

Then came the *Mystics*, men of profoundly speculative minds, led by despair of reforming and spiritualizing the Church, and through the study of the Neo-platonic writings to an exaggeration of the importance and capacity of the inner life—to a pantheistic identification of man with God. Here the vital idea, taken apart from its pantheistic setting, is the need of a personal appropriation of Christ. Outward forms are of no account. We must become united with God. God being in us and we in God. By contemplating God we become one with God. By contemplating Christ we become one with Christ. The pantheistic element was so transcendental as to affect comparatively few. The tendency toward striving after individual and conscious union with Christ had a much wider influence. But mysticism was indifferent to external order, and could not of itself bring about a radical reform.

Next came the *Revival of Learning*, with its contempt for scholasticism, its temporary return to Platonic paganism, its restoration of the study of the Scriptures in their original languages, its contempt for human authority, and its consequent promotion of freedom of thought.

Here, then, we have five grand elements of opposition to the corrupt hierarchy: The Biblical, the Realistic, the Patriotic, the Mystical, the Humanistic. From the Realistic not much could be expected. Its antagonism to the Biblical would be likely to more than counterbalance its power for good; the Patriotic was likely to be contaminated by avarice, and to introduce a vast amount of corruption into any religious movement with which it might be connected. The position of Humanism in a religious reformation could only be an ancillary one, yet its aid was absolutely indispensable. Singly, each of these elements had entered the arena, and each had failed of immediate success. The time was coming when all of these elements of opposition were to combine, and the fabric of the hierarchy might well have trembled in the face of such a combination.

We might form a useful and interesting classification of the various reforming parties of the sixteenth century, on the basis of the degree in which these elements entered into each. We should say, e. g., that the Erasmic movement was preponderatingly Humanistic. The Biblical element was, theoretically at least, taken account of by Erasmus, but with so little earnestness as to be of trifling moment—there was no mysticism, no patriotism, little financial interest. The Lutheran Reformation represents a combination of all five of the reformatory forces, with a marvellous capacity to shift ground from one to another, according to the exigencies of the time. Few religious leaders ever expressed greater devotion to the Scriptures than Luther, and in contro-