THE

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 13.—January, 1883.

I.

THE TEACHING OF OUR LORD REGARDING THE SABBATH AND ITS BEARING ON CHRISTIAN WORK.

ON several occasions during our Lord's ministry, the Sabbath came into special notice, and the record of His instructions on the subject, forms an important part of the Gospel history. Of thirty-three miracles, of which we have a detailed account, no less than seven were performed on that day, while another is supposed by many to be referred to in one of His discourses (John vii. 21–23), and probably there were many others, not specifically mentioned. Those specially recorded are, the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, on the second Passover of His ministry (John v. 9); of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, at the commencement of His Galilean ministry (Mark i. 23–26; Luke iv. 33–36); of Simon's wife's mother, the same afternoon (Matt. viii. 14, 15; Mark i. 29–31; Luke iv. 38, 39); of the man with the withered hand (Matt. xii. 9–13; Mark iii. 1–5; Luke vi. 6–11); of the man born blind, who sat begging at Jerusalem (John ix. 14); of the woman with the spirit of infirmity (Luke xiii. 11–14); and of the man who had the dropsy, at a feast given by one of the chief Pharisees (Luke xiv. 1–4).

The number of these cases, as well as the whole circumstances connected with them, indicate that our Lord had important designs to serve by this procedure. To appreciate this, we must notice that all these cures were unsolicited. The people made no application to Him on the Sabbath. We read that on the evening of the same

VI.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN AND THE OXFORD REVIVAL.

THE Oxford Tractarian movement during the early part of the present century has been lately an object of renewed attention and interest. This renewed attention and interest is due to a number of causes. One of these is the publication of Mr. Mozley's somewhat rambling reminiscences of Oriel College, which bring the reader into rather intimate acquaintance with a variety of Anglican thinkers known more by their works than by their personal characteristics. Another cause has been the death of the Regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford, whose secluded life at the University and at the Ascot Priory led many to forget him and the important part played by him in ecclesiastical affairs, except when he commanded attention by his occasional appearance on the field of controversy. Still another cause which has tended to make men look back at the Oxford movement is the rise and spread of what is now called Ritualism and the vigorous measures taken by both Church and State for its suppression. To this it may be added that the striking contrast presented between the Oxford of Newman and Pusey and the Oxford of the Master of Balliol and Max Müller has already caused uneasiness in some quarters—admiration in others. Canon Liddon withdraws from his professorship; the Primate of England reproves him for his Pessimism—and this in the pages of a popular magazine. It is, however, difficult to believe that a period of less than half a century could work so great a change. Nothing sheds so clear a light on the religious history of that period as a survey of the career of John Henry Newman, once a leader in Anglican theology, now a Cardinal in the Latin Church.

That Ritualism was a result of the Oxford tracts very few will deny, although the Archbishop of Canterbury suggests that it is only a manifestation of the prevailing æstheticism. The claim that both Tractarianism and Ritualism may be traced to an earlier source is justified by a glance at history. Two questions at once arise: Is

Ritualism a true interpretation and logical result of Anglican doctrine? Is Rome the logical end of Ritualism? Before considering these questions in the light of Cardinal Newman's course of action, it is well that one should notice the condition of the English Church just before the Tractarian revival and the nature of the effect of that revival on the ecclesiastical and practical religious life of England.

Although there were germs of the Broad-Church development in England long before the time of Newman, that development was not remarkable until it was furthered by men like Maurice, Arnold, Kingsley, and Stanley. The prevailing parties in the early part of Newman's career were the Low-Church, Evangelical party and the old-fashioned High-Church party, nicknamed the "High and Dry." The former had obtained great influence by its earnest preaching and pious zeal; the latter by the conservative and thoroughly English manner in which it followed certain divines of the seventeenth century. But Evangelical and High-Church parties were already growing cold. The haughty reserve and formal inaction of the latter were equalled only by the growing indolence of the former. Evangelical principles of action had indeed overthrown much of the fox-hunting and convivial clerical influence of the eighteenth century, but dissent was daily growing in power. Just as Methodism was banished from the Establishment and driven into self-supporting chapels, so the earnestness of Wesley's successors and the rude but zealous enthusiasm of English Congregationalists and Presbyterians found but little encouragement in an Erastian Church. The growth of dissent in the face of apparently insuperable financial and civil difficulties is partly to be explained by its incompatibility with the exceeding "respectability" of the religion of the State. One may, perhaps, regard the Tractarian teaching as a revival of "Popish" religion; another as a revival of mediæval religion; that it was a revival of *religion*, no one can deny. It was an infusion of life into the sluggish body of complacent bishops and most idle priests. While there was undoubtedly much real piety and earnestness among many of the clergy and laity where some of the warmth of the elder Wilberforce's influence and of Newton's example still remained, the English Church was, on the whole, remarkably inactive. This was due to many influences, but the effect was worldliness in the metropolitan parishes, indifference and carelessness in the provinces. Meanwhile the Nonconformists, struggling against many difficulties, were gaining over the middle classes, but were taking but little hold upon the wretched men and women in the large towns and the laboring classes in the country.

All important theories find their way into man's practical life and

inspire literature or provoke action. A theory may be strained or filtered through the minds of great writers or of lesser writers and at length become the thought and motive of the people. In Philosophy the effect of Stoic and Epicurean teaching in the Roman world illustrates this proposition. It holds good in the religious world. Ritualism is the manifestation in thought, motive, and action of Tractarian Theology.

The Oxford writers were men who sought to find a historical and stable foundation for Anglican theology and the Anglican ecclesiastical system. They were startled at the indifference of those in the English Church whom they called "Calvinists" and "Lutherans." They found two opposing influences at work in their communion. There was on the one hand, the doctrine of Episcopacy, the power of the keys in each diocese and the ecclesiastical importance of ordained clergy; there was constant appeal to the councils of the early Church, a liturgy which sanctioned the right of the clergy to hear confession and pronounce absolution, which gave a sacerdotal character to the ministers of religion, which taught the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and the Real Presence. On the other hand, were the thirty-nine articles which apparently upheld all Protestant dogmas, the historical connection of the English Establishment with Reformed theology. The problem was: what is the real character of the Anglican Church? Is it Protestant, or not? Some escaped solving the problem by saying, there is room for both views. The Tractarians solved it in their own way, and the revolution began.

The truth was that the English Church had but half reformed. The articles which indeed set forth a Protestant principle, at the same time referred to the "godly doctrine of the homilies," and the godly doctrine of the homilies might at times surprise the Protestant reader.* It was difficult to say which was to be preferred. The authority of the Church could not lie in the articles, the homilies, or the liturgy, for if one interpreted them in his own way, he would be regarded either as a Protestant on the one hand, as a follower of Rome on the other hand. He would be told that the English Church was reformed, would be referred to the thirty-nine articles, would be warned against Popery; or he would be reminded that allowance must be made for the compromising spirit of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; that the Anglican Church must hold its own against the encroachments of Rome on the one side, against the liberalism of Protestants on the other; that the Church

---

* Vide "Apol. pro vitâ suâ," p. 82.

was the Expositor of the Bible and that Dissent was schism—a most grievous sin. In such a Church Newman found himself, and he at once chose the Catholic alternative. Many followed his example. They felt that the Reformation by its vigorous reaction against Roman doctrine had blinded many eyes to the real meaning and mission of the Catholic Church. The visible English Church after the Reformation was hardly like the organization of the early centuries. Anglicanism in their eyes had a historical continuity with the Church of St. Augustine and St. Athanasius. The Anglicans had quite as good a right to claim the first four or six centuries as had Rome. In addition to this it was held that the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican communions were all parts of the Holy Catholic Church. Rome had degenerated by exalting Primacy to Papacy and by certain so-called "accretions"—a fungus growth, it was maintained—upon the "faith once delivered unto the saints." To restore to the partially Protestant Church of England this heritage of the past; to put into practical form the teaching of the early centuries, to acknowledge the apostolic power of the Bishops and the sacerdotal character of the clergy, to give the sacraments and works of devoted charity a supremely important place in religious life—such was the chief object of the Tractarians, and such is the chief object of their successors. There was in the religious life of the time an element which was quite powerful in leading men to look for authority. Infidelity, both British and Continental, was abroad. Tübingen was not alone in the spirit which treated with cold and unsympathetic scrutiny the narrative of the gospels and the theology of the epistles. But if one will look more deeply into the movement of thought in Europe, one will find a convergence of currents to some point of unity. The Absolute Philosophy of Germany, the Eclectic Philosophy of France, the high Ecclesiasticism of Oxford are all manifestations of a deep longing on the part of the restless thinking world for a unity. This appears even in Politics, and one looks instinctively from Berlin and Oxford to the Imperial Idea of the nineteenth century.

The two commanding figures of the Oxford movement are Newman and Pusey. Canon Mozley's stern logic in one department of abstract theology kept him from following them. Keble helped them by his sermons, which show more of "sweetness and light" than of intellect, and by the charm of his sacred poetry. There were many lesser lights; none shone so brightly as did those of Newman and Pusey. The greater part of the English Church rose at once and opposed the Tracts. "Popery" is, to be sure, a question-begging

epithet, but the cry of "down with Popery" is very effective, and has been the means of desecrating the sanctuary of many a ritualistic church in spite of the efforts of some who have given up all in order to "preach the Gospel to the poor."

There are few biographies of these faithful men, but one catches occasionally a glimpse of parishes in the great manufacturing towns of England, and of the lives of men like the late Charles Lowder, who have indeed worn "Romish" vestments, and have burned candles and incense, but have sacrificed their comfort and given up their lives for the sake of the lowest classes in the east of London. Riots, foul epithets, foul missiles, discouragements, have not turned them back. His Grace of Canterbury, looking at a non-essential point, has considered Ritualism, as I remarked above, to be a species of æstheticism, and the awakening of earnestness in the Church of England to be due largely to the influence of Dr. Arnold. It is rather early for one to attempt to defend such a proposition. It is difficult to forget that the thought of Dr. Arnold's school reached a climax in a London deanery in the thought and person of one who respected the theologies of others too deeply to have a definite theology of his own; while the history of Bedford Chapel, the incumbent of which is now an Unitarian clergyman, shows quite clearly the direction in which the finger of the Broad-Churchman points.

It is not necessary, and it would be wearisome, to follow the long dispute which followed the appearance of the Tracts. It will be sufficient here to trace the course of Newman as it appears in what one may call, without exaggeration, the light of History.

A very suggestive fact in connection with this subject, is the emphasis laid by the Tractarians on the apostolic character and authority of the Bishops. No Anglican of this century has shown more humble submission to his Diocesan than Newman showed. This has not been a distinguishing characteristic of the High Anglican party, and it may be remarked *en passant*, that there has been no more amusing inconsistency in the modern religious world than the encouragement given by some who are fond of talking about the Unity of the Holy Catholic Church to men who deliberately set the authority of Bishops in defiance. Every English church erected in Catholic Europe is a schismatic church, and there was less excuse for the High Anglicans in supporting Père Hyacinthe than there would be for a French priest, were he to smile approvingly upon Mr. Newman Hall. One is not surprised at finding the views of the Bishop of Oxford in the days of the Tracts requiring far more obedience than the judgment and conscience of Newman could give. This was a most

important element in determining the latter's secession. As I have just intimated, the successors of the Tractarians have been often in collision with the Bishops. It is true that one apostle may withstand another, "because he is to be blamed"; but when a clergyman remains in prison because he will not follow the dictates of his apostolic guide, it is difficult to see how he is to be considered as a martyr to so-called Catholic truth. The dioceses in both England and this country have, as a rule, been under the control of very Low-Churchmen, or of men who, to use Newman's words, follow "the channel of no meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of Aye and No." A Bishop seldom objects openly to doctrine. Universalism, more or less disguised, has been preached by men in orders, in the dioceses of England and in those of America, without interference on the part of the "successors of the Apostles." But a vestment too ornamental, or a light too many, is a fit object for episcopal anger. It may fairly be asked whether a Bishop who will allow a cross on the "super altar," but not on the altar, is not a greater ritualist than the ritualist himself. Some notable exceptions to this insubordination are to be observed. The members of the "Cowley brotherhood" stripped their church in Philadelphia of many ritualistic emblems, at the command of the Bishop of Pennsylvania, who disliked the "outward and visible signs," who could not do away with what they regarded as the inward and spiritual grace of their creed and doctrine.

It must be constantly kept in mind by those who would understand Newman's course of action, that the collision between the authority of the English Bishops and his own belief was an efficient cause of his departure to Rome. He believed that the doctrine of apostolical succession was taught by the primitive Church, and that the authority of the Bishop must be respected. But the question must have arisen, supposing that the Bishop commands what I believe to be in opposition to the teaching of the Church, who shall decide between us? Does the decision rest with the primitive councils? If so, and the instruction of the Bishop is at variance with the teaching of the councils, which is to be followed? If the Bishop interpret primitive Christianity in the light of Reformation principles, who is to decide whether the Bishop or myself is right? The decision of the Church catholic on this point cannot be obtained, for that Church is so divided that its Greek, Latin, and Anglican apostles cannot meet on common ground. Where, then, is the authority? Private judgment will lead to insubordination as an Anglican, or into the schismatic territory of the dissenter. To Newman, the Via Media seemed

beset with such difficulties. With Pusey, he maintained the divine authority of the Church, but who shall decide what catholic doctrine is? It may seem strange that the doctrine described as *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, could not be ascertained. Dissenting Protestantism might appeal to the Bible, and if two men differed in interpretation, they joined or formed sects which might adopt their views. But to do this was, according to the Anglican, to become schismatic, and schism was worse than "Popery." These difficulties occurring to Newman, probably led him to question the right of the English Church to remain separate from Rome, and thus the two inquiries, Where shall I find authority? and, Which is the Catholic Church? were blended into one.

The "Apologia pro vitâ suâ" may in a few particulars be compared to the Confessions of Rousseau and the autobiography of the younger Mill. It is not so personal as these other narratives, but we are taken into the author's confidence and are made spectators of the struggle which went before his change of creed. It is easy to see that the question as to authority was the main one to be answered. It was necessary to decide whether the Anglican Church by being cut off from Rome had lost its catholic character. He seems to have considered the question how far apostolical succession is a mark of catholicity, rather than the question as to the validity of Anglican orders. He at length reached a decision. The Monophysites or Eutychians and the Donatists had the true orders, but were schismatic. The first great separation after the Council of Nicæa and the second separation after the secession of Henry VIII. prevented the reassembling of the three branches of the so-called Catholic Church. The Latin Church alone professed to be alive. It had a living authority at Rome which defined the Faith, which slowly settled disputes, which was a real ecclesiastical centre. After the fourth, or, according to some, after the sixth century, Anglicans had no living authority. Their churchly authority was "buried in libraries." Protestantism had invaded Anglican boundaries and Private Judgment was contending with the primitive councils. If the Anglicans are not schismatics, why are the Donatists and Eutychians? If the Church of the East is Catholic, why should the Province of Canterbury claim the See of Jerusalem? There seemed to be a considerable *hiatus* between Anglican and Primitive Catholicity. Continuity in authority was to be found only at Rome.

It seems indeed quite clear, admitting that God's purpose has been to speak through a visibly united Church, that the councils of later centuries are as authoritative as those of the first four. Why should

one claim authority for Ephesus (where Eutychian doctors under Cyril very nearly carried the day) and not for Trent? Because, it is said, the whole Church was not represented at Trent. But who shall decide what the whole Church is? If heretical Bishops were absent from the earliest councils, it would hardly be claimed by the Anglican that the decrees of those councils are invalid. If it be held that the Council of Trent was heretical, the question arises, How can that heresy be determined and recognized? One must fall back upon some other council, and that may be open to the accusation of heresy from another quarter. The point is briefly this. The High Anglican claims that the Protestant is not justified in confining his faith to the Bible as interpreted by Private Judgment, that the Holy Ghost spoke authoritatively in the Primitive Councils. The Protestant would reply that he has a right to judge of the agreement between the doctrines as he finds them in the Bible and the decrees of the councils, and if the latter seem to conflict with the Scriptures, he must reject the latter. The Anglican refuses to grant this right of private judgment, but is suddenly confronted by Rome, and Rome is armed with the same weapon which was just before wielded against the Protestant. Why, asks Rome, do you confine your faith to the Bible or to the Primitive Councils? It would be as reasonable as to confine your faith to the Old Testament without the New. If the answer be, the later councils are not Catholic, behold a *petitio principii*.

The Eastern Church seceded on the question as to the filioque clause. This schism was either justifiable or it was not. If it was justifiable, then any body of Bishops can do as the Anglicans have done, can do as the Reformed Episcopalians have done. It requires much ingenuity in the Anglican's logic to show how the Reformed Episcopalians, for example, are schismatics. If it be proved that they are, the foundations of the English Church are undermined. Whatever may be said as to the content of Roman doctrine, it must be acknowledged that there is a living authority at the Vatican. The Anglican claims that this authority is at variance with that of the Primitive Church, and the Protestant claims that the voice of the Primitive Church is not in harmony with the voice of Scripture. It is quite evident that the traveller in this via media is in a dilemma—Protestantism or Rome. Protestantism to Newman was the high-road to infidelity, and to Rome he went with the words of Augustine ringing in his ears, *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*.

The "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," which is perhaps the ablest of Newman's works, shows how he was led to view

what many are accustomed to call the "accretions" of Roman doctrine. This subject he treated with great ingenuity and skill. But the great obstacle to those who approach Rome from the Anglican side is the doctrine of Infallibility, the Supremacy of the Holy Father. Newman does not present the claims of Rome as they are ordinarily presented by scholastic and modern Italian writers. The Anglicans are in his eyes "schismatics," not so much because of defective orders, but because they have lost organic union with the See of Peter. Instead of appealing to a species of episcopal oligarchy which might fall into error, he looked to Rome as the representative of Catholic unity, separation from which was schism. This is not the place to discuss the Papal pretensions, but it is plain if one regards the Church as a visible organism in process of development, with living and infallible authority, that it is as easy to believe that the power of the keys has been given to a single Bishop speaking *ex-cathedrâ* in council as to suppose that authority resides in the disunited fragments of the Anglican, Roman, and Greek communions. I am not discussing the propriety of accepting the dicta of councils or of popes. The question of authority, however, belongs to Protestantism quite as much as to Catholicism. The appeal made by Protestants to "the Bible only" has doubtless caused some abuses, but it is significant that a decided change has come over men's minds in their view of the relation of the Bible to Christian doctrine. For example, the authority of the Bible as a source of doctrine has never been impaired in the Presbyterian Church. When an appeal to that authority is made, all men agree on the *essential points* which are the result. Formerly the Unitarian, the Universalist, the Antinomian must be met in the field of Biblical Theology. One by one these adversaries have changed their position. Parts of the Bible are good as statements of practical ethics; but it is not, so it is held, to be considered to be a source of Theology. In proportion as the Bible is elevated to the Papacy of Protestantism, ought its credentials to be examined and its meaning explained. It seems probable that the efforts at revision, the awakening of the critical spirit in the study of Biblical Literature, are signs of the high importance with which Protestants look upon the question of the authority and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures.

It must be evident to the candid Anglican that he has far less reason for rejecting Roman authority than has the Protestant. Many objections made by the High Anglican to Latin Theology are trivial. The right of the Pope to define doctrine is denied, but the doctrine so defined is not very different from that of the Church of England.

Why object to the vicegerency of a mortal man, when one holds that the priest possesses the tremendous power of Absolution? Why object to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, if one uses the "Hail Mary" as a form of prayer? It is more appropriate to address the *Ave* as a prayer to a being immaculately conceived, especially if the *Ave* be coupled, as is so often the case, with the *Paternoster*. The invocation of the Mother of Jesus and of the host of saints is only a part of the sacramental system. If a man bow the knee before a cross; if he fall in adoration before the elements, behind which the ineffable presence of the Incarnate One is hidden; if the Eucharist and the water of Baptism, if fasting and penance are material means of obtaining supernatural grace, it would seem quite natural that the St. Peter or St. Joseph should be sacramental means of securing grace by the invocation of their prayer and aid. The difference between the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence is partly a mere difference of metaphysical terms. The denial of the cup to the laity is a change in the original form of the sacrament, but so also is the mingling of water with the wine, and the adoration of the elements. Of course such resemblances and analogies do not of themselves form reasons for the secession of Anglicans to Rome, but they tend to show that the Anglican objection to the Papal authority is not founded on as deep principles as many have supposed. The preponderance of so-called Scriptural teaching is probably on the side of the Anglican; the preponderance of Logic and visible Authority being on the side of the Roman.

The doubts in Newman's mind caused a struggle, and for many months he appears to have been unsettled in his convictions, but he preferred to turn from the dead authority of the early Church, and from the perilous use of private judgment, to find at Rome the definition of doctrine as well as the power of Absolution and the power of the keys.

There is probably nothing which so thrills the reader of history or of fiction as the story of great critical periods in the lives of men; in their struggles with feeling and surrounding circumstances. This forms the charm in works like Hamlet, Macbeth, and Manfred; in the lives of martyrs and of great reformers. But there is no crisis so pathetic and impressive as an intellectual crisis when the mind takes arms against a sea of intellectual troubles, when feeling seems to be the only anchor of faith, and when the understanding can make but little progress against the force of apparently overwhelming difficulties. We find one of these crises in the life of Newman. One can imagine him crying out, as Pascal once wrote in the silence of the

Parisian monastery: "*Certitude! Certitude!*" In Newman's eyes certitude was to be sought only in authority. That authority he found at the Vatican. It is fashionable to sneer at such an attitude as involving intellectual suicide and the shifting of moral responsibility. The same keen insight that detected the weakness of the Tractarian position discovered ways of escape. The result was that ingenious and brilliant treatise, "The Grammar of Assent."

There has been enough written about this work to warrant my noticing it only very briefly here. But it has hardly had the high place assigned to it to which it seems fairly entitled. The reader who is familiar with Aristotle and Kant will find errors in the use of technical logical language; but the believer in Revealed Religion, whether he look to Rome or to his Bible, will find in Newman a most powerful defender of supernatural truth. Assent is conditioned by apprehension, but we need not comprehend the proposition to which assent is given. While natural religion furnishes the basis of revealed religion, the latter is not a product of the former nor a product of the reason. If the authority upon which religious truth is founded be established, it is not necessary that the content of the declarations of that authority should be comprehended. "Revelation begins where Natural Religion fails. The Religion of Nature is a mere inchoation, and needs a complement. It can have but one complement, and that very complement is Christianity. Natural Religion is based upon the sense of sin; it recognizes the disease, but cannot find, it does but look out for a remedy. That remedy, both for guilt and for moral impotence, is found in the central doctrine of Revelation—the Mediation of Christ." *

Both Newman and Dr. Ward, whose names stand high among English Catholics of this century, show in their writings a philosophical spirit, but their philosophy leads them to Authority beyond themselves. Pusey seems never to have passed into that region of doubt where the preparation for a healthy faith is to be found.

Leaving out of view the fact that Newman found his authority at Rome, one may dwell upon the fact that he vindicated with surprising ability the appeal to authority. When one looks at the inactivity of rational religion, and at the practical activity of Revealed Religion, one is tempted to doubt whether Rational Theology can any longer claim the high place which once it occupied. The question which must be settled before all other questions is, what is the authority to which appeal is to be made? and if Reason be the authority, Relig-

* "The Grammar of Assent," p. 486.

ion becomes a barren Philosophy. The nineteenth century has been a strange battle-ground, and there are few parties which cannot show their trophies of victory; but it is only just to say that the thick of the religious warfare has not always been where the voices were the loudest. Some day eyes will be turned not toward the mausoleum, or monument, or pantheon of saints and philosophers, but to the simple epitaph in some English churchyard, some rude tablet in a Dissenting chapel, some lonely tomb, and men will be persuaded again that Philosophy has not always won the day.

The secession of Newman from the English Church severed all those ties which bound him to his friends and to his former life. It must have been a heavy blow to Oxford and to his University friends. It may now be some satisfaction to him, although such satisfaction is mingled with pain, to read testimony to the failure of Tractarianism to hold its own in Oxford. With Pusey dead, and Canon Liddon in retirement, with Prof. Jowett the Vice-Chancellor, the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, though sad, are to the Dissenter and the Catholic not unexpected.

"The great University of historic orthodoxy is regarded by many as a hot-bed of free, if not of anti-Christian thought. Within the last few months the most eloquent representative of the Oxford school preached a sermon in which he warned his hearers that Oxford will in a few years at the most cease to be a Christian university. If this be his belief, the bulwark of a fourth century Church to which the old leaders trusted as a refuge from the storm, powerful to resist the coming invasion, has crumbled in dust."*

It might be fairly asked whether the bulwark of the English Church, with its ambiguous theology and conflicting parties, encourages any more well-established trust than the Church of the first four centuries. If the former Church is illogical, the latter leads to Rome. Whether orthodox dissent, or the earnest Ritualism of the present will react upon the changing Oxford of to-day, is a question which can hardly be answered. But as intimated above, there must be a definite solution of the problem as to authority, and if reason alone is declared to be the authority, the University of the future will not be religious. In the meantime the author of the *Via Media* may look back with some satisfaction on his secession from a Church which seems to be losing its hold on the greatest intellectual stronghold of England.

One cannot but believe that from that sad time when Newman gave up, first the vicarage of St. Mary's, then his parish at Little-

* *Macmillan's Magazine*, October, 1882.

more, then his stall in the University, the words of his own prayer from the *Lyra Apostolica* were always in his thoughts :

" Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on !
The night is dark, and I am far from home—
Lead Thou me on !
Keep Thou my feet ; I do not ask to see
The distant scene—one step enough for me."

The light which at last appeared shone, indeed, from the Papal tiara. Few will deny that it was to him only a reflection of that " true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER.