

and that it is only by reason of the sins of the citizens of the Kingdom that their Master's inheritance is not reduced to possession, Christians will have a motive of transcendent energy for spending and being spent in the cause of the Lord Jesus.

The prospect of having to contend with the "aggrieved parishioner" is nothing new, either in England or America. It may in some cases operate as a hindrance to those who desire Holy orders. But the most peaceably disposed clergyman that ever lived cannot do his duty thoroughly in any parish without exciting opposition somewhere; and unless a man has counted this item as a necessary part of "the cost," and is in some measure prepared to meet it, he had better not seek to enter the ministerial ranks.

We believe however that the greatest obstacle in the way of accessions to the holy office of the ministry is to be found in our "unhappy divisions,"—divisions, not as existing among the laity, but as found among the clergy. When the clergy shall have learned how to form a compact body, not only organized but so united that they have learned the charity which can bear with each other's differences, and which can believe in the purity of each other's motives, then we shall have no fear that the laity will be behind either in personal zeal or in ministering to the requirements of the Church with their substance. And when this happy consummation shall be realized, we have no question that many will be far more easily induced to take the responsible and self-sacrificing positions required by a system which will recommend itself to the noblest aspirations of generous minds, by its grandeur and by its truthfulness.

#### THE REFORMATION.

The features of the English Reformation as distinct in its whole character from the so-called reformations which took place on the continent of Europe, cannot be too often brought before our minds or too emphatically dwelt upon. The Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne) in his "Pastoral Letter," of which we have already given two notices, introduces his account of these characteristic differences, with some notices of the Papacy to which we alluded in our last issue. He points out the fact that "the Papacy even of the middle ages was the extreme development of one important element of the Church of Christ, the element of unity and order."

In endeavouring however to suppress disorder, it tyrannized over the consciences of men to an unwarrantable extent; so that efforts were made year after year, age after age, to resist its encroachments. These efforts which were not only in the interest of disorder, but also in the interest of a healthful freedom of thought and action, finally culminated in what is termed the Reformation, which says the Bishop, "was multiform in its development." The Lutheran and Anglican Reformations were both intended to be conservative; the one assuming the attitude of protest, when they were unable to effect reform; but the English reformed, without subverting the national Church. In Switzerland however, the Reformation was of a widely different character. Zwinglius threw down all the ancient landmarks and rejected all former institutions; "and then the genius of Calvin building up a wholly new edifice, based on new principles and hedged in with new fences." His Lordship is very emphatic in pointing out the distinction between these reformations, so radically different in character; and with his characteristic perspicuity and force, he thus describes what took place in Germany and England:—"The Lutherans desired to reform the German Church, eradicating its corruptions, but retaining its constitution. If they could have carried their princes and their Bishops with them, they would probably, under the guidance of Melancthon, have effected a true reformation. As it was, they seceded, with the thought of remaining separate till such reformation might be possible, and, at the same time, they could put forth a solemn protest against the corruptions which they could not remove." But "the English was a true reformation. Some may think it defective and others excessive; but it was not secession, it was not destruction, it was not revolution—it was "in the true and proper sense of the word," *reform*. It took a long time to effect. Its work went through many reigns, beginning with Henry the Eighth, and certainly not perfected till Charles the Second. It retained all fundamental doctrines—it respected all ancient formularies—it changed no ancient constitution. It had the same creeds, the same clergy—even the same services, translated and purged, but not abolished—the same Church courts, the same Church laws. There was but one thing which it absolutely swept away, viz., the usurped supremacy of the Pope and its natural consequences."

The Bishop does not mean to assert that the work was all well done, and that there were no defects and no excesses; he merely maintains that such were the principles on which the English reformation was carried on. It was viewed in this way by the bishops and clergy of that day, who are commonly styled the Reformers. Statesmen, sovereigns, laws of the land, all treated it in the same way. As Dr. Freeman remarks:—"It is certain that no English ruler, no English parliament, thought of setting up a new Church, but simply of reforming the existing English Church." "In their own eyes, they were not establishing, but reforming; they were neither pulling down nor setting up, but simply putting to rights." "There was no one act called the Reformation; the Reformation was the gradual result of a long series of acts. There was no one movement, no one act of parliament, when and by which a Church was 'established;' still less was there any act by which one Church was 'disestablished,' and another Church 'established' in its place." Even the Pope must have taken a similar view of the subject, as he would have tolerated the changes of faith and worship in the reign of Elizabeth, if only the Queen would acknowledge his supremacy.

His Lordship considers that it was probably a blessing to England that there was no one great master mind among her reforming clergy, such as Luther or Calvin. The reformation in England therefore proceeded more slowly, and at the same time more safely. Calvin was prepared for radical changes, although he could not entirely agree with the rationalism of Zwinglius. The organization of the ancient Church which the English retain, was beyond the reach of Calvin; and therefore he elaborated from his own brain a new system which was to rival the old Catholic system, whether corrupted or reformed. He enslaved the conscience, not by the power of the priest, but by a blind submission to the unlimited sovereignty of God. The Bishop notes the fact that no trace of anything like Calvinism can be found in the first four centuries after Christ; and he concludes his masterly review of the system by stating that, "doubtless the Calvinistic 'Reformation' was a move and a very extensive move, in the direction of free thought; but it was clear to Calvin that free thought required strong curbs and heavy restraints; and so the system of Calvinism was, and still is, as exclusive, and in some re-