

# 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>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

from which you cannot see your Saviour's face nor feel the heat of a Father's heart lying upon your own. Into such chill regions of experience it is well not to wander. It is doleful work there. That is a cheerless, and it is a fruitless, land. To abide in sunlight, one must follow the sun and one must face the sun. He of us who so follows Jesus shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.

J. OSWALD DYKES.

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF  
CARDINAL NEWMAN.

It is not without reluctance that I have undertaken, at the editor's request, to place on record sundry personal recollections of the great Cardinal who has passed away. He has, more than any one other man, influenced my own life and career, whether for good or for evil it is hardly for me to say. I was still a schoolboy when the appearance of his *Apologia* in bi-monthly parts first attracted my attention to him, and thenceforward I was more and more conscious of his influence, though I never saw him until ten or eleven years later. I recollect eagerly buying his *Grammar of Assent* on its first appearance—my copy was doubtless the first one sold in Oxford—and reading it with intense though somewhat perplexed interest. The Vatican Council was sitting at the time, and the theological atmosphere was murky with the papal infallibility controversy. I did not at that time, nor at any subsequent time, attach the highest importance to that. It seemed to me, what it seems now, an internal domestic question of the Roman Church, practically settled in the affirmative long ago, and a matter of expediency or policy whether it should be formally decided or no. But the *Grammar of Assent* went to the roots of the whole difficult question of dogmatic faith, and it was pleasant to note the writer's cheery treatment of it, as he

passed from one subtle disquisition or ingenious illustration to another, apparently sublimely unconscious of the theological wrangle of the day. A few years later I was so impressed by the weight of his authority in the controversy between the Roman and Anglican Churches, while I was strenuously maintaining the position of the latter, that I had in view an elaborate criticism of his anti-Anglican utterances, hoping to show that from time to time he seriously contradicted himself, and relying not a little on the prevalent impression that he was not really at his ease within the Roman Church. When this contention became untenable in the face of the well-known sentence in the postscript to the second edition of his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* in reply to Mr. Gladstone's attack on *Vaticanism*, I found myself unable any longer to resist the strength of the many arguments which go to prove that, granted a mystical and ecclesiastical system is the legitimate outcome of primitive Christianity, the Roman Church has the best claim to be recognised exclusively as "the Church." It was to him that I went, almost as a matter of course, to be received into the Church; and, after a few months on the Continent, I lived for more than seven years as a member of his community, under the same roof, and for the greater part of the time in the closest intimacy with him. So much it seems necessary to say, if I am to claim to speak with any authority, as having had direct knowledge of the man, and not merely as a casual visitor, who may have had an hour's conversation with him from time to time; and the misgiving to which I have alluded is not due to any lack of opportunity for knowing his mind on a great variety of subjects, but to a consciousness that (as the proverb teaches is inevitable) proximity somewhat dwarfed the great idea I had formed of him from his writings and from the common repute. This is especially true of the four or five years that I knew him after he had become Cardinal; and yet at the

same time I do not wish to be taken to mean that this dwarfing process is true of all that I learnt about him. In some ways my respect and affection for him grew as I knew him better; and I have never ceased to feel towards him more tenderly than I have ever felt towards any other man, though for seven years I have now been separated from him by the same waves of theological controversy which before brought me to his feet. I shall therefore set down naught in malice, though I admit that my position will lay me open to suspicion of acting otherwise. There is however already, indeed there has long been, a mythical Newman, just as in High Anglican circles there is also a mythical Keble and a mythical Pusey. I may then be able to contribute something which will be serviceable hereafter to those who want to form a true idea of what the man actually was. An extended biography I have not been asked to write, and I have no idea of attempting it. Some of the details I record may be accounted trivial, but none, I think, are altogether without interest.

Newman was pre-eminently a theologian in the popular sense, as having experienced and closely scrutinised all the intimate facts of religious consciousness; but he was certainly not a typical Catholic theologian in the scientific sense. No doubt he read, when in Rome, so much of the scholastic philosophy and theology as was expected of him, but it never interested him. St. Athanasius was more to his taste; and I recollect that when Leo XIII. made sundry pronouncements in favour of an exclusive use of the writings of St. Thomas, and the Cardinal was in duty bound to write to his holiness approving and praising his action, he slipped in a saving clause, claiming that St. Athanasius was doubtless included in the papal recommendation. So again, without actively controverting the accepted Catholic position, that the existence of a personal God can be certainly known to man by the light of reason, in his view that knowledge

was rather a matter of intuition than of logic. And, doubtless with the most transparent sincerity, he maintained that God's existence was as clear to him as his own. I can recall the soft and reverent tones in which he would refer to such a topic, plainly conscious that where he trod was holy ground, and infusing faith into others more by a kind of magnetic sympathy than by argument. If I rightly understood him, it was impossible to "get behind" Divine faith. It was to be recognised as a fact whose existence could not be denied. He admitted that the conclusions of faith were more solid and certain than the premisses to which men appealed in support of them. But that was no matter, and did no discredit to those conclusions, which had a moral rather than an intellectual basis. His doctrine on this subject is best made clear by some brief *Theses de Fide* which he used as the text for a course of lectures delivered in 1877 to myself and two other members of the community.<sup>1</sup> He admitted that this doctrine had been condemned as dishonest (I think in a conversation he had held with Sir James Stephen), and he noted, with a transient expression of pain, that I had some sympathy with that view; but he did not think it necessary to do more than restate his position.

It is never easy to estimate what a man's historical knowledge may be unless he has written on that period which we have ourselves specially studied. A passing remark may attest insight, but not information. My impression is that in this respect Newman was vastly inferior to Döllinger. Of course there was a period which he had made his own, that of the Arian controversy; and here he was second to none. Doubtless too there were sundry episodes and sundry personages belonging to other epochs about which he had good information and clear and correct ideas. But of the earlier centuries he appeared

<sup>1</sup> A translation of these theses will be given in an appendix to these articles.

to know but little, and not to care much for what could be known ; while he scarcely entered upon the great field of Church history subsequent to the days of Arianism and extending to our own times. Of course he had the knowledge of it that every educated person has, and a knowledge better than that somewhat uncomplimentary expression implies. But it would be a mistake to regard him as an expert in the case of (let us say) Pope Honorius ; he would himself have disclaimed any such position, and he had rather a contempt for knowledge acquired by "mere antiquarian research."

In regard to the Bible, or rather to "Scripture," as he almost invariably styled it, his position was pretty much that of the old evangelical school. Biblical criticism, as it is now understood, had no interest for him. At one time he had made some study of the English Catholic versions, and had hoped to have been given the task of producing a revised one. In that case what he would have done would not have gone beyond a closer approximation to the Authorized Version of 1611. That version never ceased to be "Scripture" to him. After five-and-thirty years within the Roman Church, he still could not avoid quoting it in his sermons instead of the Rheims or Douay. Nor is this surprising when it is remembered that Catholic priests, with the rarest exceptions, never read the Bible beyond what they have to read (the same passages constantly repeated) in the recitation of the office, and that, apart from those portions which are read as the epistle and gospel on Sundays at high mass, they never have occasion to read the English Catholic versions at all, and are as little familiar with them as are the laity, which is saying a good deal. Behind the Vulgate, Newman, as I knew him, never cared to go. Of recent criticism of the Greek Testament he knew nothing ; and as to the Old Testament, never having studied Hebrew or its cognate languages, he was not in a position

to do more than follow the received Latin or English texts. So far as I can judge, he had never so much as heard of recent theories, such as that about the post-captivity date of the detailed Mosaic law, etc.; and as he knew no German, and never had occasion to meet the English exponents of the German and Dutch criticism, I believe that this was really the case. One could wish it had been otherwise, and that he had been free to follow or to criticise the critics; for his characteristic penetration would certainly have thrown light on questions that yet remain dark. But that was not his field. He was not insensible to the difficulties which modern ideas, mainly moral, have placed in the way of the old-fashioned belief in plenary inspiration; and his way of meeting them may be seen in his article on the subject in the *Nineteenth Century* for February, 1884. What it comes to is this, that whereas the Vatican Council has plainly declared that the whole Bible "has God for its author," Newman thought we might fairly interpret this in a sense which would practically read "has God for its editor." Further than this he did not go.

It is natural to compare or contrast Newman with Döllinger. Before 1870 it was generally thought they had much in common; and doubtless they had this much, that they both distrusted the policy of Pius IX. But Döllinger had visited Newman a few years before, and the two men had found it hard to get on with each other. "It was like a dog and a fish trying to make friends," so the latter described it some time later. The ultimate basis of Newman's dogmatic theology was feeling, that of Döllinger's was history. They were together for a time, just as two travellers are, one ascending and the other descending a hill. No doubt Newman deplored Döllinger's excommunication, in the sense that he thought that one who had served the Church so well deserved every sort of considera-

tion, and that no irrevocable step against him should have been taken till every form of private influence had been tried again and again and had failed. But of the justice of his excommunication in that event he entertained no doubt. Newman's position in the infallibility controversy was much misunderstood, and it must be confessed that he did little to clear up the misunderstanding. The doctrine itself he never doubted, and never dreamed of doubting; it was not to him less credible than any other part of the Catholic creed. Indeed, he went beyond what was required of him in the matter, as he himself told me, believing that the pope is infallible in canonization. Why under these circumstances he should have resented, as he certainly did, the definition, almost as if it had been personally directed against himself, is a mystery which he has never explained, though there are passages in his published writings which give some kind of clue to his meaning.

Some six or eight miles from Birmingham, on the road to Bromsgrove, lies Rednal, where there is a small country house of the Oratory, in which Newman used to spend a good deal of his time and write a good deal. It was here, I believe, that the *Apologia* was written. The house is just visible from the railway, nearly hidden in the trees, on the side of the Lickey Hill, soon after the traveller has passed Barnt Green station, on the line from Worcester to Birmingham; but the place must be approached nearer if its full charm is to be realized. A little bit of Scotland seems to have been dropped here into an English midland county. The hills are not lofty, but are picturesquely arranged, partly covered with pines and partly with deciduous trees hiding a rich undergrowth, the more exposed parts being carpeted with heather and bilberry, while the views are extensive in every direction. It is part of the "idea" of the Oratory to have a country place, just as the Roman Oratory has its "villa"; and the Edgbaston community always had such

an establishment in view, though their position in the suburbs rendered it hardly so necessary. If I rightly recollect what I was told, Rednal and its charms were discovered by Father Ambrose St. John (Newman's closest personal friend) one day when he was out riding. He contributed a substantial sum to the purchase of the land and the building of the little house and chapel, but the original fund was the surplus remaining after the expenses of the Achilli trial had been paid—friends having collected some £13,000 for that purpose; and I think that the profits on the sale of the re-issue of the *Plain and Parochial Sermons*, or a sum paid by Messrs. Rivingtons for the privilege of reprinting them, were devoted to increasing and improving the property at a later date. Anyhow this delightful retreat was to Newman as the apple of his eye; sometimes he would spend several days there consecutively, or at any rate he would be there one night every week, and say mass in the little chapel in the morning. He would walk about the garden and the fields, spud in hand, and he was never tired of giving directions for removing this or that tree or shrub, and replacing them by something that he hoped would grow there with better effect. It cannot be said that he was successful as a landscape gardener; such artificial beauty as Rednal has is due rather to Father St. John, after whose death in 1875 Newman often deplored his own inability to manage the place as it had been managed before. But it was always with pride and pleasure that he received visitors there and showed them over the grounds; and almost the only occasion when he displayed the geniality usually supposed to be characteristic of a parish priest, even welcoming poor children, with whom at other times he showed scant sympathy, was when they came out to Rednal, by his permission, for their annual summer excursion. In the little graveyard below the chapel lie buried Father Ambrose St. John and Father

Edward Caswall, whose hymns and translations have been so widely popular; and henceforth the place will be famous as the last resting-place of the Cardinal himself.

He took an immense interest in the Latin plays which for some years were performed by the boys of the Oratory School at the midsummer breaking-up. Their introduction was originally due to Father St. John, who brought the tradition from Westminster; but the idea was taken up with something like enthusiasm by Newman, who edited several plays of Terence and Plautus—transforming the broad *Eunuchus* into what he named the *Pincerna*—and writing prologues and epilogues appropriate to the new circumstances of their performance. On several occasions these performances were admitted by competent judges to be about as good as possible. No trouble or expense was spared to make them perfect in every detail; and inmates of the house, who knew the somewhat shaky condition of its finances, were dismayed at the recklessness which brought wig-makers and costumiers to the Oratory so that the “get up” of each player might be correct. The somewhat stiff traditions of Westminster were certainly improved upon, and the performances were made as intelligible and as enjoyable as possible; but only the actors knew how much Newman himself had contributed to make it a genuine histrionic success. He coached nearly every one privately, and astonished them not a little by the extraordinary versatility and dramatic power with which he would personate for their imitation a love-sick Roman exquisite or a drunken slave. Perhaps there was never any more remarkable testimony to the attractiveness of the drama than Newman’s eagerness about the performance of these classical plays, at a time when, by his position as an ecclesiastic, he was excluded from witnessing any theatrical performance of a public kind. And this eager interest he retained when he was over eighty years of age.

Some reference to the Oratory school is necessary, as through this, more than in any other way, Newman has undoubtedly influenced the English Catholic body. It was begun in 1859, and its genesis may be ascribed to Newman's innate love for young men and their training, which he needed in some way to satisfy after he had withdrawn from his work as rector of the Catholic University of Dublin. It was the jealousy of the Irish bishops which thwarted him there; and jealousy from other quarters beset the establishment of the school at Edgbaston. It was natural that Oscott, which had possessed something like a monopoly for central England, should resent the setting up of a new school for the same class of boys within the distance of an easy walk; and it was natural that the Jesuits should look with suspicion on an establishment which it was understood would be conducted on principles more liberal and less un-English than their own. But in this school Newman achieved his most genuine and lasting success, unless we so describe his being made a prince of the Catholic Church. As a boys' school Oscott has now ceased to exist, and the Jesuit system in England has been modified in a liberal direction; while meanwhile the school at Edgbaston, which was to combine the traditions of an English public school with Catholic safeguards and surroundings, and did so with marked success for many years, has turned out some of the very best among Catholic priests and laymen. It never had anything to boast of as regards buildings, nor distinguished names in its teaching staff; but it will live in the loyal affection of its "old boys," who are rightly jealous of the good work it has done for higher Catholic education in England.

Newman was passionately fond of music of a certain type, and was himself a very fair musician of the old school. That is to say, up to the year 1879 he fre-

quently took the second violin in quartets of Beethoven, Haydn, and Mozart, and performed the part with scrupulous accuracy, but without (so far as I can recollect) any *verve* or fire. He was very slow and painstaking in getting his instrument perfectly into tune, and he held it low, against the chest, rather than against the neck, as was, I believe, the old-fashioned method.

His interest in music hardly extended beyond the works of the classical composers above named, and it was only for orchestral music, or for concerted pieces for stringed instruments, that he cared. Chorus-singing of the dignified oratorio style had no attractions for him; and the same was true of organ-playing. For many years he was content to have in the church of the Oratory a most miserable and inadequate instrument; and when one of the community made a present to the church of a really fine one, he almost resented the donation; apparently because its effect was to render less necessary the occasional performance of high mass with an orchestra, in which he really delighted. Operatic music was more to his taste than the solemn and serious oratorio, and Beethoven was his favourite composer. Of course he was precluded by his position from ever hearing an opera dramatically performed; but I take it that his ideal would have been reached had he been present at a performance of *Fidelio*, after having had plenty of time thoroughly to familiarize himself with the music: for he always maintained that good music must be known before it can be appreciated, and that a first hearing gave no one the right to judge—a doctrine that might be laid to heart with advantage by our newspaper musical critics. I was with him when Wagner's *Supper of the Apostles* was performed at the Birmingham Musical Festival, I think in 1876; and it made no impression on him whatever. No doubt it is not a good specimen by which to judge of Wagner's peculiar genius; still it shows traces of

his power; but to Newman it seemed to convey no ideas but those of eccentricity and noise. Much the same was the case when we were present at the last rehearsal before the production of Gounod's *Redemption* in 1882. The composer himself conducted, and was presented to the Cardinal, and the managers of the festival were extremely anxious that he should pay him some compliment on his work; but he would say nothing, save that he could not judge by a first hearing, though in this case much of the music is certainly intelligible enough to be at once appreciated. In Gregorian music Newman could see no beauty whatever—none at any rate in the usual antiphons and “tones.” An exception must be made in favour of those familiar chants occurring in the mass for the *Sursum Corda*, the *Prefaces*, and the *Paternoster*. I recollect his telling me, after we had heard one of Cherubini's masses admirably performed at a Birmingham Festival, that the music, though so beautiful, needed the interspersing of those quaint old chants to make it really devotional—a remark which will be accepted as most true by all who know how those simple melodies haunt the memory, and seem to be an indispensable feature in Catholic public worship. Newman left the Church of England before the revival of musical services, Gregorian or otherwise. Protestant Church music to him therefore was of the cathedral type, or else the old-fashioned psalms and hymns; and on that account Gregorian music might have been expected to have for him a specially Catholic savour. But it must be borne in mind that his associations of Catholic worship with music were formed chiefly in Rome, where the plain chant was seldom heard forty or fifty years ago. By introducing the institute of the Oratory into England, Newman contributed something towards the establishment of hymn-singing in the vernacular as a part of Catholic worship in this country. He wrote several beautiful hymns, and made a number

of exquisite translations from the mediæval hymns of the Breviary. But these latter he never thought suitable for common use. For popular devotions, such as those of the month of May, or during *triduos* and *novenas*, he preferred hymns of lighter character, more of the carol type, and several of these, which are to be found in his *Verses on Various Occasions*, became very popular at the Oratory and elsewhere. Many of them he set to music himself in a singularly naïve fashion. Discarding utterly, on account of their associations, the older hymn-tunes, he took melodies from the concerted music of Beethoven, Haydn, etc., and somehow or other made the words go with them. He printed, but did not publish, a collection of the hymn-tunes that he had thus called into existence, many of them arranged in sweet simplicity, with treble and bass parts only. One other remark of his *in re musicâ* I recollect, which was to the effect that stringed instruments, with their plaintive expressiveness, give us the music of humanity, while wind instruments suggest the music of the gods, dwelling in the clouds above.

The mention of popular devotions as used at the Oratory recalls a common mistake about Newman, for which he is himself in part responsible, to the effect that he never took part in any of the extravagances of mariolatry, such as shock the Protestant traveller in Italy and elsewhere. So far from this being the case, Newman was responsible for the introduction at the Oratory of the *Raccoltà*, a collection of popular Italian devotions translated into English by Father Ambrose St. John. These devotions have the speciality of being all "indulged," and beyond that they are mostly expressed in singularly strong terms towards our Lady and the saints, terms that are undoubtedly idolatrous, if, under such circumstances, any terms are. There is no obligation for any one to make use of them, either in private or in public. Apparently they

originated in private use, and for that they are perhaps best adapted. But they are utterly un-English in tone, and many excellent English Catholics feel themselves quite unable to use them. There was a priest at the Oratory, the son of a Catholic Lancashire farmer, who could never see his way to join in these devotions. And it would certainly have astonished many of the admirers of Dr. Newman, who believed that his Catholicism was of a "moderate" kind, if they could have seen him (as they might evening after evening in the month of May) forming one of a semi-circle of priests, vested in cottas and bearing lighted tapers, kneeling before the gaudily painted statue of the Virgin, which stands on the left at the upper end of the nave of the church, and leading or joining in these extravagant and tasteless devotions. In a smaller man one would have set it down to a kind of recklessness, which induces converts to rush to such extremes, and to accept everything that is put before them, on the principle, "in for a penny, in for a pound"; but in the case of Newman so simple an explanation seems insufficient. Perhaps it was the outcome of his loyalty to the institute of the Oratory which led him to prefer the Italian to any other form of Catholicism. Certainly it was the case that classical architecture was more to his taste than Gothic, while the Madonna and Child be thought more helpful to devotion than the crucifix. He had no sympathy whatever with that revival of mediævalism which put stained glass windows, memorial brasses with illegible inscriptions, rood-screens, and the like, in the position of badges of ecclesiastical orthodoxy. His idea of the modern Catholic Church was that it should establish in this country the contemporary externals of religion in Rome. Nothing had a better claim to be authorized than this in the absence in this country of any traditional Catholic rite. To attempt to revive the defunct English Catholicism of the Middle Ages seemed to

him to savour of heresy ; and he chose Roman models in preference to Gothic for the churches that were built, one in Birmingham and the other in Dublin, under his immediate supervision. He took moreover a keen interest in every detail of their furniture and decoration ; and the fact that he approved so much that was merely imitation, and often very poor imitation, leaves his taste in matters of art much open to question. He was very particular about the minutæ of ceremonial, insisting on their due observance, and learning them with scrupulous accuracy himself. I recollect a newly ordained sub-deacon who had just discharged his function as such for the first time at high mass in the presence of the Cardinal, and believed he had made no mistake, being surprised and vexed at being told by him that, when he closed the book at the conclusion of the ceremony, he had left its opening side turned in the wrong direction. And in spite of his being only two years short of fourscore at the time of his being made Cardinal, he took evident delight in learning and performing as accurately as the infirmities of age would allow him the new and somewhat elaborate ceremonial details which his dignity involved. There is a passage in his essay on John Keble (1846) which explains how he felt in regard to these things.

At the time that I knew him he had ceased to possess any striking characteristics as a preacher. In the sense of orator he can hardly be said ever to have been a preacher at all, since he had no power as an *ex tempore* speaker. All his printed sermons were read from manuscript, and when the pen was out of his hand his felicity of diction quite failed him. He told me himself that he never *saw* the congregation he was addressing—a fact which, I suppose, by itself shows that he had no oratorical gift. But when he read with slow and musical enunciation the exquisite sentences he had penned in the privacy of his room, there was something almost magical in the effect. I have in

my mind chiefly the answers that he read in reply to the numerous addresses presented to him on his return from Rome as cardinal. At his reception in the church on his first return he attempted to say a few words *ex tempore*, and he did the same in reply to the first address that he received—it was, I think, from Oscott; but the attempts were failures, and it was painful to listen to him, though he evidently felt deeply what he wished to say. After that he always wrote his replies, and they were in every case admirable and satisfying. His two volumes of Catholic sermons are in various ways better than his Protestant volumes, and these were all written and carefully corrected for publication. But the spoken sermons he used not infrequently to deliver in the church were by comparison deplorable. They were apparently unprepared, and were without plan or point. Occasionally when he uttered some familiar phrase, he would do it with force and feeling; but throughout he was rambling and dreary, and while listening one had to stimulate one's imagination and memory to feel assured that this was the great Dr. Newman, the unrivalled classic preacher of St. Mary's, Oxford. I often used to lament that he did not write out and read something which might have been half the length, and yet a thousand times more effective; and while I think his attempts at spoken sermons were partly due to an idea that preaching ought not to be reading, I am bound to add that I believe indolence and a sort of contempt for the congregation he had to address were partly responsible for them. I can recollect his rushing up to the library a few minutes before he had to be in the pulpit, in fact, while the *Gloria in Excelsis* was being sung, to find something to talk about.

I believe that before 1852, when the Oratory was in Alcester Street, Birmingham, and had attached to it a poor and populous district, Newman was fully as assiduous in parochial work as a Catholic priest can be, and certainly

one cannot but hold his self-devotion in the highest admiration when, at the time of the cholera in the Black Country, he and Father St. John were sent by the bishop, at their own request, to Bilston, to minister to the sick and dying there; but twenty-five years later he not only took no part in parish work himself—that his age of course would explain—but he seemed to regard its being undertaken by any members of his community as at best a necessary evil. To account for this in part—for it is not easy to account for it altogether—it must be remembered that, strictly speaking, the Oratory was not designed to undertake parish work, nor should it have a parish assigned to it. It was intended to supplement the work of the parochial clergy around, its members preaching and hearing confessions almost continually; but they were not expected to visit people at their homes, save in case of sickness, and generally speaking they were to be found at the Oratory, and not elsewhere, and were to regard their own rooms as their nests. In this way the community, at any rate in Rome, obtained to some extent the character of a college of learned divines; and this ideal, rather than the parochial one, was doubtless Newman's. The circumstances of the Catholic Church in England made it however imperative that a definite district should be assigned to the Oratory as its parish; but this arrangement he persisted in regarding as only a temporary one, and on that account he discouraged anything that might tend to bind the Oratory to parochial work.

Similarly he supported very coldly, if he can be said to have supported at all, any schemes that involved the Oratory in responsibilities in the elementary education of the poor. My impression is, that he thought that Catholics throughout the country were wrong in laying on themselves heavy pecuniary burdens in this matter, though of course he could not actively oppose the course that the bishops had decided to adopt. But with his usual penetra-

tion he foresaw that the compromise of 1870 was not an arrangement that could be counted on as permanent; and I gathered from remarks that he made occasionally, for he never expressed any definite opinion, that in his judgment it would have been better to leave the secular education of the children, Catholic and Protestant alike, in the hands of the secular authorities, only insisting that priests should have access to the public schools at certain hours to give religious instruction to the Catholic children in a separate room. It may be found hereafter that these terms are the best the Church will be able to secure, and Newman will then have the credit of having foreseen the ultimate solution; but the whole tendency of Catholic teaching everywhere has been to the effect that the education of Catholics should be wholly in the hands of Catholics; and this principle, so far as it concerns any class but the lowest, Newman would have himself admitted; and he practically enforced it as regards the upper class in founding the Oratory School. I could not escape the impression that Newman, as I knew him, had not that care for the poor which is commonly a characteristic of the Catholic clergy. He had a few retainers among them, to whom he gave alms somewhat freely; but he can hardly claim the beatitude adjudged to the man who "considereth the poor and needy"—in the Catholic version *qui intelligit super egenum et pauperem*. I never knew him make any thoughtful suggestion in regard to their physical, moral, or religious welfare.

ARTHUR W. HUTTON.

(To be concluded.)