

predecessors had, but then they found in them a theory of a Church that made it a very different thing from a mere moral police establishment. What, they said, Clergymen are Priests then; there is a grace conferred with orders in virtue of the *opus operatum*, and Apostolical succession is a sober reality; Priests can hear confession of sins then, and give absolution; Priests must offer a sacrifice, and that sacrifice is the body and blood of the Lord! If so, let us assert our true position. Thus commenced "the movement," of which only the first act is ended. At once it took shape and standing that attracted all eyes. Men like John Keble, Hurrell Froude, Pusey, Newman, could not be pooh-poohed. The results could not be pooh-poohed. Oxford was leavened with a spiritual life that it had not known since the Reformation. Men who really believed, men in earnest, gave the tone to its society. The "Tracts for the Times" defined their position. No. 90 was their ultimatum. England rejected it, and the party were then in the same position that the Scottish Non-Intrusionists were when their Committee broke off the negotiations with the Government. But the Scotchmen had the easier task before them. They had only to construct a new Church, and they had a fervid democracy at their backs. But the Neo-Anglicans were precluded by their own principles from schism, except a schism that would take them into the camp of the enemy, and they had not moulded public opinion into ripeness for that, and few of themselves were ripe for it. And so the party broke up, the majority remaining in the Church, resiling to gather strength and to prepare the slow public mind of England for their next advance; the more intrepid minority sacrificing everything, and at the call of principle joining the Roman Church. Now the astonishing thing is that the men who laud the heroism of Chalmers, Cunningham, Candlish, and their confederates most loudly, refuse to see any moral beauty, any faith, in Faber, Manning, or John Henry Newman, though they acted in obedience to precisely the same principles, and were men of at least equal purity of life, and equal intellectual and spiritual power. Why should there be nothing but praise for Chalmers' honesty, and nothing but blame for Newman's honesty. Because, do you tell me, the former went out for the cause of truth, the latter went out for the cause of error. Precisely. The former went out for