

formal dogmas of Rome, specially defined in the Council of Trent; thirdly, actual beliefs and usages, tolerated or approved by Rome. These last he called "dominant errors." Now everyone knows that the "dominant errors" were condemned by the articles. On the other hand, Newman held that the Catholic teaching was not; and as to the formal dogmas some were and some were not condemned.

Notwithstanding its consistency and its strength, the tract met with universal disapprobation. It was censured by the Hebdomadal Board of Oxford and despite an "understanding" was denounced as pernicious by the bishops, one after another in their charges to the clergy. Confidence was shaken and Newman felt that he could no longer be of service to the movement.

Some years before in reading a history of the Monophysites a doubt arose in his mind which never quite left him. He saw a striking resemblance between the past and the present. And now as he was engaged on a translation of St. Athanasius the old doubt came back with renewed force. The Arians were the Protestants; the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and Rome was then where she is now—she was standing serene, trying to allay the tempest. Even in this very year 1841, an event occurred which tended to unsettle him more and more. The Archbishop of Canterbury and a Prussian Minister of State, for political purposes, were carrying out a scheme to appoint an Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem. In Jerusalem there was not a single Anglican and yet what seems strange, they were sending out a bishop to "make a communion"—to fraternize with dissenters and oriental sects.

This was the beginning of the end. There was nothing precipitous, nothing rash. Newman in his *Apologia* has given us a beautiful description of the last four years. "From the end of 1841" he writes "I was on my death-bed as regards my membership with the Anglican Church.