

by this kind of preaching, united as it was to a life that was felt to be above all other things religious—the following letter will prove. I quote it at some length because of its interesting if melancholy description of the low ebb of religion in public institutions at the period when Arnold went to Rugby. It was written by another distinguished school master, the Head of Winchester School, Dr. Moberly. “The tone of the young men at the University” (when he was there) whether they came from Winchester, Eton, Rugby, Harrow, or wherever else, was universally irreligious. A religious undergraduate was very rare, very much laughed at when he appeared; I think I may confidently say, hardly to be found amongst public school men. . . . A most singular and striking change has come upon our public school. This change is undoubtedly part of a general improvement of our generation in respect of piety and reverence, but I am sure that to Dr. Arnold’s personal earnest simplicity of purpose, strength of character, power of influence and piety, which none who ever came near him could mistake or question, the carrying of this improvement into our schools is mainly attributable. He was the first. It soon came to be a matter of observation to us in the University, that his pupils brought quite a different character with them to Oxford than that which we knew elsewhere. . . . His pupils were thoughtful, manly-minded, conscious of duty and obligation, when they first came to college. This is the testimony of a man who held theological views the opposite of those of Arnold and is therefore of the more weight. He adds, “he regretted, indeed that his pupils were deeply imbued with principles which he disapproved, but he cordi-

ally acknowledged the immense improvement in their characters in respect of morality and personal piety and looked on Dr. Arnold as exercising an influence for good, which (for how many years, I know not) had been absolutely unknown in our public schools.”

In addressing such an audience as this upon the theological opinions of Arnold of Rugby, it is not necessary to speak at any great length. I do not propose to weary you with details of what would be only interesting to Anglicans. But some statement of his position in regard to religion whether of the Anglican or Nonconformist type, must be made if our outline is to be complete. There have been in the last 150 years three main religious movements in the Anglican Church. The Evangelical Revival which belongs to the eighteenth Century and the High Church and Broad Church movements which belong to the first and second quarters of the 19th Century. Arnold was a strong Broad Churchman, who in the midst of his cares and duties at Rugby found time to interest himself in the large life of the National Religion of England.

A Broad Churchman is sometimes supposed to be a Christian lukewarm in his Christianity and a Churchman who is positively cold to his Church. Both of these ideas are erroneous. We have but to name such men as Dean Stanley, F. D. Maurice, Robertson of Brighton, Charles Kingsley and many others who were amongst the most devoted men of the 19th Century. Nor shall we suppose that Arnold was lukewarm about anything. Nor must we assume too readily that because a man is not in sympathy with High Church views that he