Danton? What shall we say of that rhetorician, consumed by hatred and shrunk with envy, who conceals under an array of arrogant vulgarisms the poverty of his thoughts? That inexhaustible talker, who makes the existence of God and the immortality of the soul the props of his dictatorship, almost as his master made them the themes of eloquent periods to crush his opponents, the philosophers—that proud and solitary man, who makes all revelation consist in a supreme adoration of himself—is he not the son, a very degenerate one I grant, but only too easily recognized, of that writer whose metaphysic vein nourished a whole generation? *The most cruel chastisement of Rousseau is to have given birth to Robespierre*, and the test of the political opinions of the author of ‘*Emile*,’ is the application of them attempted by the sanguinary triumvir. Robespierre was the obstinate and conscientious worker out of the doctrines built upon the triple foundation of natural religion, primordial contract, and the native excellence of humanity, such as they appear in every page of Rousseau’s writings; and the master must be answerable for the disciple.

“They were then, so to speak, present at that solemn trial of their wisdom; those doctors who had so long shaken France, and who in the infinite variety of their thoughts had agreed together

to extinguish in the heart of man the Divine inbreathing which helped it to live! On those benches there crowded the pupils they had formed, in those tribunes were the public they had created. The female philosophers and the academic wits had passed from the *petits soupers* of the farmers-general, and from the *salons* of Madame de Pompadour to the greasy cortege of Chaumette, and the apostate Gobel translated into the vulgar tongue the witty blasphemies that had so long charmed the Court and the town.”*

Let me ask the reader, whether these two extracts do not land him in two regions of thought so different as to render the task of comparison extremely difficult. It is much as if, in the sphere of intellectual power, we are asked to decide, whether Raphael was a greater genius than Mozart, or Milton superior to Kepler. Dr. Littledale, however, has the right to rejoin, that it was of the English, and not of the Continental leaders that he was speaking, when he instituted his comparison between Reformers and French Revolutionists. I have already admitted that the Anglican Reformers, though far more sound as thinkers, were inferior to the French and German leaders alike in genius and in courage. But the same thought recurs. Let any man read the trials of Ridley and Latimer before the Commissioners who judged them, or even that of Cranmer; let them recollect that Cranmer, who advised his friends to fly, had refused to avail himself of the same opportunity; let them read any fair account of the deaths of Latimer and Ridley and compare them with those

* ‘Etudes sur le Gouvernement Représentatif en France.’
Tome i. pp. 246—8.

of Danton and of Robespierre. Let them contrast the comments of the Roman Catholic writers, Tierney, Dodd, and Lingard on these executions with the comments of such men as M. de Carné on the Reign of Terror and its necessary recoil upon its authors: and I will then leave the matter in their hands. They will not, I conceive, in any large number of instances, return a verdict in favour of the justice of Dr. Littledale's comparison.

It may be well, however, to take into consideration one other important feature in the case. I have spoken of the respective progenitors of the Reformers and the Revolutionists, and it will not probably be thought to be a very partizan-like speech, if I avow my preference for the former; if I prefer the company of Wickliff, Huss and Jerome to that of Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire. But in trying to estimate the agents of a mighty change we look, and that naturally and rightly, to their mental descendants as well as to their ancestors. Who were the children of the Revolutionists? Napoleon with his court and his Marshals. Who were the progeny of the English Reformers? Hooker, Andrewes, Laud; from whom in turn sprang Barrow, Butler, Heber. Nay, strange to say, the intermediate position in which they left the English Church has enabled her not only to rear great and saintly intellects for herself: but she has first bestowed on many of those who, on either side, have strayed from her communion no scanty measure of her fostering care, the unspeakable advantage of a training which combined things

old with new, a connexion with the past with present freedom, and opportunities to form plans for the future. What Roman Catholics, bred in England under the shadow of Rome, have proved equal to the Oratorians brought up in English Universities? Have our Roman fellow-Christians trained for themselves any equals to Drs. Newman, Manning, and Faber? And can Dissent point to any of her sons superior to Baxter, Whitfield, and John Wesley, all of whom were brought up within the pale of the English Church, and were set apart for the ministry of God by the benediction of her Bishops upon their brows? I am not among those who take the most unfavourable views of the character of Napoleon. Whatever we think of the desolating ambition of the Empire, we ought surely not to forget the wonderful achievements of the Consulate; the extraordinary power and sense of justice displayed in the reconstruction of society, in the fusion of the old state of things with the new and altered one.* But of the set around him it is difficult to think favourably. *Les adieux de Fontainebleau* do not leave a favour-

* M. de Carné's remarks on this head are very striking. Alison has also devoted to the subject a fair and interesting chapter. The fine stanza in Manzoni's Ode is well known:—

“ Ei si nomò : due secoli,
L'un contro l'altro armato,
Sommessi a lui sì volsero
Come aspettando il fato ;
Ei fe' silenzio, ed arbitro
S'assise in mezzo a lor.”

able impress upon the mind. On the whole, the descendants of the Reformers must surely, even on humanitarian principles, occupy a better position than those of the French Revolutionists. Nor is it wholly alien from this subject to suggest, that the Royalists who gathered around the standard of Charles I. were, with all their faults, on the whole, a far nobler set than the Legitimists of Coblenz, possibly even than those of La Vendée.

And as regards the general question, when men look across the Channel, and gazing on that great country where the storm arose, say of France—"First, the Reformation; and then, as a consequence, the Revolution;" I answer "*No: the Reformation stamped out, and therefore the Revolution.*" There was a period in the history of France, when that extreme form of Protestantism which was preached within her borders had drawn to itself a very large proportion of the energy, the intellect, and the rank of the country. That period passed away: partly by questionable means, but partly also—it must be said—by perfectly legitimate ones, the Gallican Church resumed her sway. France (as also Spain) gained something too through distinguished exiles cast out from other lands by Protestant rule. But it was as a drop in the ocean compared to what she lost. Her expulsion of the Huguenots transferred to Holland, and still more largely to England, not merely industrious artizans, but likewise families formed to thrive, and increase her commerce as merchants, to judge as wise lawyers, to teach and to guide men as

distinguished authors, to recruit the nobility of the land; to impart to Saxon and to Norman blood some fresh elements by which they were decided gainers. Had France reserved within her own bosom all that vitality and power, it might have prevented her rapid decline in the third quarter of the eighteenth century; might in all human probability have saved her destinies from the fiery gulf to which they were hastening.

VII. The relation of the Reformation to the Church of the Future. These pages have already spread over a larger space than I had anticipated, and my concluding section must needs be brief.

A lecturer, to whom reference has already been made, the late Professor Smyth, told his hearers to learn from the history of the French Revolution how to check their own tendency to extremes in either direction:—if they were inclined to admire despotism, they were to consider in what the sole and unchecked sway of a Louis XIV. terminated; if they were eager for the transfer of political power into the hands of the many, they were to think upon the use made of it by the rulers of 1793. Some similar warning would I attempt to give to those who have kindly followed me thus far. The Church of England was, half a century since, described by de Maistre in well-known (would that they may prove prophetic) words, “as *very precious*, because she might be looked upon as “one of those chemical agents capable of uniting “elements naturally hostile.” Mr. Ffoulkes en-

courages us to cherish the same hope. But then it must be said (to adopt a phrase from a munificent lay Churchman) that if she is really to occupy this grand position, she must not hold out an open hand to one side and only a clenched fist to the other. The means towards union, says Döllinger, “are
 “meekness, brotherly love, self-denial, *recognition of*
 “*truth and goodness wherever they exist*, thorough
 “search for the faults of our own system, and
 “earnest resolution to work for their removal.”*
 Such recognition must include, we may thank God for it, multitudes of Christian teachers upon every side. For as the same writer has elsewhere affirmed,—and no nobler sentiment has been uttered by any theologian of this generation—“upon everything that
 “is Christianly is laid a blessing, which in its integrity and entirety never is utterly lost, and never
 “can be perverted into a curse. No matter how defective may be its form, nor with what manifold
 “errors disfigured, nor how much by human passion
 “and perversity deformed and degraded, still *that*
 “*which is Christian will accomplish an incalculable*
 “*amount of good.*”†

It may probably be assumed, that the majority of my readers feel no difficulty in acknowledging the sanctity of such men as Xavier, Borromeo, Cheverus, among men of action; of Scupoli, Rodriguez, Justiniani, among men of thought. Let them likewise learn ‘to recognize the truth and goodness’ of such men as Oberlin and Marshman, of such writers as

* Address at the Munich Congress in 1863.

† The Church and the Churches.—P. 225. (Eng. Transl.)

Vitringa and Vinet ; and of that remarkable Lutheran school which includes such names as those of Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Julius Müller, Dorner, and their fellow-workers. Sanctified intellect, and sanctified toil for others' sake, are a great and glorious sight. And what is here said of labourers and of thinkers beyond the seas, must of course be understood to apply with equal force to those within our own country.

But a whisper occasionally reaches the ear which hints that cases of remarkable individual piety (whether, say, in the dark ages or among Lutherans of our own time) are merely so many isolated exceptions, which prove nothing whatever respecting the general tone of those around them. Now this is a view which, happily, it is almost impossible to admit. Granting that there may be instances, like that of a Nehemiah at the court of Persia, or even of a righteous Lot in Sodom ; yet the general lesson of history surely teaches us that, as a rule, surpassing greatness is both a *result* and, in its turn, a *cause* of an abundance of lesser excellence. We see this clearly in the domain of intellectual power. Show us a country where the splendour of a great orator has lit up the firmament, and we can straightway name the lesser satellites that have shone around his orb : the land that has produced a mighty dramatist has also witnessed the rise of less eminent brethren who have preceded him or who have followed in his track. A Demosthenes guarantees the existence of a Phocion, an Antiphon, an Hypereides, an Æschines,

an Isocrates : a Shakspeare is a citizen of the country which rears a Marlowe, a Ford, a Massinger. The same law holds good as regards mathematics, scholarship, physical or mental science, generalship, seamanship, statesmanship. The great ones of the earth are produced by, and in turn produce, the humbler cultivators of the same departments of human endeavours. And thus too in the world of grace, the prayers and strivings of a thousand Christians are the condition of the nurture of Christendom's noblest sons ; and the very existence of a Ken, a Chalmers, a Fenelon are a pledge for the co-existence of hundreds more, less prominent, less highly endowed, but still sincere and earnest worshippers of Christ. There was one of old who thought that he was left alone, a solitary witness for truth, a witness too whose life seemed hanging upon a thread. "But what saith the answer of God unto him ? I have reserved to myself seven thousand
 "men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of
 "Baal." Even so will it ever be. Elias may imagine that he stands alone ; but the seven thousand, though he know them not, are still seen gathered around him by One to whom all things are laid bare.

To the advice of Dr. Döllinger respecting the means requisite to attain the great end of union, I would fain, if it be not presumptuous, subjoin a few additional remarks.

Is it too much to ask of my brethren, the reverend Clergy, whether they sufficiently lay to heart the undeniable truth that they, like all other classes,—law-

yers, statesmen, nobles, merchants, physicians—have their own especial class-temptations? They are, for example, as a rule (and I say this without any reference to one party more than another) deficient in judicial temper: and this knowledge ought surely to make them at least reflect very seriously, whenever they find themselves at variance with the bulk—not merely of common-place and careless laity, but—even of communicants and earnest men. We see how great an evil is that painful severance, which in France, and even still more in Italy, has arisen between the Clergy and the Laity. It is from no wish to compromise truth that I would say, let us beware of a like danger springing up at home.

Smyth's hints on the mode of correcting extreme tendencies in politics may also be applied to our judgments upon foreign countries as compared with our own. If any of us are in danger of admiring England too fondly, and of fostering in our hearts the once popular notion, that she is incomparably in all respects the wisest, as well as the most moral and religious of nations, it may be well for such to refer to the short paper on 'The Decay of Phariseism' in one of the early issues of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, or (still better) to the powerful, though perhaps overstated case against her claim, put forth in the autumnal number of the *North British Review* for 1867. All that I would venture to assert is, that no one country is in a position to rear her head in the presence of Great Britain and say, "Look at *me*: on
" all these points wherein you fancied yourself pre-

“ eminent, *I am the model for you to follow.*” If, for example, it be thought that France is this pattern land, let the inquirer study well the pictures given by that high-toned writer M. Jules Simon ; and consider the meaning of the contemptuous criticisms of M. Taine upon English fiction for its comparative innocence. It would be easy to name similar evidence concerning Italy : indeed some passing hints have already, I trust, been furnished.

And as for denunciations of error upon either side, it is not to be denied that they must, in their place, be needed. It is not a good sign, when vice or heresy are treated as trifling things ; nor have those ages been truly great that uttered such euphemistic tones. But still the task of blessing is nobler than that of cursing. It is with blessing that the Divine discourse of our great Teacher is most rife ; its scene is known for all time as the Mount of the Beatitudes ; and even under the Mosaic dispensation, though wrath was therein more predominant, yet the nature of the division of the tribes speaks loudly on the comparative dignity of the respective offices. On Mount Ebal to curse, stood the disinherited Reuben with five others, of whom four were the sons of lowlier birth ; but on Gerizim to bless, were ranged Benjamin, beloved of his father’s old age, Joseph with the pledge of the double portion, Levi with the authority of the priesthood, and Judah with the promises of that undying royalty which finds its consummation in the person of the King of Kings.*

* Deuteronomy xxvii. 11—13.

It is pleasanter to think how much we have to learn from one another, than always to be engaged in fault-finding. Even those bodies of Christians which have not hitherto contributed largely to our stock of theology, have often set a noble example in the way of courage and self-sacrifice, and of serpent-like wisdom in organization. And as regards that great and wonderful community from which the Reformation severed us, the Church of Rome, most entirely do I agree with Mr. Ffoulkes, that "as a general rule, Roman Catholics are weak where Anglicans are strongest, and strong where Anglicans fail." How powerful Rome is we know by a hundred signs; by none more than by considering the stamp of men whom she has won from us during the last quarter of a century. How great are her gifts and endowments we know no less cogently; more especially by those features--such as retreats, sisterhoods, arrangement of services,--in some of which the Lutherans, as well as we ourselves, have of late years been learning to imitate her. But still it is no exaggeration to assert, that her strength is hardly less patent than her weakness. Her utter failure to weld into an harmonious body the converts gained from Anglicanism is most remarkable. The breakdown of the *Concordat* with Austria, the histories of Italy and Spain during the Pontificate of *Pio Nono*, or indeed ever since 1815, betoken one continuous line of mistaken policy. Moreover (if we except some converts from Anglicanism and the Germans, more especially the Munich school which

cultivates charity and strives for union with Lutheranism), it may well be asked, what has become of her theologians? The entire French episcopate only furnishes one prelate of very striking literary ability, Mgr. Dupanloup of Orleans; and one of his latest compositions is a graceful attempt to give a colourable interpretation of the last Encyclical from Rome. Father Perrone, by many supposed to be the author of that document, is to me (let all due allowance be made for prejudice) a very disappointing writer: and not all the brilliancy and originality of the Benedictine Monk, Luigi Tosti, nor his varied learning nor his ardent patriotism, can save him, I humbly conceive, from the charge of being an erratic thinker. Ventura, Gioberti, Rosmini, among the dead, and Passaglia among the living, have fallen under the displeasure of the Papal Court. In Spain, says Döllinger, "Balme appeared as a solitary, soon—
 "vanishing meteor, and his writings show very
 "clearly the great deficiency of historical and theo-
 "logical culture in his country." In points already referred to, and in care of the poor, in missionary zeal, and in culture of the inward life, we have very much to learn from Rome; but in breadth of view, in freedom and vigour, she has very much in turn to learn from us, as well as from the Lutherans; and never, perhaps, until unity be restored, will the manifold forms of unbelief be properly and fully met.

There is nowadays an amount of learning, of intellectual power, and (in many instances) of calmness pressed into the service of unbelief which may well

strike us with a sense of sorrow, and even of awe. But the sentiments thus engendered may be kept quite separate from anything like dismay. Christians look back to a promise which can never fail ; they call to mind the ill-success which attended the three great infidel writers of old, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian ; they see the immense influence still exercised by the entire line of doctors and apologists for the faith, from Arnobius and Origen down to Pascal and Butler ; while the works of Toland, Chubb and Tindal lie almost undisturbed in libraries : and they are well assured that at no distant day, the volumes of Strauss and of Renan will enjoy a similar repose. Still less, I believe, is there any lasting peril from the present fashion of Positivism. Nevertheless some of the indirect attacks of the Positivist school demand more attention than they have hitherto received, and the need of calm and well-reasoned replies to them has a close connection with my present subject.

We see in Gibbon a writer who, to a certain extent, anticipated positivist views. Combining the evidence furnished by his 'Autobiography,' with that of his history, we may probably extract from it, without unfairness, some such address as this:—"I, Edward Gibbon, having traversed very large tracts of human learning, and having tried at least two forms of Christianity, the Roman Catholic and the extremely Protestant, have arrived at the following conclusions. Nothing whatever concerning the supernatural is really known by either side. In

“ spirit both the Reformers and their opponents were
 “ equally intolerant; but the former displayed in
 “ this respect the greater inconsistency. For choice,
 “ if I were in some way compelled to pronounce in
 “ favour of either, it would be on the side of Rome.
 “ The Roman Catholics demanded from me the
 “ acceptance of a mysterious tenet which was *above*
 “ my reason; but the Calvinists ask me to admit
 “ what is *contrary* to reason and to conscience too,
 “ namely, *that God is a cruel and capricious tyrant.**
 “ Do not tell me that the Fathers and the Schoolmen
 “ had previously discussed the subtle doctrines con-
 “ cerning grace and predestination. That may be
 “ true enough, but it was Reformers [see the Helvetic
 “ or Westminster Confessions] who first *enforced them*
 “ *as the absolute and essential terms of salvation.†*
 “ After all, the Reformation looks to my mind like a
 “ very half-and-half affair. It is on what both sides
 “ hold in common, more than in what they differ, that
 “ the difficulties of a sceptic like myself are mainly
 “ founded. It is against *these* tenets that the attacks
 “ of modern combatants for free-thought should be
 “ directed. And as for Christian ministers of reli-
 “ gion, concerning all of them does my *dictum* alike
 “ hold good, that to a philosophic eye the virtues of
 “ the clergy are far more dangerous than their
 “ vices.”

As a political prophet, Gibbon was not felicitous.

* The words in italics are the *ipsissima verba* of the historian.
 ‘Decline and Fall,’ chap. liv.

† Ditto. *Ibid.*

But as a calm bystander, discussing as *ab extra* these solemn themes, he is surely deserving of great attention. The chief assaults of unbelief since his time, those already named and others of a less direct character, *have been* almost exclusively of the kind indicated by this famous historian. I have said that such a circumstance gives no ground for dismay. Let me add that to many of us it must seem replete with hope. It must, I believe, sooner or later draw together all the worshippers of Christ. It must tend to realize the striking words of the Prussian statesman, Von Radowitz, "We plainly perceive that the minds of men are ranging themselves under two banners;—upon one of which is inscribed the name of 'Christ the Son of God;' while beneath the other are incorporated all to whom that Name is foolishness and a reproach."

It is true that certain features of the ecclesiastical horizon look extremely unlike any prospect of future union; such are, for example, the denial of all human priesthood on one side, the extreme development of the *cultus* of the Saints on the other. Yet when we reflect on the wonderful revolution of thought which has taken place in these matters during the last hundred years; when we remember that the prayer of Christ for the unity of His Church can hardly remain for ever unfulfilled; it is impossible to refrain from hope that before many generations have passed away, an united Christendom will have become a reality. And those who make any honest attempt to promote such an end may trust, that Professor

Goldwin Smith will be found to have had reason when he wrote, that “probably it would be a greater “service to humanity, on philosophical as well as “religious grounds, *to contribute the smallest mite towards this consummation*, than to construct the most “perfect demonstration of the free personality of “man.” Such a mite we, who discuss these themes, offer in such publications as even this Essay: *cupientes aliquid de penuriâ ac tenuitate nostrâ cum pauperculâ in gazophylacium Domini mittere*.*

While I am writing these concluding pages, a brilliant daily Journal is making merry with the attempts of the Convocation of York to send greetings in various directions. “To the wits be their jests, “and to the mockers their gibes.” There will almost of necessity be mistakes, awkwardnesses, food for mirth, in much that concerns the manner, if not the matter, of these attempts. Where the glee is malignant, such as that of Mr. Buckle over the fierce denunciations of bodies of Clergy by each other, we must regret it for the scorner’s sake, and try to give less cause for it in the future. But let us beware of self-deceit in this matter. We are all apt to enjoy a little sarcasm and irony when it is directed against our opponents, and to cry out against such weapons as impious and irreverent, when we find them turned against ourselves. Probably, however, a living writer is correct in thinking that Lord Shaftesbury’s well-known aphorism (though much denounced by his

* Petri Lombardi Sententie. Præfatio.

honoured descendant) is not to be rashly set aside as wholly false. Ridicule is thus far the test of truth ; that it is a poor cause, which can allow itself to be extinguished by jest and sarcasm. If satire be kept within reasonable limits, it may prove a real gain for us to see what points of a cause, or of its method of management, lie fairly open to such a weapon of reproof. But as regards its ultimate effect, let the timid take heart of grace. There never was a time, at least in England, when it was more impossible to laugh down any 'enterprise of great pith and moment,' than at the present day. There never was a time, when those, who are convinced that they are pioneers of a noble and a righteous cause, could better afford to look with good humour on the passing and ephemeral mirth of the satirist. Where it is well-founded, it may, I repeat, do us good. Where it is idle, it will effect no lasting harm.

Risû inepto nulla res ineptior.

Whatever may have been achieved by satirists in other times and climes, there will be need of mightier agencies to effect here, and in our day, the repression of any good work amongst us. Such stronger agencies may of course in God's good providence be permitted : it may be even wise to expect them, and in a strength not our own to try and meet them. But beyond the strong wind of religious controversy, and beyond the earthquake of political storms, and the fire, if it must be, of persecution, many thousands of devout and humble hearts will listen for the still

small voice which calls the divided Churches to reconciliation; and in that voice they will recognize their Lord, and say to Him, with fresh meaning infused into them, the words which He Himself has taught — *Adveniat regnum Tuum, Domine; fiat voluntas Tua!*

APPENDIX.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF CONSERVING WHAT IS UNJUST. (p. 57.)

This is one of the many impressive remarks of Mr. Carlyle. The phrase, 'that elegant Pagan,' as applied to Leo X., is likewise his.

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE ABOUT MEN ACCUSED OF HERESY APPEARING WITH AN IMPERIAL SAFE-CONDUCT. (p. 58.)

Quod, *non obstantibus salvis conductibus Imperatoris, regum, &c.*, possit per judicem competentem de hæreticâ pravitate inquiri.

"Præsens sancta synodus ex quovis salvoconductû per Imperatorem, reges, et alios sæculi principes, hæreticis, vel de hæresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic à suis erroribus revocare, quocumque vinculo se adstrinxerint concessio, nullum fidei catholicæ vel jurisdictioni ecclesiasticæ præjudicium generari, vel impedimentum præstari posse, seu debere declarat, quo minus *salvoconductû non obstante*, liceat judici competenti et ecclesiastico, de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, et alias contra eos debite procedere, *eosdemque punire quantum justitia suadebit*, si suos errores pertinaciter recusaverint, *etiam si de salvoconductû confisi, ad locum venerint judicii, alias non venturi*: nec sic promittentem, cùm fecerit quod in ipso est, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum."

Quo statuto sive ordinatione lectis, *idem statutum fuit approbatum per dominos episcopos* quatuor nationum, ac reverendissimum patrem dominum cardinalem episcopum Ostiensem *nomine collegii cardinalium*, per verbum, PLACET.

Acta Conciliorum (Labbé. Ed. Hardouin) Parisiis, 1714. Tom. viii. p. 462.

MEDIOCRITY IN THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH. (p. 25.)

Here, as I have often found in other cases, I owe a valuable hint to that highly suggestive journal the *Saturday Review*. Its article on Brazil and Slavery on 13th March, 1869, prompted the concluding ten lines of my fifth section.

I have embodied the substance of the *Guardian* critique on Dr. Littledale, in the matter of the comparison between the Reformers and Revolutionists, and that between the Dean of Chichester's form of partiality, and Dr. L.'s own partiality.

ABUSE OF THE POWER OF EXCOMMUNICATION. (p. 29.)

I subjoin a single example of this sad feature from Machiavelli. It would be only too easy to supply a dozen similar cases. Balbo refers to some.

. . . . "The Emperor, despairing of Italian affairs, went back to Germany. He was no sooner gone, than John, King of Bohemia, came into Italy, invited thither by the Ghibellines of Brescia, and took that city and Bergamo. And because his coming was done with the Pope's consent (although the Pope feigned that it was not so) the Legate of Bologna assisted him, judging that this was a good plan for preventing the Emperor's reappearance in Italy. From which proceeding Italy changed its condition; for the Florentines and King Robert [of Naples] seeing that the Legate favoured the undertakings of the Ghibellines, became enemies of all those, to whom the Legate and the King of Bohemia were friends. And without regard to party, whether Guelf or Ghibelline, many princes united together with them, amongst whom were the Visconti, the Scala, Filippo Gonzaga of Mantua, the Princes of Carrara and those of Este. *Wherefore the Pope excommunicated them all.*"

Le Istorie Fiorentine, p. 50 (Ed. Niccolini: Firenze, 1851).

What was the *spiritual* crime or error of these men?

FALL OF MORAL TONE IN THE CHURCH DURING THE 15TH CENTURY. (p. 27.)

Cesare Balbo, one of the writers most favourable to the Papacy among Italians of our day, thus expresses himself:—

"Thus, in short, arose, what we have above called a bacchanalia, but which we must here add, was a most elegant bacchanalia of culture; a confused maze of iniquities, sufferings, and feastings, for which, the whole of Italy in the sixteenth century might be compared to Boccaccio's joyous company, singing, love-making, and tale-telling, in the midst of the plague; only that in this later case, there were, besides the plague, repeated foreign invasions, wars, sacked cities, homicides, perfidies, stabbings, and poisonings; and, besides the songs and tales, every species of writings and engravings, of painting, sculpture, and architecture; every

infamy, every elegance, every contrast. We old men can remember a time inferior to this, but similar, that of the last French invasions; they were similar in their contrasts, similar too in that (in both cases) *all the cultures were the fruits, and all the men were the sons of the preceding century.*”—*Storia d'Italia* (Torino, 1852) p. 222.

SUAREZ ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST. (p. 71.)

“Sunt sub quâlibet specie—partes omnes substantialiter integrantes Corpus Christi, eo modo conjunctæ, qui ad perficiendum corpus humanum necessariu~~s~~ est: quia Corpus Christi non est mutilum, nec monstrosum sed pulcrum et ornatum; *et ideo capillos etiam habet, et barbam*, quia hæc etiam pertinent ad integritatem et intrinsecum ornamentum humani corporis: *sunt denique cum sanguine reliqui humores*, quia omnes sunt de veritate corporis humani ideoque in glorioso corpore existunt.”

Suarez proceeds to express his opinion that the included air of the Sacred Body is most probably present, and then adds: “Secus verò dicendum est de aliis rebus merè extrinsece et accidentaliter conjunctis, quales fuerunt in nocte cœnæ vestes, quæ nullo modo componunt humanum corpus, sed adjacent extrinsecus, item saliva, cibus indigestus, et excrementa, quæ tunc fortasse erant in corpore Christi.”

Vol. iii. Dissert. I. sec. 1, p. 632, col. 1, B. 6.

I am indebted to a writer, who signs himself J. B. for calling my attention to this passage (*Church Review*, for Feb. 29th, or March 2nd, 1868). I observe, that the able review of Mr. Blunt's new History of the Reformation, in the *Times* newspaper, gives an account of Dr. Döllinger's explanation of this mysterious subject entirely agreeing with what I have termed the spiritualized and ethereal view of the Real Presence.

DEAN HOOK ON CRANMER. (p. 78.)

No one can read these two volumes without learning very much from them. I was glad to find that on the characters of Henry VIII., of Wolsey, and of Queen Catherine; on the divorce case, and on the want of genius displayed in the works of Ridley and Latimer, I had already arrived at conclusions so identical with those of the Dean of Chichester, that if I were accused of plagiarism, I should have no defence, but to stand on my character, and try to show that I was

not usually backward in acknowledging obligations. Of the state of the monasteries, I had formed a rather more unfavourable opinion than that conveyed by Dr. Hook. His censure on Latimer's conduct in regard to Forrest might, I venture to think, have been strengthened. Of the wickedness of Crumwell I had formed but a faint conception before reading this work.

I will leave it to others to judge whether Dr. Littledale can make out his case against Dean Hook as unduly and extravagantly apologetic for Craumer. To me the Dean's volumes, if at times unduly tender, seem to show all possible desire to be fair, and to be full of spirited declarations which no man would have published, who hoped for the favour of a Court, or who was merely seeking popular applause.

Mr. Sidney Gibson, in his Lecture on Craumer, is, I think, fairer than Dr. Littledale, both towards that primate and towards Dr. Hook. It well deserves to be read. Sir C. Young's able Lecture on the Reformation seems, in great part, to coincide with the line adopted in this Essay.

FAILURE OF ROME WITH HER RECENT CONVERTS IN ENGLAND.

(p. 173.)

Last year I wrote a short paper for a friend, who had heard it said that our only choice in these days lay between Rome and Rationalism. Finding that it interested a larger circle than I had at all anticipated, I sent it to the now defunct *Scottish Witness*, (Aberdeen: Brown and Co.), wherein it appeared in April, 1868. From this paper I now reprint the following passage:—

“6. Some twenty years since, a devout and amiable Roman Catholic (a 'vert, as Mr. Ffoulkes would say) concluded a pamphlet by the intimation, that the staff who had turned Roman would work as one man, each harmoniously carrying out his appointed task. Now look at the facts. Among the most distinguished 'verts during the last twenty years have been Archbishop Manning, the late Dr. Faber, Dr. Ward, Messrs. Capes, Ffoulkes, Palgrave, Hemans, Thomas Arnold, Sir John Simeon, and the greatest of all, John Henry Newman. Of these it must be said that Dr. Manning heads a small, earnest, but apparently narrow and ill-informed band: that Dr. Faber is described by Dr. Newman as *not* being followed by more than a very few English Roman Catholics, in his extreme views concerning the

homage due to the Blessed Virgin, just as Dr. Ward is described by the same authority as not being followed by more than a very few in *his* extreme views respecting the papal authority; that Messrs. Capes, Palgrave, Hemans, and Thomas Arnold, have all left the Roman Church; that Sir John Simeon, for venturing to argue in favour of a cession of the Romagnas by the Pope, was fiercely denounced by Dr. Ward, and opposed when he (successfully) sought in 1865 to be M.P. for the Isle of Wight; that Dr. Newman is not even a Bishop, while a person so far his inferior as Dr. Manning is an Archbishop. But then the one has high intellectual gifts, and must retain some independence of thought; the other seems simply to evade difficulties, and to be willing to satisfy the Court of Rome in all respects. Dr. Newman is not even to be permitted to preside over a Roman Catholic College at Oxford.

If then I felt—I am thankful to say I do not feel it—the pressure of Rationalism, I should still say, “*Quid Romæ faciam?*” Am I to run the risk of following Bayle or Gibbon? to leave the communion of the Church for some vague theory, with recent converts who have left it? to accept blindly (with such biographies as those of Leopardi, Giusti, Azeglio, and many more before me) a theoretic dream of some ideal state of things in Italy. Am I to follow Dr. Döllinger and Sir John Acton, or Dr. Ward and Archbishop Manning?

I fear that all this distraction would only make me more rationalistic than before, if my temptations led me in that direction.

That we have much to learn from Rome; that we *have* learnt and *are* learning *very* much, I should be the last to deny. But Rome has also much to learn from the Reformed Communions; and the proper deduction to my mind is, as I have already said, that drawn by Dr. Döllinger and the late King of Bavaria; namely, that what we need is ultimately an amalgamation, not a conquest of either Reformed or Unreformed Communions by each other.”

ON PARTIALITY. (p. 134-6.)

It may be well to notify one form of partiality to which writers of fiction are very prone. They (sometimes perhaps unconsciously) draw a common-place specimen of a person brought up in one system, and a very unusual type reared in another; and then virtually, if not explicitly, ask us thence to

compare the two systems. Thus, in that really powerful tale, "A Son of the Soil," the Anglican curate is a *very* ordinary sample of his class; but the hero, brought up in Scotland, is a farmer's son, who *twice* saves the same person from a watery grave, gains a double first-class and a Balliol Fellowship at Oxford, and *then* becomes the minister of a parish in the Scottish Establishment: certainly, to say the least, a career which has never yet been exemplified in actual life. It is only fair to add, concerning this ideal Presbyterian minister, that "it appeared to him, that if he were but there [in Scotland] he could breathe a new breath into the country he loved. What he meant to do was to untie the horrible bands of logic and knit fair links of devotion around that corner of the universe, which it has always seemed possible to Scotsmen to make into a Utopia; to *persuade his nation to join hands again with Christendom; to take back again the festivals and memories of Christianity, to rejoice at Christmas and sing lauds at Easter, and say common prayers with a universal voice.* Those were to be the outward signs; but the fact was that *it was a religious revolution in Scotland* at which Colin aimed. He meant to dethrone the pragmatic and arrogant preacher whose reign has lasted so long. He meant to introduce a more humble self-estimate, and a more gracious temper into the world he swayed in imagination."—*Son of the Soil*, chap. xlv.

I am responsible for the italics in this extract. It is interesting to compare with it the excellent articles on Mr. Ffoulkes' pamphlet and Mr. Blunt's new 'History of the Reformation,' in the *Times*. Even *Fraser's Magazine* for March, 1869, allows that the desire for the unity of Christendom is a good feature in the Ritualist school: and though such a voice may sound to many of us somewhat like that of a Saul among the prophets, yet what a cheering and hopeful sign of the times it is!

CASES OF CALAS AND OF DE LA BARRE. (p. 153.)

The case of Calas is well known. Little more than a century ago, (it was on March 9th, 1762,) he was put to death by the frightful process of being broken on the wheel, on the ground that he had killed his own son; who, the family being Protestants, had been thought likely to become a Catholic. Eight judges against five found Calas guilty; but public excitement had first been roused to the highest pitch

by the conduct of the White Penitents of Toulouse and the Dominicans, who gave the son a splendid funeral, and treated him as a martyr.

To the lasting honour of Voltaire, he took up the cause of the widow, and with the loftiest courage and indefatigable perseverance, insisted on an appeal to Paris. (*O si sic omnia!*) There the judgment was reversed. Calas and his family were all pronounced innocent. The young man was of a melancholy temperament and a gambler; and I suppose that no sane man doubts but that he committed suicide. The King, Louis XV., gave the family £1200, but the persecutors were not punished. Nevertheless, the parliament of Toulouse long lay under a deserved cloud for not having interfered. They sent a deputation to Versailles to apologize, but their excuses were not favourably received.

I only know of one writer of this century, who has dared to insinuate that Calas was guilty; and that writer, to my deep regret, is De Maistre. It is a warning to all of us, when we see that a high-minded man of real genius, in a work replete with elevated, pious, and suggestive thoughts, could condescend, under the influence of religious prejudice, to sully his pen with words so unworthy alike of his head and heart. Firstly, he says that the *innocence* of Calas is *unproved* [one might submit that before a man is put to a cruel death his *guilt* ought to be *proved*]. Next he tells us, that there are a thousand grounds for doubting it, and *even* [!] for believing the contrary. But to his mind the most striking one is, that Voltaire, in the middle of the trial, wrote a private letter on the matter couched in a style of buffoonery! So that, because Voltaire's unhappy spirit of mockery for a moment betrayed itself, even in the midst of a grave affair, we are called upon to believe that his client was guilty! And after all, the most atrocious phrase which De Maistre can cite from the letter is this: "You found my memorial too hot, but I am getting ready another up to boiling heat. (*Vous avez trouvé mon mémoire trop chaud, mais je vous en prépare un autre au bain marie*)." The phrase *au bain marie* is, no doubt, a slang expression, like our *piping hot*; but would to heaven that Voltaire had never said anything worse than this, upon more sacred subjects!

De Maistre concludes by saying, "Mais laissons là Calas. Qu'un innocent périsse, *c'est un malheur comme un autre*, c'est à dire commun à tous les hommes." No; it is not a *misfortune like any other*, that religious corporations should

hound on a populace, and even judges, to a wild state of excitement, which renders them unfit to sit in judgment. Nor could such an event have happened, had not the revocation of the Edict of Nantes rendered the Huguenots so feeble in numbers and influence.

The deeply interesting *Soirées de Saint Pétersbourg*, from whose first conversation I have just been quoting, ignore the case of De La Barre. As it is less known than that of Calas, I give a short account of it. De La Barre was born at Abbeville, in 1747. His father had dissipated a noble fortune, and the youth was adopted by his aunt, the Abbess of Villancourt. A man of about sixty years of age, Duval de Sancourt, employed in occasional business transactions for the convent, made himself ridiculous by a sort of courtship of the Abbess, who repelled his advances with indignation. The young La Barre sympathized with his aunt, and treated M. Duval with insulting haughtiness. Duval vowed vengeance, and before long was able to charge against La Barre that he had passed a religious procession without raising his hat, that he had once sung some libertine songs at a supper, and that he was concerned in the mutilation of a wooden crucifix found broken on Abbeville bridge during the night of August 9th, 1765. The two prior charges must be considered proven. The evidence for the third does not seem by any means conclusive. But the natural horror of the sacrilege in the matter of the crucifix had caused intense excitement, and there seems to have been a wish to see some one punished for it; and though the parliament of Paris in some degree mitigated the sentence, they did not reverse it. On July 1st, 1766, De La Barre was put to death, having first been tortured by the application of boards to crush the knee bones. The Bishop of Amiens had enjoined the faithful to reveal the authors of the sacrilege under pain of excommunication. Duval had immediately come forward and denounced La Barre, connecting the mutilation of the crucifix with the slight offered to the procession.

Here again Voltaire showed his nobler side. It is sad to be obliged to remember his incessant toils against Christianity itself; that scoffing spirit which, engendered by him, has never been rooted out of France; his wicked and most unpatriotic poem of *La Pucelle*; and his persecution of the Jesuits, "towards whom," says the ultra-Protestant Sismondi, "he shewed neither candour nor justice."

DR. LITTLEDALE'S REFERENCE TO THE HISTORY OF OUR OWN
TIME. (p. 150.)

Dr. Littledale says of the Russian war: "The *sole* resistance came from the High Church Peelites, who did not think Islam as good or better than Christianity." (Lecture, p. 20.) He must have forgotten that the war in question was commenced by the Aberdeen ministry, of which Mr. Gladstone, the Duke of Newcastle, Sidney Herbert, and other Peelites, formed an important part. This section of politicians, (of which I desire to speak with sincere respect,) subsequently resigned office, and opposed the continuance of the war. But the only leading politicians who denounced it from its commencement were those of the Manchester school, led by Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright. The late Dr. Neale was against it, with some other theologians, both lay and clerical.

Public opinion (Mr. Kinglake's History betokens this) has certainly much changed in this matter. Never having been philo-Turkish nor violently anti-Russian, I am still not convinced that the war was wrong. The account of its origin, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, in 1856, attributed to Mr. Gladstone's pen, is, I conceive, a very fair one. I am not the less sensible of the great moral courage and contempt for popularity displayed by both its earlier and later opponents.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND MR. FFOULKES. (Passim.)

As I have expressed so much concurrence with these two writers, I should like to say that I do not wholly adopt the views of the former respecting the relation of the Church to the New Testament, and that I am not by any means persuaded of the correctness of his criticism on the passages of the New Testament which bear upon divorce.

Mr. Ffoulkes's conception of the character of Innocent III. is less favourable than mine. I think that I have Dr. Arnold with me here; as also in the confession that we have much to learn from the Roman system. But Dr. Arnold would be with Mr. Ffoulkes and Sir F. Palgrave in their condemnation of the Crusades. I cannot follow them. Neither can I wholly sympathize with Mr. Ffoulkes in his extreme sentiments concerning the *Filioque*.

POSITIVISM. (p. 175.)

If this Essay should suggest to some readers views differing from those entertained by its author, it will not be matter of surprise. In November, 1868, I sat close to a Most Reverend Prelate, and heard him deliver to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society an admirable address on Positivism. The concluding words formed to my mind a strong plea in favour of attempts at union among Christians; though that idea did not seem to be present to the mind of the speaker. (Archbishop Thomson's Lecture has since been published.)

CHANGE OF THOUGHT DURING THE LAST 100 YEARS. (p. 177.)

A paper in *Blackwood's Magazine*, for January 1869, has some excellent remarks on this subject, in connection with Bishop Berkeley and his attitude towards the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ROMAN ACADEMIA IN ENGLAND.

The two volumes edited by Abp. Manning, contain some curious antiquarian lore from the pen of Dr. Rock; an ingenious and (to my mind) satisfactory solution of one of Dr. Colenso's difficulties; and a most masterly, if not thoroughly convincing, essay on the spiritual worth and functions of the human intellect, by Dr. George Ward. I cannot, for my part, see in this publication much else that is either novel or valuable. Why the distinguished editor should have thought it worth while to print and publish his own Lecture upon 'Inspiration,' I am utterly at a loss to conceive.

For two of my mottoes (the 3rd and 5th) I am indebted to Mr. Oxenham's generous and most valuable Letter to Father Lockhart.

Besides my acknowledgments to the Founder of Cumbræ College, I have to return thanks (1) to the noble President and the Council of the 'Scottish Church Union' for their invitation to me, though not a member of their society, to deliver before them in Aberdeen the outlines of this Essay as a Lecture; as also for their kind reception of what I said, and encouragement to publish it: (2) to Prince Albert de Broglie for his valuable present of the *Questions de Religion et d'Histoire*, from which I have learnt so much that bears

upon the problems here discussed: (3) to the Rev. George Hay Forbes of Burntisland, to whose conversation I am indebted for many important suggestions, more especially for the query propounded at page 82, and for the comparison of the descendants of the English Reformers with those of the French Revolutionists. Even those who are acquainted with the 'Panoply,' and with Mr. Forbes's editions of the Gallican Liturgies and of his (incomplete) S. Gregory of Nyssa, can form but an imperfect idea of his mental powers and rich and varied learning.

THE REV. SIR WM. PALMER UPON CRANMER.

The general ground and character of the difference between Dr. Littledale and myself concerning the character of the English Reformers is, I trust, tolerably obvious. My main position regarding them, as contrasted with his, is this; that even if I granted (which I am not prepared to do) that every one of his charges against them was proven, there would still remain a vast number of opposing considerations, which he has neglected to take into account, but which nevertheless deserve to be carefully weighed by any who are really desirous of arriving at just conclusions.

This line of argument is no novelty. More than a quarter of a century has past away, since the Rev. Sir Wm. Palmer, in his 'Treatise on the Church of Christ,' (a work respectfully combated by Father Perrone) was led by such reflections to anticipate, to a considerable extent, the attacks of Dr. Littledale. And though the author of the 'Lecture on Innovations' entirely ignores this celebrated work, I would fain recommend a study of at least those portions of it, which bear upon the subject before us.

Dr. Littledale bids his readers to liken the English Reformers to those false and villainous prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah, whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire (Jeremiah xxix. 22). For their own sakes, I would beseech men to ponder long and seriously, before they incur so grave and solemn a responsibility. That Cranmer cannot in strictness be reckoned as a martyr, we may be ready, with Dean Hook, to admit: but the same arguments do not apply to the cases of Rogers, Saunders, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, and many more.

So long as it is granted, as it is by Lingard and all fair historians, that these men might have saved their lives by

the admission of certain current doctrines respecting the Holy Eucharist and the Papal supremacy, so long must it be reckoned, I would maintain, a decision contrary to all truth and charity, to say with Dr. Littledale that 'they were burnt for their crimes.'

I do not profess by any means to follow Sir Wm. Palmer implicitly. With Burnet and Hallam, I condemn Cranmer in the matter of the oath taken to the reigning Pontiff, on the occasion of his elevation to the primacy. Nevertheless the different limitations upon this oath adduced by Palmer,—admitted by the famous Roman Catholic canonist, Van Espen, by Fleury, by Florens, to be practised at various times in France, Spain, Belgium, Austria,—do tend to modify our estimate of the degree of Cranmer's faultiness in this respect. Again, the nullification of the marriage of Henry VIII. with Anne of Cleves is justly said by Palmer (as even Lingard grants) to have been the act of the entire convocation, not of Cranmer individually. Burnet declares that Gardiner was the chief agent in this proceeding. On the general question I have much pleasure in quoting the following passages from the *Church Review*.

"To depreciate the Edwardine Reformers and Reformation is not difficult. They are not armour-proof, as the smallest acquaintance with history so-called shows. But if it be easy to point out their shortcomings, it is not less easy to bring out into a strong light the sins of the system which the Edwardine Reformers, whether for our salvation or our elective merit, were raised up to obviate. Indeed, all the worse that the Edwardine Reformers are made to appear, the worse must we think of the persons and systems which gave them so easy a triumph in their work of destruction. If, for example, the monasteries had fulfilled the objects of their founders, to say nothing of carrying out the evangelization of the country, they would not so easily have fallen. If the canonical hours had been duly said, who could have thought of hashing them up into Matins and Even-song? If the Sacrifice of the Mass had not well-nigh taken the place of the Communion of the Faithful, who could have succeeded in demolishing Altars with the view of bringing in Tables? If the celibacy of the clergy had been pure and inviolate, how difficult it would have been to break down the long-standing prejudice against married priests and bishops? If the Roman Pontiff had not overstepped his authority by claims of temporal jurisdiction, who would have ventured to ignore

his prerogatives as a spiritual Patriarch? If indulgences had not been put to sale to such an extent as to become, in the language of Pope Clement IV., ‘fabulous and ridiculous,’ who would have decried them as utterly void of spiritual advantage? To speak broadly, if the Roman Court had not for three centuries resisted all appeals from Catholics for reforms, would Christendom have endured their introduction by individuals? Make then, if you please, the Reformers as black as you will, but remember you only intensify the blackness of those who were opposed to them, and were the cause of their standing up for a Reformation. By depreciating Luther, you only render Leo and Tetzel more infamous. By defaming Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, you provoke the contrast of Wolsey, Pole, and Gardiner.

“It is perhaps somewhat depressing to be told, that the Edwardine Reformers were villains of a darker hue than Robespierre, Marat, and Danton. It would certainly not be assuring to the believer in an Apostolic Church to have it demonstrated to him that the Apostles were scoundrels; yet we have the admissions of historians, even of the Ultramontane type like Baronius, to the effect that many of the popes were villainous in the extreme. If want of sanctity be tolerable in the Supreme Head of the Church, God’s Vicar upon earth, we need not be so much distressed, if it can be shown us that those who attempted its reform were not themselves impeccable. We will answer for it, that there is no conduct attributable by their greatest enemies to the Edwardine Reformers, which cannot be more than paralleled by the examples of the occupants of the Pontifical throne.”

The analogy of the elder dispensation might lead us to expect some such strange anomalies, even in the fortunes of the Church of Christ itself. The founders of the Mosaic system sin in such wise that they are not permitted to enter the promised land; its first High-priest moulds the golden calf; and the King, who bestows the most zealous attention on the service of the sanctuary (1 Chron. xxiii.—xxix.), is one who has experienced that fall, than which no sadder is recorded in the annals of the chosen race. “Moses and Aaron among his priests, and Samuel among them that call upon his name; they called upon the Lord; and he answered them. . . . Thou answeredst them, O Lord our God: thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance of their inventions.” (Ps. xcix. 6, 8.)

Let me add a word respecting the author of the Lecture on 'Innovations.' The only other works of Dr. Littledale, with which I am acquainted, are his 'Offices from the Service-books of the Holy Eastern Church,' and his continuation of Dr. Neale's 'Commentary on the Psalms.' For both of these our Church owes to him a deep debt of gratitude; but more especially for the latter. Many may have doubted, whether we had amongst us any one endowed with the peculiar stores of thought and learning needed for the continuation of Dr. Neale's work. Dr. Littledale has freed us from all fears on this score: it is hardly too much to say that he has even surpassed his predecessor. Neither do I wish to forget that, though wholly unacquainted with me, he was good enough some eight years since to suggest by letter, that I should undertake an inquiry into a branch of the philosophy of religion; wherein he was willing to assist me both with advice and by the loan of books from his library. Circumstances prevented the execution of this design; but I am very sensible both of the kindness and the compliment; and I regret that it should now be my lot, since no one else seems to come forward, to appear almost in the guise of an opponent.

But if I have used all the freedom of a reviewer (and my first 30 pages may still betray that I began this paper as an article for one of our serials) it is some satisfaction to feel, that anything like undue severity, if I have been guilty of it, will light upon one who is alive and perfectly able to defend himself. Mr. Blunt's 'Reformation,' and the late Dean Milman's 'Annals of St. Paul's' will be found, I suppose, to strengthen some parts of Dr. Littledale's case. But I would fain ask my readers, whether such works exclude the necessity of pondering those other considerations, of which I have here attempted to remind them.

It is a satisfaction to be able to believe, that I and my opponent (if I must needs so call him for the nonce) are both desirous of stating the truth; and both anxious, even if we seek our end by slightly different paths, for the reconciliation of a divided Christendom.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

The sentiments of Fox, referred to in page 7, will be found, I believe, in a biography of Speaker Abbot, first Lord Colchester, published some ten or twelve years since.

The language of Dr. Arnold, which favours the view of Innocent III., given at p. 21 of this Essay, is as follows:—
 “We dare not analyze too closely the motives of our best actions; but if ever grand conceptions of establishing the dominion of good over evil may be allowed to have concealed from the heart the ignobler feelings, that may have been mixed with them, this excuse may be justly pleaded for Gregory VII. and Innocent III.”—(*Miscellaneous Works*, p. 283.)

For my extract from the biography of St. Carlo Borromeo, at p. 34, I am indebted to the *Union Review*. The *Chronicle*, from which I have given a lengthy passage concerning Wimpeling, at p. 36 *et seq.*, was a Roman Catholic newspaper, published for a short time in 1867, 8.

It seems only fair to add concerning Winzet (p. 59), that force was employed *against* him, and that he was compelled to fly from Scotland. But this was but one of the numberless instances, wherein the Reforming party showed that they had learnt too well the lesson previously taught by their opponents.

That the position of Dr. Döllinger, quoted in p. 110, is in substance an Anglican one, as regards any accepted decision of the Church universal, may be easily shown. “Such a judgment,” says Palmer, “is irrevocable, irreformable, never to be altered.”—‘Church of Christ,’ part. iv. ch. iv.) The learned author proceeds to cite the language of ancient saints and doctors, as Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, and others; and of Anglican divines, as Field, Hammond, Pearson, Bull, Saywell, Bramhall.

Having alluded to Mr. Browning in a questioning manner at p. 119, I hope that I may be permitted to express my admiration for his genius; an admiration much earlier, I imagine, than that ‘of the British public,’ referred to in the ‘Ring and the Book.’ My own critique on his poetry (very inferior to the able one which has since appeared in the *Contemporary Review*) was published in the *Christian Remembrancer* for October, 1857.

A reference to Sismondi reminds me that his frequent favourableness towards the Jesuits, mentioned in a note to page 141, is not merely negative in its character. He is a warm eulogist of their colonization of Paraguay. Mr. Bridges is another of their defenders. I cannot honestly at present join the ranks of these apologists, though I yield to none in admiration of the heroes of the Society, and readily

acquit them of a vast number of popular charges. Mr. Borrow and Blanco White have spoken favourably of their work in Spain.

In treating of honesty (pp. 134-141) I ought to have noticed what Hallam terms 'the Benedictine spirit of mildness and veracity;' evidenced, as it is, by that famous Order's invaluable contributions to history, and by their noble editions of the Fathers, wherein spurious treatises are so sternly and righteously abjudged away from their reputed authors. But Mr. G. H. Forbes has called my attention to the painful circumstance, that in the case of what is perhaps the *chef d'œuvre* of the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur, their edition of the works of St. Augustine, the editors underwent a good deal of persecution on account of the exceeding honesty which they had displayed. They were accused by the Molinists of having favoured Jansenism by their notes: and the chief editor, Father Blampain, was privately deposed from his office as head of the Abbey of *St. Germain des Prés* by the Benedictines themselves, and reduced to the position of a private monk, because *M. L'Archevêque de Paris songeoit à le faire déposer avec éclat*. He was subsequently admitted by the Archbishop of Rheims into his diocese, as Superior of one of the principal Benedictine houses. This forced retirement was much as if a Dean of Westminster or St. Paul's among ourselves resigned his dignity to avoid being deposed; and was subsequently consoled by the gift of a living in Dorsetshire. (For the evidence see *Walchii Bibliotheca Patristica*, Jenæ, 1834, cap. ii. §. 15, and an additional pamphlet, not appealed to by Walch, *Lettre d'un Abbé Commendataire aux RR. PP. Benedictins de la Congregation de Saint Maur*. Paris, 1699.)

My implied censure of the Dutch colonists (p. 147) seems to be opposed to the tone of a recent work; Wallace's 'Malay Archipelago.' But I cannot retract it. Evidence against Holland may be gathered from the *Revue des deux Mondes*, and from the powerful tale of 'Max Havelaar.' (Edinburgh: Edmonstone and Douglas, 1868). On the task of the British anti-slave trade squadron, the comment of a late number of the 'Lancet' is very remarkable.

"*The Withdrawal of the African Squadron.*—In our efforts to abolish slavery, we have managed to extinguish a considerable number of lives and sink a great deal of money. Happily, wiser counsels have at last prevailed, and officers and men are no longer to be sent to the African coast to die in those unhealthy regions, or return as invalids to this

country, broken alike in health and spirits, and bearing in their bodies, it may be, the seeds of premature decay. It has been our fortune to trace periodically for many years, in departmental blue-books and reports, the dreadful cost to life and health at which we were holding those African stations; and as we look back on the gloomy chapter which has now closed, we may perceive how much England can sacrifice for a principle—namely, the repression of the slave trade. It is said to be the boast of France that she is the only nation possessed of political sympathy with other nations and of military enthusiasm sufficient to go to war for an idea; and she probably owes much of her power and influence to this spirit. Among the few recorded acts of national unselfishness we may fairly class our attempts to abolish the slave trade. Much as we may admire, however, the object for which we equipped and maintained a naval force in African waters, we can scarcely fail to look back on it as involving a terrible sacrifice, if not a huge political blunder.” I am not convinced that it has been a blunder.

Among the bright features of British religion in the eighteenth century (p. 151) ought to have been named the very existence of such men as Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, Dr. Johnson, and, perhaps above all, Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man. I am also reminded that one who, like myself, has for fourteen years ministered at the altars of this *dis*-established Church in Scotland, ought not to pass by the patient endurance and single-minded devotion to Catholic truth, which raised her from the disorganized condition in which she found herself in the year 1689 (the date of her *dis*-establishment), by a constant progress in spiritual life, to the condition which she had attained a century later, at the consecration of Bishop Seabury. With the late Dr. Neale, I deeply regret that she did not transfer her allegiance to William III. But this mistake, as I consider it, does not annul the fact that, despite every disadvantage, she reared the most eminent British theologians of the eighteenth century—such as Sage, Gadderar and Rattray.

Page 15, note, line 1, for *tout la magistrature* read *toute la magistrature*.

Page 65, lines 17, 18, for ‘of first-fruits, of Peter’s pence of annates,’ read ‘of Peter’s pence, of first-fruits or annates.’

P.S.—The author wishes to explain that the absence of any reference to the pages of the new work on the English Reformation, by the Rev. J. H. Blunt, has not arisen from any doubt of its value, as a work of learning and authority. But his own task was virtually finished when Mr. Blunt's volume appeared, and he has only gained a general idea of its contents from reviews in the *Times* and a few other journals or serials.

He would also add, that his reference to Channing in p. 148 must not be understood to imply any light view of the evils of that Socinian heresy, which that high-toned moralist unhappily adopted. But, with Dr. Döllinger, he regards Channing's Unitarianism as his misfortune, rather than as his fault. It arose but too naturally out of a re-action from that Calvinistic system, which he termed 'a libel on his Heavenly Father,' and from an apparent absence of any presentation of the creed of Nicæa to his mind, unaccompanied by one sided predestinarian theories. To adopt a well-known distinction, there seems to have been in Channing's case the existence of *hæresis*, but not of *hæretica pravitas*. At least as much, it is hoped, may safely be said of the greatest Unitarian writer now living in England.

A remark on converts, in p. 107, appears to have been originated by a passage in Mr. Gladstone's 'Church Principles.'

THE END.

ERRATA.

- P. 15, line 25, for "tout," read "toute."
- P. 39, line 32, for "poem," read "collection of poems."
- P. 40, line 16, for "Sci," read "Ici."
- P. 40, line 26, for "Conrado," read "honrado."
- P. 41, line 26, for "æs," read "ces."
- P. 138, line 3, for "Is there a work," read "Is there in a work."
- P. 149, line 3, for "gloriously," read "joyously."



Author Cazenove, John Gibson. 114665. HEccl. C.

Title Some aspects of the Reformation.

DATE.

NAME OF BORROWER.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

