

tunities I had in seeing and reading upwards of one hundred letters and appeals—a mere tithe of what had been received—sent to a well-known firm, asking for gifts of their manufacture for these sales, the bribe being in many instances an advertisement of the same goods. The letters were from all churches and denominations, Roman Catholic and Protestant, and from high and low, and hardly ever have I felt such indignation and contempt as in their perusal. Truly may it be called the degradation of charity, and it would have helped to convince many who now condone or advocate the practice. It is only of late years that the clergy have condescended to join the ranks of such advocates of ends justifying all means, and sad it is to see how heartily many now favour such plans for building churches and similar objects. Perhaps the climax of all such unbecoming—may I not say shocking?—efforts was the recent circulation of hand-bills and posters, placarded throughout the parish, announcing a “screaming farce,” to be performed by amateurs, members of the congregation, for the completion of a grand new church, in which reverence was to be inculcated as the first of virtues! An almost equally unbecoming announcement has recently been made of “a successful little entertainment,” consisting of music and dancing, having been given for a home, or hospital, “for the dying.” With these crowning and striking facts I will leave the subject.

LOUISA TWINING.

*(To be continued.)*

---

ART. VII.—“THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.”<sup>1</sup>

THIS volume forms part of that “History of the English Church” which has been planned and edited by the Dean of Winchester and Mr. Hart. Four volumes are out, and three are as yet unpublished. It is not easy to divide such a series into volumes, because the necessities of size and uniformity do not always correspond to the realities of history and facts. The first volume contains the story of our Church from its foundation to the Norman Conquest—that is, a period of about five hundred years. The next volume takes us from the Conquest till the end of the thirteenth century—that is, about two hundred and thirty years. The third volume displays the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Mary.” By James Gairdner.

Mr. Gairdner's volume professes to give us the history of not quite half a century. Indeed, the history that counts was transacted in less than thirty years. The following volume promises us the sixty-nine years of Elizabeth and James. The next, by Mr. W. H. Hutton, will present his view of the eighty-seven eventful years from Charles I. to the end of Anne; and then the story is to be continued till the close of the eighteenth century by the firm and accomplished hand of Canon Overton. We may anticipate much from these two volumes.

It will be seen that Mr. Gairdner's volume contains the fewest years, so that his period is presumably the most crowded with events. Perhaps it is for this reason that Mr. Gairdner's volume is so confused, and so unpardonably dull. The age of Henry VIII. was filled with great and interesting people, who have left an indelible mark upon our history. We cannot point to any three Englishmen who have left a more enduring work than Henry VIII., and Cranmer, and Thomas Cromwell. Theirs was a dramatic age, filled with tragedy for those who lived in it, filled with romance and awe for those who look back on it. That new learning which was abroad overcame many limitations, and carried the men of the sixteenth century beyond the flaming ramparts of their mediæval prison into the immeasurable universe. Their conflicts make us realize how sweet it may be to look out from a safe place over the great sea lashed into fury by the winds, or to look down at the strife and tumult of a war. Mr. Gairdner does not rise to or with his subject. The greatness and the human interest of his characters are not conveyed into his writing. The importance of their lives and actions appears to be altogether missed. Instead of being presented to us as men confronted by the most serious and distressing problems, and charged with all the responsibility of our future, they are set before us as men striving either blindly or selfishly against the existing order of society. Mr. Gairdner does not seem to realize how corrupt and effete that order was in itself. The new wine of the Renaissance could not be held in the old wine-skins of the Middle Ages, and the explosion was inevitable.

"The current popular view of the English Reformation," says Dr. Sanday, "greatly needs revision and correction. The writings of such men as the late Canon Dixon, Mr. James Gairdner, Dr. Gee, Mr. W. H. Frere and others, are gradually putting us in a position really to understand what happened."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Divisions in the Church." Two sermons, by the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D.; Longmans, 1902.

Now, there are various ways by which we can be put into a position to understand what really happened in the past. One way is to go back to the contemporary documents, to examine them, to arrange them, to describe what is in them—in other words, to make a calendar. This contribution to the work of history is indispensable; and it is always done with the greatest thoroughness, honesty, and skill by Mr. Gairdner. Another service to history, much rarer, but no less indispensable, is done by those who digest crude and calendared facts, who form sound and penetrating judgments upon them, who combine the facts and their judgments about them into a work of art and genius. Gibbon is, perhaps, the greatest master of this art in any language. Bishop Stubbs, in another way, is a splendid example of how raw material should be illuminated and mellowed. The Introductions to his volumes in the *Rolls Series* are, for most readers, more valuable than the chronicles and calendars themselves. If we desire to be just to "the writings of Mr. James Gairdner," we must always distinguish between his work as an explorer and a codifier of State Papers, and his efforts as a critic and judge of history. In the former capacity every student is indebted to him. As an historian he is not by any means so satisfying. His original writings are not large in amount, and the present volume, it is to be feared, only brings out more clearly those limitations of insight and judgment which weaken Mr. Gairdner's "*Life and Reign of Richard III.*" In saying this I do not question Mr. Gairdner's accuracy and impartiality, but I cannot read this volume of his without dissenting from almost every judgment he makes, and even mistrusting his capacity to judge at all. "*Non omnia possumus omnes,*" as the great poet says; and the most accurate and patient of transcribers may cause much impatience, and even propagate inaccuracy, when he aspires to be an historian.

"The current popular view of the English Reformation greatly needs revision and correction." That narrow view, not based upon documents, but on prejudices, which could see nothing good or great in the Middle Ages, which was "current," as Dr. Sanday says, in the first half of the nineteenth century, certainly wanted revision and correction. It was, I will not say revised or corrected, but replaced by another view, based on prejudice tempered by romance, which was evolved by the early Tractarians. These men so far reversed the view of their Evangelical predecessors that they could see no evil in the Middle Ages and no good in the sixteenth century. They defamed the Reformers and derided the name of Protestant. Their bias so far prevailed that it may be described as "the current popular view of the

English Reformation" during the second half of the nineteenth century. This view also "needs revision and correction," and it certainly will be revised. Romance has given place to history. Prejudice is yielding to documents and evidence. Scientific methods and the historical spirit are modifying every branch of scholarship, and they are bound to affect both the once-accepted views of the English Reformation. They will make certain childish and narrow theories about the Reformers and the Reformation untenable; but they will justify the Reformers to a large extent by showing how many of their supposed innovations were a true and sound return to early, or at least to pre-mediæval, Christianity. They will also show that a great deal of mediæval and current theology has no solid foundation at all in history.

Mr. Gairdner's views are so confused and curious that one is sometimes tempted to challenge his knowledge of any history outside the range of his own period. He deals in his Introduction with the Church under Henry VII., and he says: "No one could have had the smallest presentiment of the days that were to come." Surely the legislation and the temper of Parliament during the reigns of Edward III., of Richard II., and even of Henry V., were full of grave warnings to the Papacy and the Religious Orders. The Reformation in England was probably deferred by the French war of the fourteenth century and the dynastic wars of the fifteenth. When it came it was no sudden storm. Mr. Gairdner can even talk about the "strengthening of the Church," by which he means the Papacy, after the Council of Constance. There was a strengthening, no doubt, of the Papal status and an aggrandizement of certain Papal families, but these things were gained at the expense of the Papal office, and to the detriment of the Church as a moral influence. The Popes of that age were a byword and a scandal. Their diplomacy filled all men with distrust. The Church itself had wandered so far from its ideals that scholars like Erasmus and Colet could not recognise the Church of the New Testament in the mundane and political institution which they saw existing at the eve of the Reformation. Mr. Gairdner seems to ignore the actual state of the Church and the Papacy at the opening of the sixteenth century. So far from realizing its weakness, he thinks "it was needless speaking against a jurisdiction so firmly established," and he blames "heretics" everywhere for daring to conspire against a society which they saw to be corrupt, and which many of its loyal supporters feared was irreformable. "Repression," he says, "makes heresies all the more mischievous, and not a little dangerous besides," yet all his sympathies appear to be with those who repressed, and against

those who resisted. Similar reasoning would condemn those who resisted Charles I. and Laud. If that reasoning were valid there would be no English liberty and no Italian monarchy. "How demoralizing," says Mr. Gairdner again, "to have secret societies, with books kept underground," but how much more demoralizing to have a Church government, both corrupt and cruel, which made these courses necessary. Mr. Gairdner seems to be deluded by the current sophistries about the coercive power of the Church. "The Church," he says, "had no coercive power, but only suasion." If argument failed it could excommunicate. "After excommunication, a further step *naturally* followed." The excommunicated person was handed over to the secular power. "It was not really the Bishops who burned heretics." It was not, technically; but Mr. Gairdner forgets to add how the secular power was worried and threatened, and when possible coerced, if it did not enforce the sentences of theologians. The claim to coerce and influence the secular power was renewed in the Syllabus of 1864, and the tolerance of the secular power in Rome was complained of not so long ago by the reigning Pope.

Mr. Gairdner is no less contradictory and confused about the Royal Supremacy. In one place (p. 396) he describes it as a "new principle." In another place (p. 155) he says: "it conveyed no new powers." In the latter assertion Mr. Gairdner blunders into correctness. The Royal Supremacy was old in fact, though new in phrase. There was no need to assert it in the ancient English Church, because the Bishop of Rome had not invaded the jurisdiction of the Crown before the Norman Conquest. Edward the Confessor styled himself "Vicar of the Most High King." The early Christian Emperors exercised a Royal Supremacy. They not only summoned Councils, but presided over them. They asserted, indirectly, a cure of souls, as our own King did, in the sense of being responsible for the spiritual welfare of their subjects, but, like our Article now, they never confused Supremacy and the ministerial office.

Mr. Gairdner not only ignores the history of the early Church and the whole development of the Papacy, but he judges the Papacy of the sixteenth century by its official and conventional phrases, instead of by notorious facts. He can describe the servile hierarchies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the only restraint on despotism, forgetting that Ximenes, Morton, and Richelieu were the very effective instruments in founding the despotism of the Hapsburgs, the Tudors, and the Bourbons. Mr. Gairdner can talk, again, about the "independence of the Holy See" in an age when it

had forfeited all moral influence and was politically subservient to the Kings of Spain. By ignoring these facts his judgments about the divorce are ludicrous. He can even say that “the tribunal at Rome was a perfectly just one,” when diplomatists on both sides scoffed at the partisanship of the Roman Court. Mr. Gairdner says, again: “Henry knew an impartial decision must be in the Queen’s favour.” Henry had cause to know that any Papal decision would be in favour of the Queen, for the sake both of the Papal authority and of the Papal status; but he also knew, for both these reasons, that no Papal decision would be or could be impartial. He did not forget, as Mr. Gairdner does, the various expedients by which the Pope tried to evade giving any responsible decision.

It is impossible to follow Mr. Gairdner through all his prejudiced opinions. Indeed, his language in some of them is so peculiar that it is not easy to attach any meaning to his words; *e.g.*, that “‘accommodation’” of some sort is absolutely necessary in translating the Scriptures is a fact which does not strike the unlearned; but the New Testament itself was not written in classical Greek, or the Vulgate in classical Latin.” Mr. Gairdner condemns Tyndale’s Bible, because “familiar terms,” such as “priests,” “church,” “charity,” were replaced by “elders,” “congregation,” “love.” He does not seem to realize that the dispute between the old and the new learning turned very essentially upon the mediæval meanings which in course of time and use had been read into these words, and that the Reformers were pleading for a return to their simple and original meaning. When Mr. Gairdner complains that the “do penance” of the mediæval versions, based solely on the Vulgate, “had become ‘repent,’” one is inclined to ask whether he knows or understands the force of the New Testament in Greek.

Mr. Gairdner’s judgments about persons are as unsatisfactory as his treatment of great principles and of scholarship. His first allusion to Knox (on p. 245) is about as unfair and inadequate as any statement can well be. The phrase “Ridley lingered for some time” in the fire is a curious way of disguising the atrocious cruelty and clumsiness of his death. The list of Mr. Gairdner’s “authorities” throws a great deal of light on his opinions. He quotes official documents, of course, but he also recommends a great many Roman Catholic advocates, both contemporary and recent. By all means let them be heard, let their evidence be weighed and their views understood; but to accept them blindly as authorities is not the way to get impartial history. It is for this reason that the current view of our ecclesiastical affairs must be revised,

just as the pre-Tractarian view was revised. The process will result in something very different from that which Dr. Sanday seems to expect, if not to desire. Mr. Pollard's Life of King Henry VIII. is a fine and promising example of what a genuine revision will produce.

Mr. Gairdner seems to ignore the real interests which were at stake in our Reformation. He does not appear to see that our national life, our Imperial greatness, and the causes of civil and religious liberty, were all involved in the struggle of our Reformers. Dr. Sanday is "glad that they showed so much zeal," and he thinks "that we owe them a debt of gratitude." This is an advance upon the scurrilities of Hurrell Froude and Newman, but those who understand the liberties of England will resent the "faint praise" which condemns the heroes who did and suffered so much to obtain them. Dr. Sanday speaks well and truly of Hooker. It is a pity he does not realize that Hooker and the extreme Ritualists among us are incompatibles. The beliefs and practices which they specially desire are one and all condemned in the "Ecclesiastical Polity." There used to be—and there need be—no serious disagreement between the Evangelicals and the older High Churchmen. They could all accept the Anglican *Via Media*, as formulated by Hooker. The New Anglicans have, however, so far departed from our old historical and theological position that some of them are openly advocating a surrender to the Papal monarchy, and others put in the forefront of their teaching those very doctrines and practices for which Cranmer and Ridley were burnt, against which Hooker wrote so decisively, which even Laud and Andrewes opposed with all their strength.

ARTHUR GALTON.



## The Month.

THE Education Bill has aroused new interest during the past few weeks in consequence of an amendment proposed by Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, and accepted by the Government. The effect of this amendment is to place religious teaching in the Denominational Schools under the control of the managers, subject to the tenor of the trust-deeds. It is alleged by lawyers of authority such as Chancellor P. V. Smith that this amendment does but state explicitly what would in any case have been the effect of the Bill; but this does not alter the fact that such an effect was not anticipated by many of the supporters of the Bill, and that it materially alters the position of the Clergy in their schools. Hitherto, the schools have practically been under their management, subject to two restraints: One, that in many trust-deeds an appeal on disputed points in religious instruction was left to the Bishop;