

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

HENRY VIII.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. POLLARD, M.A., Hon. Litt.D., F.B.A.
(Professor of English History in University of London).

The second of a series of Lectures on the Reformation, delivered under the auspices of the Reformation Study Brotherhood, National Church League, at the Dean Wace House on Monday, October 26, with the Right Rev. Bishop Knox in the Chair.

IN the last lecture I endeavoured to deal with one or two of the broader aspects of the Reformation, and to bring out certain underlying developments which seem to me of very considerable importance, but are not obvious, and are not usually brought out very clearly in the books we read. This afternoon my object will be to try and answer the kind of question that Sir William Joynson-Hicks put from the Chair on the last occasion. He expressed a doubt as to what my view was of the importance of Henry VIII. He asked, in effect, "Can you define in any way the exact and real importance of Henry VIII's place in history?"

Now, in human affairs one cannot do anything very exactly. History may be a science, it certainly is an art, but it is not an exact science. Nothing that is human ever is. It is only when we come to inanimate nature or to an abstract study like mathematics that we can be exact. But I do want to try and put before you the kind of importance, and the reasons for that importance, which attaches to the place in history of Henry VIII. We have to realize that no man, however apparently despotic and complete his authority may be, however great may be the force of his personality and his intellect, can ever achieve anything except with the co-operation of forces which exist quite independently of his will. Even the most despotic and absolute government that ever existed has always been necessarily to some extent an expression of some sort of public opinion. And Henry VIII would not have been able to do what he did, had it not been for conditions, tendencies, aspirations, and so forth, which existed among the English people, and indeed elsewhere, quite independently of Henry himself. And in order to bring out the importance of the action of Henry VIII and of the English Crown in the sixteenth century, I want you to carry your minds back over a century earlier than the sixteenth.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century we find already in existence a considerable number of forces tending towards the reformation of the Church and a repudiation of the jurisdiction of the Papacy. But those forces failed, and they failed at that time, largely because of the lack of that particular element which was supplied a century and a quarter later. You had, for instance, at the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth obvious signs of the passing of the Middle Ages, and of the disappearance of many of the ideas which underlay the medieval organization

of the Church, society, and the State. You find the Papacy apparently hopelessly weakened by its captivity at Avignon and by the prolonged papal schism. You find social discontent expressed by the Lollard movement, and in France by the Jacquerie. You have Wycliffe anticipating in a remarkable way many of the views that were adopted in England and other countries in the sixteenth century. Wycliffe has been described as the "morning star of the Reformation." So far as a poetic description can ever be historically accurate I think that is a fairly good description of Wycliffe and the Wycliffite movement. You have also the strong feeling against the monastic system as being non-national if not anti-national, expressing itself, of course, in the movement for the confiscation of the alien priories in England during the Hundred Years' War.

Thus you have a considerable movement of tendencies which might conceivably have brought about a Reformation—tendencies which were described at the time as heretical, and which led to the enactment of what were known as the Lollard Statutes for the burning of heretics. But the movement failed, it seemed to disappear, and people have argued whether there was continuity between the doctrines of Wycliffe and the doctrines of the Reformation. I think there is continuity. Throughout the fifteenth century you can find people who held Wycliffite doctrines and even were burned for holding them. Nevertheless, it seemed as though things had reverted to the conditions of the Middle Ages. Why was that? As I indicated just now, the English monarchy, under the House of Lancaster, made up its mind to support the hierarchy of the Roman Church, and the hierarchy to support the throne. Both the Crown and the ecclesiastical hierarchy were nervous. They had seen symptoms and signs enough to make them a little doubtful with regard to the security of their position, the Lancastrians on the throne and the ecclesiastical hierarchy in possession of its privileges and its jurisdiction. How far their policy was conscious and deliberate it is impossible to say. In any case they adopted an expedient that has often been adopted in English history and in the history of other countries by Governments that feared for their domestic position. They realized that there were considerable elements of discontent, and they wanted to neutralize those elements. They adopted what is called a "spirited foreign policy" in order to divert people's attention from domestic affairs and to satisfy them with military glory or other things of that kind. So we have the renewal of the war with France, one of the most unjust, unwise, and wicked determinations ever made by an English Government.

Henry V was a first-class soldier, but he was one of the worst statesmen that ever sat on the English throne. His policy of the conquest of France was brilliantly successful at first, but it was bound to fail in the end, bound to bring home its results; and it was the war with France that was directly responsible for the Wars of the Roses, for the lack of governance in England, and for the postponement for a considerable period of urgent measures of reform. The

ultimate cure—some people have thought it was almost worse than the original disease—of what Sir John Fortescue called the “lack of governance” which characterized England and other countries at the close of the Middle Ages—was found in what J. R. Green called “the new monarchy.” That is a good enough phrase in its way, but it does not express all that ought to be expressed. It takes rather the most obvious part of the movement, but fails to express the fundamental and permanent part. What we commonly call the new monarchy should properly be termed the modern state, because it was the development of that new monarchy that really led to the development of the modern state, and that was something much more permanent and important than simply the development of the new monarchy.

That brings me to one of the things for which Henry VIII stands—one of the things of which he is the most flamboyant expression. Of course, one may describe him, if one likes, as merely the froth on the crest of the wave; and the crest of the wave is obviously not to be measured in importance with the wave itself. The thing that Henry VIII stood for and expressed was this new conception of the State—the conception of the State as we have known it more or less for the last four centuries. That has in it much that is good, and something that is evil, and is still a matter of discussion. What is that conception? Fundamentally it is a form of conscious self-determination. In early times in all communities—but I am thinking now particularly of the national communities of Western Europe—the State was an infant, not conscious of any will of its own. It could not do anything by itself, and, like natural children, the State in its early years was given a governess. We call that governess the Church. The Church told the State what it ought to do. In the earlier forms of the Coronation Service you find the Church telling the King what it is his duty to do. The State had got no will, or hardly a will, of its own at all. There is nothing more misleading than to use the same word for the modern, and the medieval, and the Anglo-Saxon State.

Take what we call law. What do we mean by law? The definition of law now is “the will of the State,” and people almost think that the law consists of Acts of Parliament. That is a purely modern conception which would have been utterly incomprehensible in early times, or even in the Middle Ages. Nobody thought in those days that any human authority could make any law. There was a law of God, and a law of nature—neither of them things in which any human authority could intervene at all. And even in human things the sanction for law was custom. What was right was what was customary. It takes centuries for the law to grow. Indeed, our whole legislation grows up, not from the idea that people are making any new law, but with the idea that they are interpreting eternal law, harmonizing conflicts between its different expressions, and between this older and more authoritative law and the new necessities which call for fresh interpretations of that law. As the Middle Ages go on we get the growth of the idea of positive law,

the idea that human authority can create as law anything that it likes, can pass an Act to do anything that it cares to try to do. That is a modern conception, and that is one of the things for which the New Monarchy of Henry VIII stands. It represents an enormous development. You may call it, if you like, the usurpation on the part of mere human authority in spheres which have always been regarded as beyond the operation of man-made law and beyond the jurisdiction of the State. Still, there is a colossal intrusion into these spheres by the State towards the end of the fifteenth century, and still more strikingly in the early part of the sixteenth.

Now we come to consider some of the circumstances and conditions at the beginning of the sixteenth century. I have already indicated my own opinion that there was a good deal of Lollard doctrine persisting at that time. There was a great deal of what was called heresy in England before Luther appeared at all. Let me quote just one phrase from a letter written by the learned Italian, Ammonio, Latin secretary to Henry VIII. Writing to Erasmus in 1511 he complains that it is a very cold winter, and that he finds difficulty in getting wood because there have been so many heretics burned that wood has become dear! That was in 1511, six years before Luther's Theses were published. It serves as one of numerous illustrations of the existence of strong tendencies towards innovation or reformation in the ecclesiastical sphere. In the interval between Henry V and Henry VIII the Renaissance had made very considerable progress. There had been a great development in wealth and capital among the English people, and on the part of a largely increased section of the people a growth of a new demand for knowledge and understanding. But we must always remember that these manifestations were not peculiar to England.

One of the curious difficulties about the arguments I sometimes read which attribute the whole course of the Reformation in England to some personal action on the part of some man or some woman is that we have to account for the fact that in Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Hungary, and elsewhere there were similar movements. Obviously they cannot be accounted for by these vagaries on the part of Henry VIII. Not only were similar conditions producing similar results in other countries, but in many countries before they appeared in England. You are familiar with those episodes of the Reformation in Germany. There were plenty of examples. The question really was until about 1529 whether England was going to side with one part of Europe or with the other. Europe was clearly dividing itself into two, those who wished to retain the Roman jurisdiction and those who wished to dispose of it. And here again that division and the lines the division followed were not novel. One of the interesting things about the conciliar movement in the fifteenth century, the effort to reform the whole Church by means of General Councils, was that the movement broke down largely because the people who constituted and attended those Councils were found to be divided among themselves, and it is

significant that the line of division then was precisely what it was in the sixteenth century. The countries which in these Councils were mostly for reform in the fifteenth century were those which repudiated Roman jurisdiction in the sixteenth. That shows that the changes in the sixteenth century were not merely accidental.

The question was whether, in the sixteenth century, the indications and tendencies which had been in evidence early in the fifteenth century would be followed. We may say that that depended on the monarch. To some extent that is true. The monarch, by deciding for the Reformation in the sixteenth century and against the Papacy, did make a great deal of difference in the history of the Reformation of England. But I am not quite satisfied with the precision of that statement. When it is said that it depended on the monarch one asks, "What depended?" Assuredly not the question whether there should ever be a Reformation or not in England. It is impossible to believe that there would have been no Reformation in England if there had been no Henry VIII. No sane person can attribute so enormous a change, so momentous a development merely to the personal action of a single individual. What was, then, at stake?

To some extent what was at stake was the question when that change would take place. I have no doubt that if Henry VIII had not been estranged from the Papal Court he could have postponed the breach with Rome during his lifetime at any rate. Secondly, there is a question that does seem to me to depend upon the action of the monarch—namely, whether the method of the change took place more or less constitutionally by Act of Parliament and so forth, or involved revolution and wars of religion. That was the practical issue. Elsewhere in Europe there were wars of religion, and to a considerable extent revolution. Only in England, practically, was the change brought about without these. And that difference was largely due to the personal action of the Tudor monarchs and their advisers. That, of course, is different from saying that without those persons there would have been no Reformation at all. That appears to me quite an impossible attitude to take up. We have, of course, in all our historical and political studies to remember the distinction made by Aristotle when he remarked, with regard to great changes in human affairs, that the occasions of these things might be trivial, but the causes were always profound. There is no commoner mistake than to confuse the occasion with the cause of great events. You may remember that somewhat cynical saying of Pascal that if Cleopatra's nose had been a trifle shorter the whole history of the world would have been different. There have always been paradoxical minds attracted by that kind of argument. We have Gray speaking of the Gospel light "that dawned in Boleyn's eyes," though Anne Boleyn heard Mass, at least, to the end of her life! One acute writer took pleasure in trying to prove that the French revolution broke out because of a particular form of land tenure which obtained in certain parts of France. It all comes from confusing the cause and the occasion. The greatness of the change is

generally accurately measured by the profundity of the causes which brought it about.

Now we come to this question of the alienation of the monarch from the orthodox cause, the cause of the Roman Catholic Church. That made a very great difference to the situation—I hesitate to say all the difference—in the sixteenth century. In the fifteenth century the tendencies towards change were frustrated by the fact that the monarchy threw its weight into the scale on the other side, and the monarchy was in a position to hold the balance between opposing forces. By the sixteenth century the weight of the monarchy had increased owing to the period of anarchy which culminated in the Wars of the Roses and the need that was felt for some saviour of society who would rescue it from this welter of anarchy. So this New Monarchy was in itself a natural development, a development in response to an urgently felt need. Consequently, in the time of Henry VII and Henry VIII the monarchy had greater weight than in the time of Henry IV or Henry V, and that weight now was thrown into the scale of change instead of being thrown into the scale of conservatism. How is it that Henry VIII was brought to transfer his rather considerable weight from one scale to the other?

Down to 1527 or 1529 he had been an ideal King from the point of view of the Papacy. He had received from the Pope some notable gifts; he had intervened more than once in small wars on the side of the Papacy; and he had even written a book against Luther for which the Pope gave him the title "Defender of the Faith." So it seemed that Henry VIII was the least likely of any monarch living at that time to side against the Papacy. He was almost the favourite King of the Popes. The cause of his alienation was that not very attractive subject, the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, and with that one has to deal if one is treating of Henry VIII and his position and attitude with regard to the Reformation.

There is one particular point which seems to be fundamental. In so far as morality was involved, Henry VIII's offence from the point of view of the Papacy was that he wanted to marry his wives. If he had not wanted to marry them, there would have been no trouble. We reprobate Henry VIII, but in this particular respect the case of Francis I was worse, that of Henry of Navarre was worse, that of our own Charles II was worse. Henry VIII was always anxious to marry, not that he wanted wives but that he wanted sons. The fundamental question from his point of view was, of course, the succession to the throne. If he had not cared about that there would have been no trouble. And why was the succession so much in men's minds? Why were they so anxious about it at that time? The view in 1527 was that no woman could sit on the English throne. They were believed by law to be excluded. That was not, strictly speaking, the case. There was no actual law on the subject. Nevertheless, it was perfectly natural at that time that any intelligent observer, English or foreign, should have come to the conclusion that women could not sit on the throne. There had been no queen regnant in England except the Empress Matilda, who had sought to

establish her throne against Stephen; and that attempt led to nineteen years' civil war and anarchy in England. The theory had grown up that, while women could transmit a hereditary claim to their children, they could not themselves occupy the throne. That had been the theory in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Henry VII and even Henry VIII had no right to the throne when they came to it by heredity unless it were true that no woman could sit on the throne. Henry VII derived all his hereditary claim through his mother, Margaret Beaufort, who survived into Henry VIII's reign; but nobody thought of enthroning Margaret Beaufort either in 1485 or in 1509. It was tacitly assumed that no woman could sit on the throne.

At this time Henry VIII had only one legitimate child, the future Queen Mary; people were talking of a renewal of the Wars of the Roses if there should be any dispute about the succession, and there seemed certain to be a dispute about the succession if the crown should descend to Princess Mary. All these things seem strange to us after reigns like those of Elizabeth and Victoria, but we must put our minds back into the circumstances of the sixteenth century. It was not to the person of women that the objection was made. The objection was this, that a queen regnant must marry or leave the succession more doubtful than ever. If she married a subject, that would create rivalries and threaten the revival of factions which caused the Wars of the Roses; and if she married a foreign prince the position would be almost worse. People were seeing at that time one independent state after another brought into the empire of Charles V by means of marriage. "*Bella gerant alii, tu, felix Austria nube.*" ("Blest Austria, though others war, for thee the marriage vow.") It was by marriage that the empire of Charles V had been largely built, and the independence of the Netherlands and of other countries destroyed for the time. That was one of the fears of Englishmen then, that if there were a queen regnant, that queen would marry and bring England under foreign subjection, as was almost done by the marriage of Mary to her cousin Philip II.

Everything, therefore, seemed to depend upon Henry VIII's successor, and also upon Catherine of Aragon. The unfortunate details of the history of Catherine of Aragon are not generally familiar. She had a child on January 31, 1510. It died at once. Eleven months later a son was born, called the Prince of Wales, but died seven weeks later. In September, 1513, another son was stillborn. In June, 1514, a third son was stillborn. In December, 1514, a fourth son was stillborn, and in that year a diplomatist at Rome reports that Henry VIII was seeking a divorce from Catherine of Aragon because he could not have issue by her. That at least rules out Anne Boleyn as the origin of the idea, for this was in 1514 when Anne was seven years old. Matters seemed to mend when in 1516 the Princess Mary was born. Henry VIII was extremely pleased with this daughter, and said that by the blessing of God the sons would come. There were two more children prematurely stillborn, in 1517 and 1518. In 1519 Henry VIII was offering to lead a

crusade against the Turk if only he had a son. Catherine of Aragon was now forty years old. Under these circumstances men's minds went back to the legality of the marriage that had had such amazingly tragic consequences with regard to issue. Of course, there had always been doubts. The validity of the marriage depended upon whether the Pope could dispense for a marriage between brother-in-law and sister-in-law. General councils in the fifteenth century had declared against the papal power to dispense under circumstances of that kind. Pope Julius II himself doubted whether he could grant the dispensation. Catherine's own confessor considered that her marriage with Henry VIII would not be lawful. Ferdinand, Catherine's father, took a great deal of trouble to exorcise these doubts, and the question was anxiously debated in Henry's council in 1509. The doubts were, however, overruled, and nothing more would have been heard of them but for the extraordinary fatality attaching to the issue of the marriage. In that theological age it was inevitable that men should associate the two things, and a French ambassador, who was also a cardinal, wrote that God had Himself pronounced judgment against the validity of the marriage.

The other question was whether, if there could be an undisputed heir to the throne through the divorce of Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon, there were precedents for it. Technically the word "divorce" is misleading. There was no divorce at all, and could be none according to the law at that time. There could be either a separation, which did not enable either party to marry again, or a declaration that there had been no valid marriage. There were numerous precedents for the latter. Louis XII of France, who was afterwards a brother-in-law of Henry VIII, had been "divorced" from his wife in order that he might marry Anne of Brittany and thus maintain the adhesion of Brittany to France. The Duke of Suffolk, another brother-in-law, had been "divorced" twice. Henry VIII's other sister, Margaret Queen of Scotland, had been "divorced" once, and was in 1528 seeking marriage with a third husband. There was a still more singular precedent. In the middle of the fifteenth century Henry IV of Castile had sought and obtained from the Pope licence to marry a second wife on the ground of the barrenness of his first. If within a prescribed period he had no issue by the second wife, he was to return to the first.

Such were the precedents Henry VIII had before his eyes. What, then, was the difficulty? Clement VII from 1527 onwards could not help himself. As his own papal secretary expressed it, after the sack of Rome in 1527 the Papacy was entirely in the hands of the Emperor's servants. "The Pope is nothing but the chaplain of the Emperor." And, of course, Catherine of Aragon was the Emperor's aunt. The Emperor was a great politician and cared nothing for his aunt as an aunt. His concern was to see that Mary succeeded if there was no male issue. That was a definite political interest; and as a matter of fact, afterwards, when Mary was given by Act of Parliament her position in the order of succession, Charles V's friendship with Henry VIII became closer than ever, in spite of

the way in which Henry had treated Catherine of Aragon. The Emperor, therefore, used all his influence to prevent the Papacy giving a decision in Henry VIII's favour. Of course, Catherine of Aragon was a woman of the highest possible character. She was, however, indiscreet in politics. She had written in 1509 that she regarded herself as her father's ambassador. As a woman there was nothing to be said against her, and there was a very natural and proper and entirely admirable sympathy with Catherine in this affair throughout England. But the matter was not decided on its merits at all. The papal jurisdiction had become a weapon in hands hostile to England.

The causes of that go back a long way. One thing that a Pope ought never to be is a patriot. The idea of the Middle Ages was that nationalism was an insignificant thing compared with the catholicism of the world. The papal system was a reasonable system, comparatively, and an understandable system so long as that remained the case. But as soon as Popes began to be Italians first and Popes second, the whole system became illogical and unjustifiable. Julius II, when he expressed an intense Italian feeling and spoke of driving the barbarians across the Alps, betrayed the catholicism of his Church. The Papacy had become almost as nationalist and separatist as England became under Henry VIII. It was not able to avoid the patriotic infection. Popes laboured under a further defect. If the Papacy was going to be patriotic, it ought to have had the means of being patriotic successfully. But in fact it was ground between the upper and the nether millstone of France in the north of Italy and Spain in Sicily and Naples. 1527, when Henry first applied to Rome—and he was persuaded to do this by Wolsey—about the divorce, Wolsey had no doubt that through the French King it would be possible to bring adequate pressure to bear upon Clement VII. The Pope offered no resistance at first; but in 1528 the French armies in Italy were completely defeated by the armies of Charles V, with the result that in 1529 the whole of Italy passed under the control of the Emperor; with it passed the Papacy itself, and the closest kind of alliance was formed between Clement VII and the Emperor Charles V.

I said just now that Wolsey had persuaded Henry VIII to have recourse to Rome on the divorce. Consequently when, in 1529, Campeggio was revoked from England without granting the divorce, Wolsey's fall was assured. It had been prepared by Wolsey's failure in other respects. Wolsey was a great man, perhaps the greatest diplomatist this country has ever known. But his position had certain fundamental difficulties which ultimately ruined his career. I have no doubt that Wolsey wanted to reform the Church as a whole, only things always got put off; and he realized that he could not reform the Church as a whole unless he himself became Pope. In order to become Pope he must not merely follow a national policy, he must play a big part on the European stage; he must impress himself not only upon the national mind but upon the European mind. Then he might stand some chance of being elected

Pope, and be able to carry out some measure of reform throughout western Christendom. It was very laudable ambition, but again the national differences stood in his way. No Englishman except Adrian IV has ever been Pope of Rome. The double failure first of Wolsey and afterwards of Cardinal Pole to obtain the Papacy showed that there was not the remotest chance of an Englishman becoming Pope or exercising the supreme authority in Christendom. "No Englishman need apply." It was just those countries which were so inadequately represented in the College of Cardinals and in the list of Popes that broke away from Rome. When that nominally Catholic jurisdiction became a weapon in the hands of Italian nationalism or of other nations who were enemies to the northern peoples, the ideal became impossible. So Wolsey failed to secure the Papacy, and therefore it was impossible for him to carry out his projects for the reformation of the Church.

There were other difficulties. Wolsey had thought that by getting an extraordinary commission as Papal Legate—*Legatus a latere*—or Envoy Extraordinary, firstly for a year, then for two years, then five and ten years, and finally for life, he might still be able to carry out the reformation of the English Church. But no legate can ever travel one step beyond the authority given him by his chief, and his chief was the Pope in Rome. There was also a further difficulty about a national reformation to be carried out by ecclesiastical methods. Both the old Roman Empire and the Papacy set themselves against nationalism, and based themselves upon provincialism. There were provinces of Rome, but these never coincided with racial and national divisions. So you had two Archbishops in England, and more than that in France. There was no national ecclesiastical organization in the Middle Ages at all. There were provincial organizations, but no means by which the two Convocations could be brought together except by authority from the Papacy. Wolsey brought them together on a famous occasion, 1523, but not as Archbishop of York. He brought them together as Legate *a latere*, in which capacity his papal jurisdiction overruled that of the two Archbishops. It annoyed the Archbishop of Canterbury, naturally, very much to have to sit in a Convocation presided over by a Legate who was Archbishop of York.

A Reformation was not to be carried out except by the Crown and Parliament. It could not be done by purely ecclesiastical authority. Hence the constitutional developments, so much neglected, in the reign of Henry VIII. He found himself at issue with the Papacy, with Charles V, and with considerable sections of his own people. His one invaluable support was Parliament. Nobody did so much in England to develop Parliament as Henry VIII. He did not do it for the sake of constitutional principle; it was simply that he wanted means to carry out the object he had at heart. It was because Henry VIII was driven into a position in which he must needs cultivate Parliament that he did so much to develop Parliament; and in the latter part of his reign we first get the modern form of Parliamentary liberties put forward by the Speaker

and guaranteed. Henry always asserted and exaggerated Parliamentary liberties. There is some sort of idea that he invaded the liberties of Parliament. He really led a Parliamentary invasion of the liberties of the Church. The Reformation was constitutional on the theory which has since been accepted, namely, that the Crown and Parliament can do almost anything, but was certainly unconstitutional according to the views of the Middle Ages, when the Church had an independent co-ordinate jurisdiction in which no secular authority could intervene at all.

I cannot embark on a sketch of the Reformation in Henry VIII's reign. There is a great deal in Henry VIII that alienates one profoundly. He is almost fit for psycho-analysis. As a statesman I put him very high; but it is difficult to appreciate his greatness as a statesman because of our dislike for some aspects of his character. In spite of the enormous power he developed, he had that rarest sense of knowing how far he could go and when he must stop—the kind of sense that Napoleon, a much greater man in many ways, did not possess. He was never too proud to take advice or accept a warning. About his personality I should like to remark that I do not think he was a hypocrite. I do not think that anybody who is fundamentally a hypocrite ever achieves anything fundamental in this world. You must believe a thing yourself—although you may have a curious conscience. You may have that kind of faculty which convinces people that what they want is really right. Henry VIII convinced himself that what he wanted was really right. No hypocrite ever makes other people believe in what he does not believe himself. But Henry VIII is no representative of Protestantism. Whatever he expresses, he does not express that.

Archbishop Cranmer is a better exponent of Protestantism, and I am pleased to see that he figures as the representative Englishman in that magnificent cathedral now building in New York. I remember that, when at Jesus College, Cambridge, some years ago, a well-known dignitary of the Church was asked to speak for Cranmer, to my great regret the best thing he had to say for Cranmer was that Cranmer was a good sportsman. He was a great deal more than that. When he was appointed Archbishop, before taking his oath of obedience to the Papacy, which he was bound to do, he publicly and openly stated that that oath of obedience was not to bind him with regard to any measures of reformation. He had, as a matter of fact, ceased to believe in the authority of the Papacy. After all, which is the more honest thing to do, to take an oath or subscribe Articles with mental reservations, or to blurt out the truth beforehand? That was Cranmer. He was entirely without guile. He always blurted out inconvenient truths.

With regard to his recantations, some of those were written by Cranmer, some of them not, but only subscribed by him. What was the difficulty in Cranmer's mind? It was that profound problem which nobody has yet really solved. The attitude he had taken was that the nation, through its authorized organs, Crown, Parliament, and Convocation, can set up what standard of faith, of

ritual, and of doctrine it prefers. He had cast in his lot with the supremacy of the nation itself in ecclesiastical matters. He had never taken up the individualist Protestant view. He had never accepted the view that the individual conscience was the supreme authority. He always held that the national authorities had complete power and right to deal with the conscientious objector. That was well enough under Henry VIII and Edward VI, but under Mary——! I do not believe that Cranmer at any time after 1523 recognized papal jurisdiction or believed in it. I do not think he would ever have done so, if it had stood on its own footing. But in Mary's reign Queen, Parliament, and Convocation all agreed or concurred in the validity and binding character of papal jurisdiction. What ground could Cranmer find for resistance? He had never yet taken the individualist point of view.

It was in circumstances like these that those recantations were drawn up from which in time he receded. You are familiar with the story of the last hour of his life. He was never happy until his hand was burning in the fire. He had at last reached the solution of the difficulties. He had realized that there is, as Matthew Arnold said, something in us, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness. He had come to realize that that was the really important thing; it was beyond the reach, not merely of papal jurisdiction but of the English national state; and that was the real essence of the Protestant claim. And so it was that, having reached that conclusion, he was able to suffer in the heroic way in which he did. So far as English history is concerned, that was the act and sign which gave to Protestantism its vital and its unchanging character.

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. publish Dr. Darwell Stone's *The Faith of an English Catholic* (2s. 6d., cloth 4s. net). The author's views are so well known that it is not necessary to state them here. The book is the most undisguised statement of Roman Catholic teaching for members of the Church of England that we have yet seen from such an authoritative person as the leader of the Anglo-Catholic party in the House of Clergy. No one can have any excuse for saying, after reading this book, that the statements of Protestants for years past as to the true character of the movement are not fully justified. The Roman system down to the colours and ceremonial is advocated, and the book reveals the great gulf there is between the conception of Christianity here set out and the teaching and tradition of Anglicanism since the Reformation. We hope the attention of the Bishops, before they have finished their revision of the Prayer Book, will be directed to this frank acknowledgment of the practice of Romanism in our midst, and we hope that they will have the courage to say definitely that by no stretch of comprehensiveness can such teaching be covered by our Prayer Book.