

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

A STUDY OF CARDINAL NEWMAN

I

PERSONS who are familiar with the literary history of the Victorian era are aware of the fact that a goodly number of the writers and thinkers who figured in that era began life within the pale of the old Evangelicalism. It was thus, for example, with Carlyle, Macaulay, John Morley, Matthew Arnold and Marian Evans, the authoress better known to fame as George Eliot. These gifted ones began life Evangelical, but they did not continue so. In due time the restless spirit of the age struck in and claimed them all for its own. A like association with things Evangelical appears in the case of two other noted Victorians. We refer to the brothers Newman—Francis William the younger, and John Henry the elder and more famous. These brethren in their childhood imbibed the lore of Evangelicalism at the maternal knee. At a maturer stage they signified their adherence to this way of religion by a more formal profession. This condition, however, did not endure. In both men distaste for the tenets of the ancestral creed began to assert itself. Eventually came a complete cleavage and a deviation into paths of life dramatically opposite ; for Francis William became a Deist and Freethinker, John Henry went over to Rome. This event took place in the year 1845.

The secession of J. H. Newman to Rome is one of the important items in nineteenth century history. In these days in which we live the affairs of the Church of Rome, as we know to our cost, are on the upgrade, so far at least as the Anglo-Saxon world is concerned. In that extensive area of wealth, culture and Christian sentiment the Church has regained power and prestige to a marked degree. For this improvement in her prospects she is greatly indebted to her proselyte Newman. His life was a long tale of ninety years and the last sixty of these he spent consciously or unconsciously serving Papal interests. In his time he has proved a valuable recruiting sergeant for Holy Church. Even before he went over himself, disciples of his, more alive than their master to the logic of the situation, were deserting the Anglican fold and submitting themselves to the Pope, and, when the master made the great venture, another

pilgrim company followed suit and a lead was given to a trek Romewards which has gone on ever since.

Newman's day of power, however, as a Romanising force came in 1864, when he gave the world his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. This book is an autobiography written to ward off an accusation of untruthfulness levelled by Canon Kingsley against the controversialists of Rome not excluding Newman himself, also to dissipate an old prejudice against Newman as a Jesuit and doubledealer during the latter part of his Anglican career. Previous to the appearance of the book a pamphlet war between himself and Kingsley had excited public interest, so the way was paved for the larger demonstration. Partly because the book was a masterpiece of literary style, partly because the author had a charming artless self-revealing way with him, partly because the British public of 1864 were an easy-going tolerant set who had lost the earnest Protestant sense of a former age, the *Apologia* became a great, in fact, a phenomenal success. The writer stepped into the front rank as a master of English prose and a great exponent of religion. A Newman cult established itself in all up-to-date religious and literary circles. Newman allusions and quotations became the mode in pulpit and press. Protestant divines, on their travels, broke their journey at Birmingham to salute the risen sun of religion and letters. In 1879 the new Pope, Leo XIII, falling in with the Newman flair of the British people, made the admired man a prince of the Church. Father Newman became Cardinal Newman. His hymns found their way into all Protestant collections and, when he died in 1890, eulogies went up from a thousand pulpits, Protestant and Papal, and appreciations flowed from a thousand pens. This adulation of Newman did not terminate with himself. It overflowed to the system with which he was identified. In Newman the Romish Church underwent a rehabilitation. Her repellent form was seen in softened light. Aversion gave place to toleration, toleration frequently to admiration and complacence. In illustration of the revolution that has passed upon British Protestant sentiment—a revolution which we very much attribute to the influence of Newman—we instance the patronage and praise now bestowed on the Oberammergau Passion Play. This spectacle, once a thing instinctively reprobated by the British public, is now written up admiringly in our religious magazines and has even been graced by the presence of some of our Protestant ecclesiastics.

II

Thoughtful persons easily perceive that under this Newman furore a serious issue lurks. Luther, Calvin, Knox and the whole generation of the first reformers knew the Church of Rome well. They forsook her, nevertheless, and they tell us they did so lest they should lose their souls. Newman, with the added light of three intervening centuries to guide him, did the contrary thing. He re-entered the Church of Rome and he did so, he tells us, to save his soul. There is here, therefore, an absolute war of opinion and an issue emerges which urgently challenges judgment. Before, however, attempting to pronounce this judgment we will state precisely what the issue is.

If Newman then is right, the Reformation is wrong— portentously wrong. It is a European calamity to be classed with the Black Death or the irruption of the Turks. If Newman is right the Spanish Inquisition is right, the burning of Latimer and Ridley is right, and the Bartholomew Massacre, Alva's red record in the Netherlands, the wholesale extermination of Waldenses and Albigenes by the armed emissaries of Holy Church are not matters for execration. They are things to be celebrated with medals, paintings and high Masses. If Newman is right we should abolish the Bible Society, muzzle the free press, scrap our whole heritage of painfully acquired civil and religious liberties and bow our necks willingly to the absolutism of a new Hildebrand. If Newman is right, a celibate priest with authority to worm out the secrets of the whole community in the confessional should be installed in every parish as the monarch of all he surveys. If Newman is right, on every high hill and under every green tree we should erect an image of the Virgin; on our bended knees we should recite her glories and say "Mary! Thou art the hope and refuge of sinners." If Newman is right, our three centuries of Protestant hagiology, heavy laden with the record of triumphant martyr deaths, mystic experiences of divine communion, Sabbath day solemnities sanctified by the brooding presence of the Holy Dove, must go by the board as so much Satanic delusion, and the achievements of Protestant philanthropy in freeing slaves, reforming prisons, alleviating sorrows and healing wounds must be flouted as so many samples of casting out devils by Beelzebub the chief of the devils. Finally, if Newman is right, sacraments are the chief means of grace and not the preaching of the Evangel as the Apostle Paul tells us; and the

worshipper's main errand at Church is not to imbibe the sincere milk of the Word, but to swallow the wafer over which a man in priestly garb has recited his Latin formula. We say, if Newman is right. If Newman, however, is wrong, as we presume to think is the case, none of these revolutionary notions need be entertained. It is incumbent, however, upon us to explain, if possible, the tragedy of his strange life, to show how it came to pass that a man of alert sagacious mind, with all the voices of Scripture, history and experience to guide him, should peril his soul on the insane supposition that Papal Rome with her baptised paganism is the authentic reproduction of Pentecost and the Apostle Paul.

We preface our attempt with a brief resumé of Newman's outward history. He was a Londoner by birth, the year of his nativity being 1801. His father was partner in a banking firm which, however, suffered a reverse at the close of the Napoleonic wars. The household was a Church of England one addicted to the Evangelical way. When seven years of age Newman was sent to Dr. Nicolas' school at Ealing and while there was noted for his bookishness and aloofness from sports and games. In 1817 he joined Trinity College, Oxford, and began an association with Oxford life which lasted for twenty-five years. In 1822 he was transferred to Oriel, the leading college of the University, having gained a Fellowship there, the emoluments of which were welcome since home circumstances were now adverse. In 1824 he was ordained deacon and appointed curate of St. Clements, Oxford. In 1825 he was advanced to the priesthood and served his first Eucharist. In 1826 he obtained the influential post of Tutor in Oriel. In 1828 he was instituted to the Vicarage of St. Mary's, Oxford, a church under the patronage of the University, where he preached the *Plain and Parochial Sermons* which fill eight volumes of his works. In June, 1832, he finished his book on the *Arians of the Fourth Century* and, in September, started on a continental tour in the company of his fellow tutor, Hurrell Froude. He visited Rome, had a serious illness in Sicily and wrote *Lead Kindly Light* on the homeward voyage. When he reached England he found that the times were stirring. The Reform Bill had been passed, a Liberal (or Whig) Government were in power, threats of Disestablishment were being made and danger of unsound men being promoted to places of influence and power in the Church of England was imminent. There was a rally of friends of the Church for her defence. This Defence

Association was mostly of a High Church complexion ; and Newman and a set connected with him were its extreme left wing. But the Newman section soon hived off and became an independent party. They were the young party, the party who had seen a vision and whose policy was a policy of thorough. The vision they had seen was the Church as she existed in the fourth and fifth centuries, as she existed more ambiguously in the days of Laud and the Caroline divines, and as her lineaments could still be traced in Keble's *Christian Year* and in the surviving sacerdotalism of the Anglican Prayer Book. In conformity with this pattern seen in the Nicene era, the Church of England was to be revived and reformed. This meant the restoration within her of celibacy and asceticism, the transmutation of her ministers unto priests, the reintroduction of the vogue of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence and Priestly Absolution ; the stigmatising of Protestant doctrine as heresy, the unchurching of Dissenters and the exaltation of the Church of England as the one ark of safety in the realm. The whole scheme looked like a recrudescence of Popery and the sturdy Protestant sentiment of the time became vocal. Newman and his friends, however, made a distinction between Popish and Catholic. What was Popish they professed to condemn, but what was Catholic, i.e., what pertained to the undivided Christendom of the fourth and fifth centuries they claimed a right to acclimatise in the Church of England. The theory was that, thus assimilated in doctrine and practice to that golden age of Christianity, the Anglican church would survive the onslaught both of theological corrupters and political foes.

From 1833 to 1842 Newman was a busy man in the interests of this Neo-Catholicism. The movement in connection therewith was known as the Oxford or Tractarian Movement and of that movement Newman was chief champion and exponent. The issue of the "Tracts for the Times" which was a main item in the history of the movement was due to his initiative. Tract I, which was an exposition of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, was his work. This tract was issued September, 1833. In this address to the clergy of the Church of England he exhorted these officials to realise the mystical fact of their Apostolical Succession and to live up to it. In February, 1841, he wrote the last tract, No. 90, proving that a man could be a good Catholic and still sign the Thirty-nine Articles. The issue of this tract raised a storm which drove him from public life in the English

Church. He retired to a monastic retreat which he had built for himself at Littlemore, near Oxford, and remained there for two years ruminating and writing his *Development of Christian Doctrine*, a work intended to put a new face on the multitudinous accretions to New Testament doctrine and order made by the Church of Rome. These, he maintains, are legitimate developments of the original deposit brought to light by the slow process of theological thought and in due time receiving the Papal imprimatur as articles of the faith. Thus the Immaculate Conception is instinct in the fact of the Incarnation. It dawns gradually on pious minds up and down the Church; it is debated for centuries and at last is recognised as an implicate of the original deposit and made *de fide* by a decree of the infallible authority. He worked out a great number of theses on the same lines and at last fully convinced himself that he had found the right method of regularising and rendering venerable a great many things in the Roman system that repel and scandalise Protestants. In October, 1845, Newman was received into the Church of Rome where, for the next forty-five years, so far as mind and conscience are concerned, he professed to be perfectly happy. With the exception of a year or two spent at Rome and the interval 1854-58 passed in Dublin, Newman spent the remainder of his life at Edgbaston, near Birmingham, as the Superior of a semi-monastic educational establishment. During his Roman career he accomplished a great deal of literature the chief items being his *Apologia*, 1864 and *Grammar of Assent*, 1870.

III

The religious history that was interwoven with these external events was a thing of two transitions—a transition, probably about 1822, from Evangelical Calvinism to Anglo-Catholicism, and a transition, 1845, from Anglo-Catholicism to Romanism. The latter transition is related in the *Apologia* with great fullness of detail, the former transition, which is much the more important of the two, is dispatched in a curt, unintelligible manner. This difference reflects Newman's disesteem for the Evangelical order. He, doubtless, came to regard Evangelicalism as an effete outclassed affair which had outstayed its welcome on the planet and whose obsequies, in his own case, were not worth elaborating. Nevertheless, Evangelicalism was

his first phase and he received a good send-off along that haunted well-worn track. His mother was of Huguenot descent, with the spirit of old times still surviving in her. She nurtured her son on the Bible and taught him to read the Protestant divines. When he went to Dr. Nicolas' school at Ealing these influences followed him, and in the last year of his school life he experienced what he describes as a conversion. "When," says he, "I was fifteen (in the autumn of 1816) a great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influences of a definite creed and received into my intellect impressions of dogma which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured. Above and beyond the conversations and sermons of the excellent man, long dead, Rev. Walter Mayers, who was the human means of this beginning of divine faith in me, was the effect of the books which he put into my hands, all of the school of Calvin. One of the first books which I read was a work of Romaine's; I neither recollect the title nor the contents except one doctrine which, of course, I do not include among those which I believe to have come from a divine source, viz., the doctrine of final perseverance. I received it at once and believed that the inward conversion of which I was conscious (and of which I am still more certain than that I have hands or feet) would last into the next life and that I was elected to eternal glory." Here comes to light a characteristic Newman trait, namely, his capacity for a sudden easy swallowing of large novel propositions which other men ponder long and carefully. With a little persuasion he is now established in the belief that he is elected to eternal glory. Further on we shall discover him taking in, on the same easy terms, Baptismal Regeneration, Apostolical Succession, the Validity of Catholic Tradition, all propositions that are devoid of self-evidence and bristle with matter of controversy. Romaine's article of the Perseverance of the Saints is certainly not a matter of doubtful disputation but, at that point in his religious history, Newman's interest in this glory to be revealed was not to be suddenly assumed and his easy admission of such a large proposition brings to light one of the characteristic vices of his mind history.

With regard to this conversion we note that, from the Evangelical standpoint, it is a suspect affair. So far as it went it, no doubt, was a valuable experience and should have led to another issue, but unfortunately a wrong turn was given later on. A reviewer of the *Apologia* who signs himself R.r., writing in the

British and Foreign Evangelical Review for 1864, criticises this conversion thus:—"There is no evidence, so far as we have observed, of his having received then or afterwards any deep impression from the doctrine of the Atonement as usually presented by Evangelical writers." Newman himself, in an autobiographical fragment published later, reviews this experience of his in a way which is damaging. "This conversion," says he, "had in it none of the special Evangelical experiences. He did not go through the prescribed stages of conviction of sin, terror, despair, news of full and free salvation, joy and peace, etc. The normal Evangelicals doubted whether he had been converted at all."

Nevertheless some spiritual experience did, at this time, befall Newman, and under it he became a good young man of a type not uncommon. He lived a secluded life (as a student at Trinity), wrote a diary, framed Scripture arguments for, or against, controverted points in divinity and did a lot of good reading. A very favourite author was Thomas Scott, the commentator, whose Commentary he purchased and whose sermons and other works he diligently conned. He also loved to dip into Milner's *History of the Church*, a history composed upon the theory (which happens to be true) that the course of Church history has been one of alternate decays and revivals. He also read *Newton on the Prophecies*, deriving thence the idea that the Pope is the Anti-Christ of Daniel, Paul and John, an idea that troubled him even to the verge of his surrender to the Romish system. In the year 1822 or 1823, however, there came a great landslide in Newman's religious beliefs, the real history of which has been kept dark. He rejected Calvinism, root and branch, and took on the ascetico-sacerdotal scheme of religion afterwards known as Anglo-Catholicism. The first signal of this revolution was given in the preaching of his maiden sermon in Warton Church, near Oxford. This sermon was delivered shortly after his ordination in 1824. It was listened to by Rev. Walter Mayers, the excellent Evangelical man above noted, and by his brother Francis William, now a student at Oxford and still an Evangelical. Both men were astounded to note that the corner stone of the preacher's doctrine was the once abjured tenet of Baptismal Regeneration. This theological somersault affected the younger brother painfully, because, about two years previously, John Henry had communicated to Francis William

a thesis against Baptismal Regeneration. He had composed this for his own establishment in the Protestant position and had then passed it on for the benefit of his younger brother. But now the exploder of Baptismal Regeneration had become an expounder thereof and J. H. Newman, in a way very opposite to that of Saul of Tarsus, was out to preach the faith which once he destroyed. The inwardness of this change, we say, was hidden from the first witnesses of it ; it is also hidden from us.

IV

Delivered from the trammels of Calvinism, Newman's proficiency in his new faith was rapid. One important circumstance was his translation, in 1822, from Trinity College to Oriel. In Trinity he had passed the time obscurely as a scholar, but the Fellowship he had won in Oriel entitled him to rub shoulders with professors and principals, and the Oriel set, at this period, were a bright companionable lot. At Trinity Newman had been viewed askance as a sorry Evangelical, but at Oriel, Dr. Hawkins, Dr. Whately, Dr. Coplestone and other official persons made a point of being urbane and tolerant to him and to everybody. Under the sunshine of the new environment Newman thawed and came out of his shell. The opinions then current at Oriel were partly liberal and partly High Church, and Newman intimates that he had hospitality for new views on either hand. The following is an account of the new creed construction which he achieved at Oriel, say, from 1823 to 1829 : " It is with pleasure," he says, " that I here pay a tribute to the memory of the Rev. William Jones, then Fellow of Oriel, who, about the year 1823, taught me the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, in the course of a walk, I think, round Christ Church Meadow. I recollect being somewhat impatient of the subject at the time." The reader will notice how quizzical and curious this account of the matter is. The tenet of the Apostolical Succession of bishops bristles with matter of controversy both on the historical and spiritual side. If the enquirer has any alertness of mind his objections cannot be dealt with in the course of a morning's walk round a meadow. The tenet moreover is one of very solemn import. It is, if true, one of the things of faith and it cannot be worthily apprehended by a learner who is listening to the teacher's demonstration in a bored and listless frame of mind. The man who writes a history of his religious opinions

in this quizzical strain has, we think, lapsed into absent-mindedness or triviality. From Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, Newman gained some significant instruction. The Doctor convinced him that it was a foolish way he hitherto had of sorting mankind into two lots, the converted and the unconverted. He taught him likewise the cardinal tenet of Baptismal Regeneration and the still more cardinal tenet of the superior place which Tradition holds in the prescription of belief. The true source of doctrine, Hawkins held, was Catholic Tradition and the Creeds. Scripture was only of use to prove the articles thus derived. This, as Newman observes, struck at the idea on which the Bible Society is founded and it was only a matter of time for him to withdraw his subscription from the Oxford Branch. Dr. Whately was not a bad kind of man, but he was of Arminian views and, doubtless, contributed to the wreck of Newman's Calvinism. From Whately, however, he learned a true doctrine if it be not abused by ultramontane pretensions—the doctrine, namely, of the spiritual independence of the Church.

In 1827 Keble's *Christian Year* came out, bathing in poetic glamour the Feasts and Fasts, the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church as an English High Churchman conceives that institution. From this poetic work, in conjunction with *Butler's Analogy* as read by him, Newman gained two dubious notions highly serviceable in the construction of his scheme of theological thought. He gained the notion of the unreality of the material world and the other notion that Probability is the guide of life. The first notion is very useful when you come to argue Transubstantiation and the second enters deeply into Newman's theory of the formation of divine faith. In 1828 he became acquainted with Hurrel Froude, a tutor with himself in Oriel College. Hurrel Froude was the scion of a High Church home, the brother of the historian Anthony Froude. Hurrel was a disciple of John Keble, a reader of William Law and a zealous aspirant after holiness on the ascetic plan. He was a great admirer of the Mediæval Church and from him Newman acquired quite a batch of new ideas. "His opinions," says Newman, "arrested and influenced me even when they did not gain my assent. He professed openly his admiration for the Church of Rome and his hatred of the Reformers. He delighted in the notion of an hierarchal system, of sacerdotal power and of full ecclesiastical liberty. He felt scorn of the maxim 'The Bible

and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants' and he gloried in accepting tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching. He has a high and severe idea of the intrinsic excellence of virginity, and he considered the blessed Virgin its great pattern. He taught me to look with admiration towards the Church of Rome and, in the same degree, to dislike the Reformation. He fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the blessed Virgin and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence." Two other notions, speculative and illicit, came his way during these Oriel days— notions derived from the ancient Fathers Clement and Origen. One was that there is a soul of good in the Pagan cults, that the Greeks, the Romans and other nations were, in some sense, under a preparatory dispensation, as were the Jews. The other notion was one regarding the angel world. Clement or some other Father had voiced the utterly unacceptable opinion that the antediluvian intercourse of the sons of God with the daughters of men was an impossible commerce between fallen angels and daughters of the human race, that the result was an intermediate race of beings partly fallen and partly virtuous. These angelic powers were put in charge of national and public affairs in our world, hence arose the mixture of good and evil in national character and in political parties. This angelic fantasy was almost *de fide* with Newman and we can divine why. He was confronted and perhaps oppressed by the fact that Protestant nations and communities were the haunt of things fair, lovely and of good report to an extent that put Romanist nations, with their boasted possession of the true faith, to shame. The idea that these Protestants were under the tutelage of demigods, partly vicious, partly virtuous, was to him a useful solution that conserved the interests of Holy Church. All this speculation is blameable and ridiculous but, we are advised thereby that Newman, bitterly opposed to the Rationalism and Free Thought of his age, was himself a rationalist, not indeed in the way of taking from, but in the way of adding to the things written in the Book.

V

In the year 1828, besides being a Fellow of Oriel, Newman was appointed vicar at St. Mary's Church, Oxford. This Church was made notable by the four o'clock Sabbath afternoon services held there by the vicar through a course of several years.

The discourses delivered at these services have passed into literature as Newman's *Plain and Parochial Sermons*. As to the doctrine dealt forth from St. Mary's pulpit and the kind of worship conducted there, these took their tone and colour from Newman's revulsion at the Evangelical way. In the typical Evangelical service and the character of the average Evangelical minister Newman thought he beheld something to be shunned and disapproved. Evangelicalism was to him a bankrupt form of religion not only because of its oppressive doctrines, but because of its poverty-stricken form of worship. He said men want a worship which will give scope to the feelings of awe and wonder, beauty and delight, and if they do not get this gratification in the Anglican Communion they will go elsewhere for it. In other words, high mass at St. Peter's, Rome, with its sensuous and spectacular appointments, was the ideal of worship to which he was tending—although, no doubt, for the time being, ritualism at St. Mary's was only in the bud.

Besides Newman's ritualism we shall find another element coming out in these St. Mary's sermons, viz., Newman's Asceticism. This also harks back to his revulsion from the Evangelicalism of his youth. Newman was by nature an ascetic. When only sixteen years of age he had taken up for himself the idea of a celibate life. Dean Church, the historian of the Oxford Movement, says that the typical Evangelical clergyman of the time was fond of a good dinner but very zealous against dancing. We can imagine the silent contempt with which the ascetical Newman beheld the spectacle of a well-conditioned Low Church divine comfortably enjoying his dinner with his wife and family. We are, of course, not admitting the entire rightness of the Dean's indictment of the Evangelical clergy. However, Newman's ideal pulpit figure is a lean aspiring man who kept fasts and vigils amid the solitude of his books. Asceticism was stamped on his own face and comes out in his sermons. These St. Mary's sermons were preached to several relays of undergraduates among whom were many budding publicists and litterateurs. Some of these have given us their reminiscences of Newman at the height of his Anglican career. In these contributions those admirers exhaust the language of eulogy in depicting the personality of the preacher. They tell us little, however, that is precise about the subject matter of the discourses. We can see for ourselves, nevertheless, that as specimens of thought

construction and literary form these pulpit exercises of Newman are worthy of high praise. As sermons, however, intended to save and edify souls their value is nil, or perhaps we should say they are minus quantities. They are not gospel sermons, their general tone is legal, lugubrious and strained. They do not breathe the spirit of adoption, they exhale no perfume of a Christ personally known and enjoyed. We perceive the real poverty of these applauded performances and understand very well that, as far as soul benefit was concerned, "the hungry sheep were looking up and were not fed." The following is a sentence from a candid critique written amid the abounding eulogies of the time of his decease in 1890. The author is the Rev. R. McCheyne Edgar, M.A., Dublin. "Now Newman's gospel, when you examine it, was not salvation by Christ but salvation by the Church. It was salvation by 'baptismal regeneration,' salvation by 'Sacramental grace,' salvation by a priesthood with delegated powers of absolution, salvation in short through rites and ceremonies peculiar to a certain church."

By his preaching and other personal influence at Oxford Newman gathered round him a band of disciples who were his coadjutors in prosecuting the Oxford Movement. By the year 1838 that movement was at its height. The tracts were selling faster than they could be printed. In that year Newman and Keble as joint editors perpetrated the fatuity of issuing the *Diary and Remains* of Rev. Hurrell Froude. The book was a success but of the kind named in France a *success de scandal*. Some extremists were, no doubt, gratified, but the majority of rightminded persons were pained by this frank unfolding of the secret life of an Anglo-Catholic leader. The acrid aversion to the Reformers, the slapdash propaganda, the miserable asceticism, the dreary Christlessness of the whole exhibition proved an eye-opener to many people both well disposed and ill disposed to the Movement. In February, 1841, Newman issued Tract 90, which proved the beginning of the end to himself and the whole Tractarian Movement, so far, at least, as its first phase is concerned. A storm arose which drove him from his place in the official life of the Anglican Church. Likewise a view of Catholic Antiquity dawned upon him that compelled his abjuration of the Anglican position and his surrender to the claims of Rome. He retired with a few companions to the monastic retreat which he had built for himself at Littlemore. He spent two years there in

austerities and in weaving the argument of the *Development of Christian Doctrine*. On October 9th, 1845, he made his exit from the twilight of Anglicanism into the broad daylight (or midnight gloom) of the Church of Hildebrand and Ignatius Loyola.

The argument from Catholic Antiquity which drove Newman from his moorings in Oxford to the open sea of Rome is almost too whimsical to be understood or stated. Briefly, he had mistakenly supposed that Antiquity, that is, the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, was a homogeneous entity. Upon review it appears that it was really a broken affair, vexed with schisms and divisions as was the Church condition of the nineteenth century. He observed that about the year 449 A.D. a three-cornered condition of things existed which was precisely similar to the triangular situation of the year 1841. For, in that far-off year there were the Monophysites, the Semi-Arians and Pope Leo with his Roman Church, and like as Leo and his Roman Church were right as against the Monophysites and the Semi-Arians in 449, so in the year 1841 Pope Pius IX and his Roman Communion were right as against the Anglicans and the Evangelicals. For the Evangelicals are the modern Monophysites and the Anglicans are the Semi-Arians. The Monophysites of old had a simple creed and in support of it they were fond of appealing to Scripture, just as the Evangelicals of the present time plume themselves upon their simple worship, their minimum of rites and ceremonies and this simplicity of theirs they continually justify by Scripture. The Semi-Arians had a more intricate theological system and so the Anglicans of the present have a more complicated system of worship and belief than the Evangelicals. But Pope Leo was right and Monophysites and Semi-Arians were both wrong. And Leo's rightness consisted precisely in adding some articles to the creed as he did at the Council of Chalcedon in refutation of Christological heresy, whether Monophysite or Semi-Arian. And therefore as a Pope who added to the creed in 449 was indubitably right, so a Pope in 1841 who adds to the creed, for example, in the decree concerning the Immaculate Conception, is also indubitably right against Evangelicals and Anglicans. This was the historic parallel that gave Newman the start in 1841. It was, he says, as if he had seen a ghost. For ourselves we confess it leaves us cold. One reason is that we are not much concerned with what

happened in 449 A.D. Our norm is a remoter and holier antiquity and another reason is that the two triangular cases are not parallel at all but manifoldly at variance. To interpret them otherwise is to lapse into mere whimsicality.

VI

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was a very large memorable happening. It was God's answer, God's commentary upon the pretensions and exactions of the huge ecclesiastical despotism that was crushing, with its stranglehold, the life out of men and nations. From the sway of that despotism one half of Europe, by a long agony, rescued itself. The other half failed to escape and remains, to this hour, a base of operations from which the enslaver endeavours to operate. Any man who will propose to disannul the Reformation and sell us again into the hands of the old despotism, much more any man who will try to persuade us that he has a divine commission to effect this result, must submit to have his pretensions very closely investigated. We here adduce three considerations which go to prove that the light that was in Newman was darkness. The failure which attaches to Newman's conversion was a failure to get at Christ as a Fountainhead of life and light. Christianity means union to Christ and this union is effected by an operation of the word of truth. The Romanists have their transubstantiation whereby they say that Christ is present in, by and with the consecrated bread. We Protestants also have our transubstantiation whereby we say that Christ is mysteriously present in, by and with the word of truth. The records of Evangelicalism outside the Church of Rome and the records of living Christianity inside that Church always turn upon the fact of this contact with Christ which is attainable through hearing the words which are spirit and life. If Newman had duly weighed the case of Augustine he would have been constrained to believe that there is an excellent experience connected with the due use of the inspired Book. Instead, however, of waiting till this experience overtook him he took the other course of disbelieving that any such experience existed. Note his pronouncement at page 87 of his *Development of Christian Doctrine*: "The common-sense of mankind does but support a conclusion thus forced upon us by analogical considerations. It feels that the very idea of revelation implies a present informant and guide, and that an

infallible one : not a mere abstract declaration of truths unknown before to man or a record of history or a result of antiquarian research but a message and a lesson speaking to this man and that. This is shown by the popular notion that has prevailed among us since the Reformation that the Bible itself is such a guide ; and which succeeded in overthrowing the supremacy of Church and Pope for the very reason that it was a rival authority not resisting merely but supplanting it. In proportion then as we find, in matter of fact, that the inspired volume is not adapted or intended to subserve such a purpose, we are forced to revert to that living and present Guide, who, at the era of our rejection of her, had so long been recognised as the dispenser of Scripture according to times and circumstances and the Arbiter of all true and holy practice to her children. We feel a need and she of all things under heaven supplies it. We are told that God has spoken. Where ? In a Book. We have tried it and it disappoints, that most holy and blessed gift, not from fault of its own, but because it is used for a purpose for which it was not given."

In opposition to this pronouncement we say that ten thousand witnesses down the ages declare that there is a power resident in the word of truth to bring men into touch with a living Speaker, and that an experience of this power is the deep secret of the Reformation, the deep secret of Evangelicalism, and that the failure of Newman to feel this power is the deep secret of the tragedy of his life.

Side by side with this failure in regard to the central experience we note another failure, fatal to his claim to have the guidance of the Spirit of Truth—his failure, viz., to see the moral glory of the Reformation. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was a revolution which had a transcendental side. A world of powerful spiritual transactions and experiences is included in its story, and by all truth loving persons this record has to be faced and its facts accounted for. Protestant thinkers can give a consistent and credible account of these signs and portents. We say the Reformation came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God (we will venture to say it) spake and did and suffered as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And like as Elijah of old erected a rival altar to the altar of Baal and that proceeding was justified and publicly ratified by the descent of the fire from Heaven, so on the Reformation

Sacrifice the fire has descended, not once but many times. The sacred fire of the Holy Ghost bringing about a divine result of quickened sinners and edified, consoled and beautified saints, has been time and again busy in our congregations, families and private haunts of souls given to prayer. The records of these works of a Power unseen but real are written in a world of Protestant and Evangelical literature. We say that before any man can presume to desert the Protestant sphere in which he was born, and fill the habitable world with a rumour that the Protestant way is a delusion and failure he must dispose of the previous question of the divine countenance thus apparently given to the despised way of Luther, Calvin and Knox. If these are the footsteps of Deity, let Newman and his fellows fairly admit the fact. If these manifestations betoken a contrary power, let him, after he has satisfied us that he has squarely faced the evidence, boldly say so. The fact that Newman has spent no time on this very relevant investigation certifies that he, somehow, has missed the guidance of the spirit of Truth.

And as he has been blind to the moral glory of the Reformation which he renounced, so also, we take it, he has been blind to the moral infamy of the ill-starred system which he has embraced. We conclude this from the small, the mysteriously small attention which he has paid to one mighty and terrible feature of Rome's history, viz. her record of blood and cruelty. Cruelty and bloodshed are of the essence of the Papacy. "I beheld," says the Seer, "the woman drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus." Her red record is written large in the annals of the nations of Europe, and whosoever is not horrified by the spectacle it is because he is mysteriously blinded. The nearest Newman comes to an acknowledgment of this portentous fact of the Papal order is to admit that in the course of a history extending over a thousand years, doubtless there are some things to regret and explain. He actually subscribes to the delirious finding of a French zealot. "Holy Church," says this quaint person, "has never shed one drop of innocent blood. Protestantism, in its baleful progress, has shed torrents." Newman's picture of the mediæval times of Papal predominance is like that which might be given by some sophistical Hindoo idealist who, harking back to some visionary golden age of Hindoo religion should give an alluring picture of its beauties and benefits and should inflame the spirit of his countrymen by saying

“What a debt of indignation we owe to the spoiler who has ploughed up all this scene of peace and purity.” Meanwhile, he is quite silent on the ghastly seamy side of Hindoo history. He says nothing about the immolation of widows, the suicidal orgies of Juggernaut, the exposure of infants, the miseries of caste, the vogue of female degradation and helplessness. The dark places of India have been full of the habitations of cruelty, but upon all this the idealist keeps his thumb. At the same time he is very copious upon the abuses of British rule. He can give chapter and verse for a lurid list of British wrongs and outrages and, according to his account, British history in India has been an unrelieved tale of sin and misery. There is nothing impossible in such a feat of bamboozlement. It is an affair mainly of omission and wrong emphasis. The clever Hindoo idealist could achieve such a feat, but his picture would be a misrepresentation, a sophism, a lie. Pretty much like this supposed Hindoo inversion of things is Newman’s reading of Protestant history as given in his *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*. His contemporary, Lord Acton, editor of the *Cambridge History*, a Romanist, although a curiously truthful and candid one, said of Newman that he was the “manipulator, not the servant, of truth.” Newman professed to have seen a vision certifying that the Church of Rome is the true Church and haunt of salvation. He was loud and eloquent in his endeavours to convert us all to the same belief. Our point has been to prove that he has some initial disabilities that utterly unfit him for the rôle of a spiritual guide.

JOHN McNEILAGE.

Bower, Caithness.