

preaching does not retard rather than advance Christianity. There are plenty of spoken addresses, delivered with both fluency and energy, which fail to excite any emotion but that of ennui. What is the matter with these addresses? The preachers are talking all around their subject and never getting to the centre of it. They speak as men who do not fully realize the vital fact that religion is a personal matter, that redemption is not given to men collectively but individually, that the basic fact of the spiritual life is the relation of the individual soul to Christ. He who has not a vivid conception of this fact cannot be a spiritual guide. He has no right to stand in a pulpit. Whatever episcopal benediction may have done for him, he has not been called of God to the work of the ministry. Theological students should weigh this matter well. "Has religion become a personal matter with me? Am I sure of my personal allegiance to the Master?" If "Yes!" be not the sincere response of the heart to these questions, the student of divinity has placed himself in a false position, from which it were well to withdraw as soon as possible. No skill in compositions, no mastery of patristic learning, no practice of debating clubs will make him a messenger of Christ.

MR. GLADSTONE's recent lecture at Oxford, on Mediaeval Universities, was the great event of the term's life. It is said that when he entered the theatre the audience, forgetful of politics, rose in clamorous applause to greet the most astonishing of living Englishmen, as the bowed, worn figure slowly made its way to the lecturer's desk. The subject of the lecture was somewhat wider than had been anticipated. Beginning with a sketch of the origins of University foundation, Mr. Gladstone passed on to a comparison of mediaeval Oxford and mediaeval Paris, arguing that the English University took the palm for brilliant and distinguished teachers. Then, leaving the middle ages behind him, he dwelt on the Reformation and the two succeeding centuries, noting and comparing the parts played by Oxford and by Cambridge, and characterizing shortly the leading Oxford men and, above all, the leading Oxford theologians. In a lecture which covered so much ground it is hard to select special parts for notice, for the points are so many. Perhaps the lecture was specially admirable for its assertion of Laud's true position not only in Oxford but in the Church of England. Speaking of Laud, Mr. Gladstone said his name "has now for two centuries and a half been largely visited with disapproval, sometimes with contempt. So great a writer as Lord Macaulay finds in Strafford a character 'of great abilities, eloquence, and courage;' but in Laud only 'a man of narrow understanding,' 'of a nature rash and irritable,' and of 'small commerce with the world.' Yet these two men were the Pylades and Orestes of civil life, and it might be hard to show any single point of action, or opinion, on which they differed. For the political sentiments and judicial acts of either I have not a word to say, except that they were expiated by both upon the scaffold, and that they in no way enter into the grounds of the present estimate. Of Laud, as a Churchman, it ought to have been remembered at least in extenuation that he was the first Primate of all England for many generations who proved himself by his acts to be a tolerant theologian. He was the patron not only of the saintly and heroic Bedell, but on the one hand of Chillingworth and Hales, on the other of Usher, Hall, and Davenant groups of names sharply severed in opinion, but unitedly known in the history of ability and of learning. It is, again, directly to the present purpose to compare the Calvinistic Oxford to which Laud came as a youth with the Anglican Oxford which he quitted to pass out into the government of affairs. The change in this

place and in that period almost equals what was said of Augustus, that he found Rome brick and left it marble; or, if the inverted form be preferred, Laud found Oxford marble and left it brick. (Laughter.) For it is the amount of transformation and not its quality that I seek to indicate. This change was not wrought by a man having as yet the Star Chamber and High Commission at his back, but seemingly by sheer force of personal character and will. He went out into the world; he obtained hold of the helm; he gave to the Anglican polity and worship what was in the main the impress of his own mind. He then sank to the ground in that conflict of the times which he had much helped to exasperate, but his scheme of Church polity—for his it largely was—grew up fresh, and out of his tomb took effect in law at the Restoration. And now with the mitigations which religious liberty has required, it still subsists in all its essential features, not as a personal or party opinion, but as embodied alike in statute and in usage, with no apparent likelihood of disappearance or decay. Dealing still exclusively with the quantitative aspect of the case, and wholly apart from merits or demerits, I conceive that he, with Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, forms the triad of persons who have had the largest share in giving to the momentous changes of the sixteenth century so much of their form as is strictly and specifically British. Such is an outline of the facts which have led me to appreciate so highly the brain force of Laud." In a peroration of striking dignity and warmth, Mr. Gladstone spoke in general terms of what Oxford and a university ought to be. "The University in its inception was a protest and a guarantee against the unchecked predominance of the ecclesiastical order. The spiritual and temporal or secular elements, so to call them, dwelt side by side, through the long course of generations, in standing competition, even in occasional strife, but in strife which never ever threatened to become estrangement. They worked upon the whole in concert, and jointly they achieved a noble result. It is not among the favourable signs of our own era that this concord has been broken in some European countries, by the total expulsion or disappearance of theology from the academic precinct. I have no fear of our witnessing here any similar severance between the constituent parts of sound and thorough education. (Cheers.) It may be that the circumstances and some even of the measures of our time have not been propitious to the cultivation of one great branch of human knowledge, and have borne the marks of an inevitable reaction from undue clerical preponderance. Such reactions are essentially temporary and will not prevent theology from recovering whatever ground may be due to it in virtue of its own proper force. I speak of theology as a science, and not of this theology or that; and it seems no violent paradox to say that if there be a Creator of this universe, the knowledge which reverently deals with our relations to Him can hardly be other than the ground of human knowledge. (Cheers.) It can then hardly fail to offer the richest reward as well as to advance the most commanding claim to the service and devotion not of stunted or of crippled intellects, but to the very flower of our youth. Whether, as some think, the idea of a University in its comprehensive fulness has ever been or has not an essentially Christian conception, it cannot, I suppose, be open to the smallest historic doubt that the central idea of our ancient English universities is an idea essentially Christian. It is nowhere more simply and nowhere more nobly conveyed than in the motto for Oxford—*Dominus illuminatio mea*. May the day never come when that ensign shall be changed, or when there shall be the smallest inkling of a desire to change it to its opposite and to proclaim *Dominus obscuratio mea*, *Dominus obtenebratio mea*. May that root and atmosphere and light which yield the