DEVELOPMENT & INFLUENCE OF NEWMAN'S ECCLESIASTICAL VIEWS

THE DEVELOPMENT AND INFLUENCE OF NEWMAN'S ECCLESIASTICAL VIEWS.

by

W. Lyall Detlor.

A THESIS

presented to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research of McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of English.

April 29, 1931.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

No student of the life and literature of England in the nineteenth century can afford to neglect a consideration of the religious upheavals which took place in that disturbed age. While in economics, politics and science entirely new theories were being worked out and presented to the unsettled minds of the public, in art, literature and religion many men were turning back to seek their models in centuries gone by. There is thus a certain connection between the Pre-Raphaelites, the Romanticists and the Tractarians. The Oxford Movement, therefore, is not an isolated phenomenon, as is often supposed, but is another manifestation of the tendency prevailing in literature in the opening years of the century. In fact, Carlyle, as is well known, attributed the origination of the Oxford Movement to Coleridge. Not only, however, is there this relation between literature and the reaction within the English Church, but some of the greatest writings of the middle years of the century came from the pen of the leader of the Tractarians. Need it be said that the reference is to John Henry Newman? Newman is a unique figure in the history of English literature. In contrast to, and in protest against, the times in which he lived, his life and

writings provide a fascinating subject of study. As a prose writer Newman ranks among the foremost in an age which produced great prose; while some of his verse is original and of the first order, and has won for its author a permanent place among English poets.

Newman's prose style has been analyzed and scrutinized from all angles. Its most noticeable characteristic is the perfect ease and simplicity and naturalness with which it flows, and its entire freedom from mannerism. It has been called "unobtrusive", because the reader's whole attention is taken up by the subject under discussion, and the personality of the writer is never allowed to project itself before his eyes. Newman never strove for effect in writing, nor to attain an "elegant style"; but simply, as he puts it, "to express clearly and exactly my meaning". He claimed that the great writers did not aim at polished diction, but poured forth beautiful language because they had beautiful thoughts. But if he did not aim at style he was not in any sense careless. On the contrary, he took great pains. He would go over his work time and again, correcting and altering and revising. His thoughts were seldom published in the form in which he first wrote them down. It is generally admitted that his style possessed a much greater range of qualities than that of most masters of prose. It could be adapted to suit any purpose or to express any thought that the writer desired. Yet despite this power, Newman felt the inadequacy of words to bring out his meaning. If he has any peculiarity or distinctive mark at

all it is the piling up of words and clauses at great length, sometimes extending into whole paragraphs, in his endeavour to view a topic from every conceivable angle, and to illustrate it with every possible ray of light. Not only, however, is this trait noticeable in single sentences and paragraphs, but it was his method of treating a whole subject. The "Development of Christian Doctrine" is an excellent example of this. When one has read only the first chapter, he will perhaps agree with little Newman has said; but, as he reads on from page to page, the vast array of facts and illustrations which the writer, with consumate skill, marshals before his view, steadily breaks down all opposition to, and disbelief in, the original thesis which Newman was endeavouring to prove. This has been called his method of "accumulative persuasion". Mr. Bertrand Newman describes it thus: "It is not the phrase so much as the paragraph, not the part but the whole, that is the important thing with him".

Notwithstanding Newman's statement to a friend in a letter of 1869 that the only master of style he had ever known was Cicero, he drew from many sources. He once admitted imitating Johnson, Gibbon and Addison, while echoes of Hooker, Taylor and the Prayer Book are easily traceable in his work. Then too, like many great writers, his language is tinged with the phraseology of the Bible; while Shakespeare influenced him not a little. Barry has said that he "handled (English) prose as Shakespeare handled its verse". There is, however, considerable of the Ciceronian in Newman's style. It was a habit of his life to translate a sentence of English into Latin

every day, and this could not fail to leave its impress upon his writing. Thus it has been said that his style is of "the centre" in the tradition of European prose.

Leslie Stephen stated in the "Agnostic's Apology" that Newman and Mill were the "two greatest masters of philosophical English in recent times". But though Newman stands high among his contemporary writers, he has few affinities to them. With the exception of DeQuincey, whom he resembles in his ability to express with great vividness his inmost thoughts, he shows no similarity to them. Macaulay, Carlyle and Ruskin might have lived in another age as far as their influence upon Newman, or his influence upon them, was concerned. In fact, his style was not the style of the nineteenth century at all, but the style of the eighteenth, the influence of which he had come under through Arnold and Whately. The "Grammar of Assent" is written in the manner of Berkeley, though it lacks the characteristic, philosophical phraseology.

Newman's prose reputation rests largely upon two works: "The Idea of a University", written in connection with his efforts to found a Catholic institution for higher education in Dublin; and the "Apologia" --- particularily the latter. That the "Apologia" would go down to all time as one of the classics of English literature probably never entered Newman's mind while for ten weeks he was writing ceaselessly, page after page, frequently working sixteen hours, and, at least once, for twenty-two hours, at a stretch. Arising out of the famous controversy with Charles Kingsley over Newman's desire

for "truth for its own sake", its sole purpose was to justify the writer and the course of his life in the eyes of Englishmen of his day. But even his own age received it as one of the masterpieces of the language, and posterity has given its assent to the judgement. It has been said that, "Newman's 'Apologia' ranks with St. Augustine's 'Confessions' and Pascal's 'Thoughts' as one of the classics of religious autobiography". The two introductory parts, attacking Kingsley and his method of disputation, were suppressed by the author, and it is perhaps as well that they were. They do, however, along with his writings at the time of the Achilli trial, manifest the caustic side of Newman's nature, and are the best examples of the biting irony and sarcasm of which he was capable.

But if Newman gave us some of the finest English that we possess, the quantity of his work which is still read is small. This is due to the nature of his writings. Newman was essentially the theologian and Church historian, and much of his work was of a polemical nature. Writings of this kind cannot hope to find many readers after the occasion of the controversy has been forgotten. The treatise on the Arians, moreover, or the "Development of Christian Doctrine", or the "Grammar of Assent", cannot be said to be easy reading at any time. Newman was fortunate in the audience for which he wrote. It is safe to say that his writings found more readers in his own day than they would have had they been produced in the twentieth century. The Victorian public not only read

science and history, but also cherished a keen interest in dry discussions upon theological subjects. It may be said with certainty, however, that had Newman written nothing but his purely theological works, they would, despite their graceful and finished style, have dragged their author down to obscurity with them. But his writings which have caught the public fancy have gained a place on the book-shelves of well-informed people throughout the English-speaking world. Someone has said that the "Apologia" is one of the books which all educated people have read, or at least, read in. Not only, however, is the amount of Newman's prose which has become famous small, but his poetry, some of it ranking with the best, has been gathered into one little volume.

"The Dream of Gerontius" is Newman's greatest poem, and one of the most original and unique of the century. In fact, like its author, it holds a distinct place in English literature. Though Newman lived for twenty-five years after, by about 1865 his thoughts were turning towards what he seemed to feel was his approaching dissolution. Then upon the passing of a friend, the fact of death was brought home to him so forcibly that he wrote a poem depicting the experience of a soul immediately after its separation from the body. Jennings, a contemporary biographer, credits the story that Newman threw the poem into the waste-basket, from which a visitor with critical ability rescued it; and Newman was induced to publish it as the "Dream". The poem is a dialogue between the released soul and its guardian angel as they travel, in an infinitesmal fraction of time, from the death-chamber to the

feet of the Creator. Just as the pilgrim in Bunyan's allegory passes safely between two roaring lions chained on either side of the narrow way, so the soul in Newman's poem, as it enters the gates of the other world, hears the shouts and screams of fiends on either side, eager to seize it, but unable to do it any harm. As the poem ends, the soul is sent away to purgatory for purification, after which it will be allowed to return to heaven for its eternal reward. "Surely in all literature there has been no more effective effort to realize the separation of soul and body, and the thoughts which might possess a soul separated from the body,than this", is the judgement of R. H. Hutton. The poem has no local habitation or setting, and cosmography is entirely left out. We hear only the voices of the characters, and where the action takes place is not allowed to trouble us. "Gerontius" is thus closer to Calderon's "Autos Sacramentales" than to either "Paradise Lost" or the "Divina Comedia". It was not simply a flight of theological imagination, but was the expression of the inmost beliefs of Newman, and for that matter, of all Catholics, as to what takes place at the moment a member of the Church of Rome, after receiving the sacrament, passes beyond the veil. Thus it has been well said that the poem belongs not to literature but to the liturgy. It has also been called the long-awaited answer to "Lead,Kindly Light". The fame of the "Dream of Gerontius" has been greatly enhanced by its being turned into an oratorio at the hands of Sir Edward Elgar.

In 1868 Newman published "Verses on Various

Occasions" which included three earlier volumes of poems, the best known being the "Lyra Apostolica" of 1834, together with the "Dream of Gerontius". Of the minor poems, by far the best known is "Lead, Kindly Light". It has been called, rightly or wrongly, "the most popular hymn in the language". Thousands sing it every Sunday without knowing even the name of the author. Written in the summer of 1833 on a freight and passenger ship fog-bound in the Mediterranean while the author was returning home from a trip to southern Europe, it was first published under the title, "The Pillar of Cloud". Though this poem was undoubtedly Newman's supreme short effort, if one takes the trouble to look through the pages of "Verses on Various Occasions" he will find many other gems of High Church sentiment which will well repay the reading.

Despite the position which Newman holds in English literature, he was entirely without ambition to be a man of letters. "For literature as an accomplishment", said one of his biographers, "he cares not at all". He neither expected nor hoped that his writing would be read by succeeding generations. After correcting the proofsheets and sending them back to the publisher he seldom reread what he had written. His aim was not to amuse or entertain the public, nor to bring honour upon himself, but solely "to give forth what was in him" in a life-long effort to further the cause of true religion. Thus, with the exception of the pamphlet "Who's to Blame", dealing with the mismanagement of the Crimean War, practically all his writings were of a theological nature, or at least connected with the work of the Church. As a boy,

Newman had shown the trend of his mind, and all his thinking was in terms of religion. He never wrote anything, however, unless occasion called it forth. The "Tracts for the Times" arose out of the politico-ecclesiastical events connected with the wave of reform which swept England around 1830. Francis, the Cardinal's brother, tells us that he had intimations some time before the Kingsley controversy that Newman was contemplating a work of the nature of the "Apologia". Thus,he was probably waiting for an opportunity to justify himself before the English public; but, had it not been for Kingsley's unwise attack, the book might never have been written. Without an occasion Newman would seldom break his silence. Mr. Bertrand Newman has said that, "His mind, which was not essentially of the speculative order, needed above all things a thesis to defend and especially to attack, a given basis from which to start". But not only are Newman's writings theological and occasional;many of them , as was suggested in our discussion of his style, are introspective. "Newman could tell the story of his own life, but hardly any other". The sermons of any preacher are nothing more or less than confessions, but Newman carried this confessing spirit into many of his longer works. The "Apologia", of course, belongs to this class; but the "Via Media" and "The Development of Christian Doctrine" also are simply statements of Newman's inmost convictions, at different times of his life, as to the nature of the Church, while the "Grammar of Assent" is the basis of his whole belief in Christianity. It is clear, then, that, since the bulk of Newman's literary work was both

theological and introspective, and his sole purpose in writing was to advance the cause of the Church, we cannot appreciate the place he holds in English literature unless we have an understanding of the religious convictions which filled his whole being and occupied his whole attention throughout the nenety years of his life.

To the majority of Protestants Newman still remains a complete enigma and to some of them his very name is odious. There are people who will stand mute during the singing of "Lead, Kindly Light" in church rather than allow the words of a traitor to cross their lips. Occasionally someone still asks: "Was he fool, madman or rogue?" Protestants find themselves completely at a loss to understand how a highly-educated Englishman of the nineteenth century who, in his youth at least, saw clearly the testimony of history to the corruptions of priestcraft and Popery, could, in middle life, succumb to the attractions of saintly relics and the mass. But the solution of the difficulty is not hard to find if we go below the surface. In fact, anyone holding the views which Newman came to hold and belonging to any Church but that of Rome must necessarily be a hypocrite, or else misinformed as to the nature of his Church's doctrinal standards. The purpose of the present work, therefore, is to enable Protestant readers to appreciate Newman to the full as a man of letters, by showing the development of his fundamental idea --- that of the historic continuity of the Church. Before sitting down to read Newman's "Apologia", or his volume of verse,

or even his "Scope and Nature of a University Education", it is necessary to have clearly in mind the ideas which motivated his whole life. It is essential to understand his views upon Anglican High Churchism, and his theory of the modern Catholic Church as the direct descendant of the Church of the Fathers. It is also necessary to know to what extent his views have affected the history of both the Church of Rome and that of England. Above all, one must realize that there never was any drastic change in Newman's life, but that his strange and puzzling conversion was the logical result of the course of his previous life; that popular talk of his "early Evangelical days" is but a myth created by inaccurate statements made by his brother-in-law, for he was ever a Romanist in heart and mind. With these matters straightened out, one can read sympathetically, and understand, Newman's literary contributions.

Chapter 1.

THE PROPHETICAL CHURCH.

It is a mere truism to say that historians think in terms of history. But when seeking to understand John Henry Newman it is impossible to overemphasize this fact. Newman was preeminently the Church historian; and all his thinking, all his writings, all his actions, were strongly influenced by his view of the course of past events in the Christian era. It is commonly supposed that Newman joined the Catholic Church in reaction to the trend of the times; and while to some extent this is true, it was decidedly a minor cause of his conversion. The Oxford Movement was started in 1833 as a retreat from the increasing "liberalism in religion",(1)(a) as an attempt to stem the tide of Parliamentary interference in affairs of the Church of England.(b) This was, in truth, Newman's reaction to prevailing conditions; and there was no reason, as far as fleeing from liberalism

---

(a) For reference notes see pp 96-102.
(b) Leslie Stephen defined Newman's conception of liberalism in "An Agnostic's Apology". He said: "By liberalism he meant the anti-dogmatic principle; the principle which would convert religion into a sentiment, and therefore, for him, into a dream and a mockery".

was concerned, why he should not have found his final resting place in Anglo-Catholicism. In it he could find practically everything in the way of Church organization and rites which Rome had to offer: a hierarchical system of prelacy, ritual to his heart's content, dogma and authority. He tells us in the "Aplolgia"(2) that the allegiance which he had rendered to the Pope in the Catholic Church was not one whit more than he had previously given to his bishop in the Anglican. High Churchism, in fact, perhaps offered a better bulwark in England against liberalizing tendencies than did Romanism because of its wider influence. Why then did he forsake the Church of his birth? Partly because, as the Oxford Movement progressed, he was made to feel by the authorities that there was no place for such as he in the Anglican fold; but, fundamentally, because he had come to feel that the Church of Rome was the only survival in the nineteenth century of the Church of the early Christian days; in other words, because of the light in which he saw Church history.

Newman, in his lifetime, held two different theories of the Church, by which we can account for the events of his career. The first was his idea of the Via Media Church, or, as we may call it from the title of his lectures upon the subject, the Prophetical Church.(a) It was the view that the true Church

---

(a) "Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism", later published as Volume 1 of the "Via Media". This, together with the "Lectures on Justification" and "Tracts for the Times" Nos. 38 and 41, is Newman's chief discussion of the Via Media theory.

is neither Roman nor Protestant, but Catholic; the Via Media between Papal errors and the false teaching of the Reformers; the body which was not only part of the Universal Church, but had also come down in unbroken line from the Apostles. This was the theory which Newman held for the ten or twelve years after 1833, and upon which he hung the "Tracts for the Times". The second theory was his view of what can best be described as the Historical Church, which, for him, justified the Roman position. To understand Newman and his work, and so to be enabled to appreciate fully his contributions to English literature, we must begin by a study of these two theories of the Church. We will first consider the one which dominated him from the time he went to the university till he reached middle life, that of the Prophetical Church, which he worked out during the Oxford Movement.

The popular conception of the Oxford Movement is that it was a direct attempt on the part of Newman and his friends to lead the Anglican Church back to Rome. This view, moreover, is reinforced by what took place in Newman's later years. But if we are to have an intelligent grasp of the course of Newman's life we must banish all vestiges of this idea from our minds. Any attempt to fuse the Anglican and Catholic Churches is just what the Oxford Movement was not. On the contrary, it was an effort to steer the English ecclesiastical ship in the Via Media course. If it tried to avoid the shoals of "Ultra-Protestantism"[3] on the one hand, it also steered clear of the rocks of Rome on the other. When the Movement began, none of its founders had the slightest thought of seceding to the

Catholic Church. Hurrell Froude had just come back from his Mediterranean cruise with an unpleasant taste left in his mouth by the sight of the degraded condition of the people in Papal countries. If ever in his life he was moving in a direction away from Rome it was at this moment. And as for Newman, the very thought of such a thing as becoming a Catholic, or of seeing the Anglican Church merge with Rome, would have been nauseous to him. If union of all the ecclesiastical bodies possessed of Apostolic Succession is the great aim of Anglo-Catholicism today, it was certainly not so when the movement began. Newman had visited Italy along with Froude, had seen the workings of Catholicism in its capital, and had sighed:

"Oh that thy creed were sound!
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome".(4)

But her creed was not sound, and there was absolutely no hope of it becoming so. The Catholic Church had not always been in apostasy, but, since the Council of Trent, it had.(5) This idea of a turning-point in the history of the Roman Church is the key to the Via Media. Tractarianism, it is true, strongly suggested the errors of Rome to the minds of observers; yet it was not that the Movement resembled Catholicism, but rather that Catholicism resembled the Movement. For all false teaching must appear very like the truth or no one would be deceived by it.(6) In fact, Newman declared that, "No party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party".(7) The multifarious Protestant sects, moreover, by their very diversity were preparing the way for a return to

Popery, and consequently the one extreme was equally as dangerous as the other.

The criticism which Newman and his colleagues had to bring against the Protestantism of their day was not that it had once broken from the parent Church, but that what was understood by Protestantism in the nineteenth century was not what the men of the Reformation had meant by the term.(8) The professions of Englishmen in the days of the Reform Bill were the same as three hundred years before, but the significance and meaning of those professions had entirely changed. And the change had taken the form of a drift towards Evangelicalism and sentiment in religion, until it was clear "that the members of the English Church of the present day differ from the principles of the Church of Rome more than our forefathers did".(9) The reasons by which the men at Oxford were led to believe this drift had taken place were twofold. Firstly, there was the probability of it.(10) If any previous period in history were examined it would be seen that religious doctrine did not remain fixed, but was in a continual state of flux. Then secondly, there was the undeniable proof afforded by the Rubrics.(11) These were now almost everywhere held to be obsolete, and this was conclusive evidence that Protestantism had changed in its tone. The Reformers, moreover, observed many ceremonies which were now considered sheer Romanism. What, for example, did Protestants in the third decade of the nineteenth century think of the setting apart of stated times for fasting, or the observance of saints' days, or absolution in the office of Visiting the Sick, or the refusal to bury unbaptized persons with

the rites of the Church?[12] Yet these things had caused no pangs of conscience in the sixteenth century. Henry VIII had not been troubled by any of these matters, nor even by such doctrines as transubstantiation or justification. The one point of the Roman system which he attacked was that of Supremacy. It was around this question, and this alone, that the Reformation in England turned. But in the course of time the Church of England became contaminated with Calvinsim and other schismatical and heretical teachings, until people had come to regard the original Protestant religion as nothing but Popery. This perversion of Anglican doctrine was due to the contact which the Church had been brought into with Puritanism and Wesleyanism, with Nonconformists and with Protestant European countries through national, political alliances. Hoadly, during the fifty years in which he was bishop, had also done a great deal to demoralize the Church's teachings. It was not Rome which had injured Anglicanism, but rather Ultra-Protestant doctrine, mostly Calvinistic. "I like foreign influence", said Newman through the character of Clericus, "as little from Geneva as from Rome".[13] Newman is quite ready to admit that the Reformers said one thing at one time and contradicted it at another; that at one moment they were Evangelical and at the next Roman. This was due to the fact that they were groping their way to the truth in a period of transition. Nevertheless, all that is necessary to do is to state with which of their writings we agree; and he says that he agrees with them in the formularies of the Church.[14] Popular Protestantism looks askance at many things which these formularies hold as sacred and

essential. It fears that the doctrine of justification will not receive sufficient emphasis if stress is laid upon such matters as ceremonies, sanctity, humility, patience, charity, and morality for its own sake.(15) Protestantism "sweeps along with one or two prominent doctrines, to the comparative neglect of the details of duty".(16) The Protestant religion had thus changed by imperceptible degrees, and without the great majority of people knowing it, until it was no longer "the ancient Catholic doctrine"(17) for which the Reformers fought. Moreover, the affairs of the English Church, once controlled by Christian men in Parliament, were still directed by that House, but, since the recent reforms, they were no longer in the hands of Christian men. But if, on the negative side, the Prophetical Church avoided the blind alleys of both Protestantism and Romanism, as it traversed the middle road, what had it, on the positive side to offer the religious traveller?

The Via Media based its claim to acceptance as truth on the ground that it was Apostolic. As has already been pointed out, the Catholic Church seemed to Newman and his friends to have apostasized at the time of the Council of Trent in 1545 and to have never returned since then to its earlier position of truth. The Protestant sects, on the other hand, had never been part of the true Church. Of the sect which has denied all sacraments Newman emphatically declared: "A Churchman must believe its members to be altogether external to the fold of Christ".(18) And he was almost as harsh upon the other denominations, which, while they had not eliminated the sac-

raments, had nevertheless tampered with them. Between these two extremes of so-called Christianity, a historical organization, the true Church, had come down through the ages, and was proclaiming in the nineteenth century the doctrines and practice of Anglo-Catholicism. "The glory of the English Church is that it has taken the Via Media, as it has been called".(19) In the middle ages there had been three ecclesiastical bodies which could claim direct descent from the early Church, the differences between them being purely accidental.(20) Of these three, the Greek and the Latin had turned aside, and only the Anglican had not deviated from the Apostolic way. In several respects the Church of England was coterminous with the early Christian body. First, in its ceremonies;(21) second, in being possessed of Apostolic Succession;(22) and third, in administering two sacraments, not fewer nor more, and in regarding these as of intrinsic value.(25) But at this stage of his life Newman did not regard the Apostolic Church with as great affection as he did the English Church of the seventeenth century. This was his true model. It was not a return to religious conditions as they had existed immediately after the Reformation that was his fond hope, but rather a return to the days of Laud. The great majority of both the clergy and the laity insisted that Newman's doctrine had never been taught in the Church of England. But this, Newman felt, was due to sheer ignorance of Church history, "one of the especial evils of the day".(24) He found these identical beliefs in the writings of Andrewes, Hooker, Taylor, and other eminent Anglican theologians. "In the seventeenth century the theology of the divines of the English

Church was substantially the same as ours is".[25] And again he says: "It was the true Via Media".[25] If the Oxford Movement and its Tracts drove people to Rome, it was not the fault of the men carrying on the Movement, but rather the fault of the Anglican authorities who would not recognize in the Church of England even the potentialities of true Catholicism, which was sought. And now, with a clear idea of the Prophetical Church and just what Newman conceived it to be, we are able to turn to the celebrated Tract 90 and see how he fitted the "Thirty-nine Articles" into his ecclesiastical scheme.

No incident in Newman's life has been more subjected to what a Priest of the Oratory recently called "false or distorted views disseminated through prejudice or from ignorance",[26] than has the publication of Tract 90. Even today Newman is still charged with intellectual dishonesty, not because he forsook the English Church, but because he wrote this pamphlet. The storm which broke over his life at this time is comprehensible, however, for to the Protestant the reasoning which he used is completely foreign and inexplicable. It cannot be denied that it appears like gross equivocation. And yet anyone who has carefully examined the course of Newman's life cannot but be convinced, from the whole tenor of it and from the sacrifices which he made, that Tract 90 could not have been mere prevarication. His biographer, Hutton, has said: "It is very far indeed from an insincere document".[27] One of the very articles, moreover, --- that in which he distinguishes between "Mass" and

"Masses" --- which seems so like evasion, was to him conclusive proof that his interpretation was the true one.(28) Newman has told us in the "Apologia" how he was led to write the Tract; it was to keep the Movement in hand. Some of the more advanced of the supporters, such as Ward, were fast drifting towards Rome because they felt that they could not conscientiously subscribe to the Articles; but Newman was convinced that the elasticity of the document was sufficient to allow even & catholic-minded men to sign it. And when he was instructed by his bishop to keep his followers in check, he felt it his duty to publish the true position of the Articles. Thus he says: "I was aiming far more at what a man who subscribed it might hold than what he must, so my conclusions were negative rather than positive".(29) Of the claim of elasticity in the Articles there can be no question. They were written in a transition period and were designed so as not to exclude anyone of catholic beliefs as long as he renounced the Supremacy of the Pope.(a) At one time, moreover, Calvinists and Lutherans held directly opposite views upon the interpretation of one particular Article. It was also certain that the men who drafted the Articles were by no means thorough-going Protestants; for they approved without qualification the use of the Homilies, and these are to a large extent based upon the

---

(a) Hutton states that the Church of England "was a political compromise between opposite tendencies from the day of its separation from Rome". "Cardinal Newman", p 74.

Apocrypha. Thus Newman's attitude was by no means unreasonable; for he claimed that in cases where the interpretation was in doubt the vagueness was intended by the writers, and therefore the meaning taken should be the widest and most comprehensive possible rather than the most narrow and exclusive.(30) Newman's conception of their origin, moreover, was not that of most other men. To the majority of people they were a direct attack upon the corruptions of the Church of Rome, and an effort to safeguard England against such abuses. But to Newman they did not appear as a protest against the whole Roman system, but merely as an attempt to correct the abuses of the particular age in which they were written. "Our Articles", he said, "are not a body of divinity, but in a great measure only protest against certain errors of a certain period of the Church".(31) Then again, his theory of "Roman doctrine" was somewhat involved, and far too obscure for the patience of even the average Anglican clergyman. Newman's own words can best explain the rather subtile distinctions which he drew. By this term "might be meant one of three things: 1, the Catholic teaching of the early centuries; or 2, the formal dogmas of Rome as contained in the later councils, especially the Council of Trent, and as condensed in the Creed of Pope Pius IV; 3, the actual popular beliefs and usages sanctioned by Rome in the countries in communion with it, over and above the dogmas; and these I called 'dominant errors'".(32) It had never occurred to the bulk of Protestants that any such distinction existed, or could exist. To them practically all the teachings of Rome were erroneous, or at least tainted with corruption. Consequently,

when Newman wrote Tract 90 from the viewpoint that the Articles condemned the "dominant errors", but that they did not condemn the "Catholic teaching", and that of the "formal dogmas" some were condemned and some were not, Protestants were at a loss to understand him. To them, his distinctions were nothing more or less than equivocation. Newman, moreover, regarded the Articles, in the light in which he interpreted them, as the highest and best expression of Anglo-Catholicism which could be found; and, consequently, a knowledge of their true value and interpretaion was absolutely essential. The purpose of Tract 90, then, and in fact of the whole Oxford Movement, was not to impose upon the Church of England teachings and interpretations of doctrine which had ever been foreign to it; but simply to lift it out of the slough of Protestant error and raise it to the full stature of its doctrines.

The trouble, therefore, with the Church of England was not that she did not possess truth, but that the truth was so corroded by the action of nominally Christian sects upon it that it required a thorough scraping and cleaning to eliminate the accretions. What would be left after this was done would be true Christian or catholic doctrine; and the Church proclaiming that doctrine would be the Prophetical Church, or the Church of the Via Media. Thus, in the "Apologia" Newman said: "Had I been asked twenty years ago what the doctrine of the Established Church was, I should have answered, 'Neither Romish nor Protestant, but Anglican or Anglo-Catholic'".(33) Thus the purpose of the Tracts, as stated in the first of the series

which was written by Newman himself, was to revive forgotten doctrines.(34) This must be done even if it required a "Second Reformation".(35)

Since Newman's ideas had been practically unheard of for two centuries, the question naturally arises, Where did he get his theory? While he was at Oxford, many people were convinced that there was some underground communication between one of the seats of Jesuit operations, either Stoneyhurst or Oscott, and his rooms at Oriel.(36) The popular conception of Newman is of a man coming from a home steeped in Calvinism and filled with the Evangelical fire of the Methodists,(37) and ending in the highest position in the Catholic Church, the Pope's office alone excepted, which it is possible to atfain. And while it is true that he passed from mild Protestantism to staunch Romanism, there is probably considerable misrepresentation of the influences which he came under in his youth. As a matter of fact, his early life was never so far from Anglo-Catholicism as is often supposed. We must, therefore, turn our attention to the sources from which Newman got his theory of the Prophetical Church.

It has just been said that his early training is not clearly understood; this is true of the atmosphere in which he grew up at home. The Newman home is usually thought to have been of Low Church and strong Calvinistic tendencies. And while it is true that it was Low Church, its Calvinism was probably not at all strong. Newman complained in the "Apologia" that the term "Protestant" was inexplicit, being purely negative. It did

not tell what a man was, but merely what he was not. The same thing might also be said of the appelations, "Low Church", or "Evangelical"; they are purely negative, as used in the Anglican sense, suggesting only the doctrines which certain men do not hold. Thus when a home is called Evangelical it frequently means little more than that it is nondescript. The home in which John Henry Newman was born was of this type. If it was Evangelical, it was certainly not Evangelistic. And of the Calvinistic doctrines inculcated into the minds of the children, Francis Newman, John Henry's brother, says in his book upon the "Early History of Cardinal Newman": "Here I ask leave to digress in defence of my mother and sisters, whom my brother-in-law, my sister Harriet's husband, strangely misrepresented in his Memorials of Oxford. He stated after my sister's death, and without consulting any of us surviving, that my mother reared us in extreme Calvinism, and that certain Scottish Calvinist manuals had been familiar to us from earlier days. I instantly assured him that I had never in my life seen the books, and that my mother was far too wise a woman to train children to any sectarian religion".(38) Hutton is probably near the truth when he describes Newman's mother as a "moderate Calvinist".(39) She had her favourite books which she gave her children to read for their instruction and edification, as all good women do. Chief among these were the works of Scott, Romaine, Newton, and Milner. These undoubtedly had considerable influence upon the minds of the children in directing their thoughts along religious lines, for all of them had an active interest in theology. But to suppose that the general tone of the home was strongly of any one

school of Christianity is undoubtedly to get a false idea of the background with which Newman started life. There is an entry in the diary of Maria Rosina Giberne, who knew the Newmans quite intimately, which sheds much light upon this matter.(40) In 1826 Mrs. Newman left two of her daughters at the home of the Gibernes for a short vacation there. Much of the conversation which Maria Rosina had with the Newman sisters was of a religious nature, and she was dominated by the stronger personalities of her friends. Thus she says in the diary: "I remember the first thing I opposed with all my might was the idea of a visible Church, and it was not till long afterwards, when I was staying with their mother in the country, that I took up this idea". From this statement we understand that both Mrs. Newman and her daughters had a firm belief in the doctrine of a visible Church. Could this be held by true Evangelicals? Absolutely not. The visible Church notion is directly opposed to the Gospel of the Evangelicals. We may conclude, therefore, that the Calvinism and Low Churchism in Newman's home, if anything, bordered upon the High Church position. An interesting sidelight, moreover, upon the character of the father, John Newman, is also provided by Francis. He stated that his father was somewhat of a free thinker, and occasionally got into an argument with his eldest son, the future Cardinal.(41) The paternal influence towards Evangelicalism, therefore, could not have been great. Finally, we read in the "Apologia" a statement which seems positive proof of this claim that Newman's home-life did not carry him very far in the direction of Ultra-Protestantism. It

is this: "Of the Calvinistic tenets the only one which took root in my mind was the fact of heaven and hell, divine favour and divine wrath, of the justified and the unjustified".(42) This tenet, certainly, would not be a serious obstacle to keep him from Anglo-Catholicism.

Some of the traits of Newman's character, moreover, which manifested themselves in his boyhood, tend to show that he was not of an Evangelical turn of mind. It is true that from the time he could read he was taught to study and love the Bible, and his memory was stored with the dicta of the catechism.(43) To have a knowledge of these is, of course, an exclusively Protestant custom. Moreover, the idea of the Pope as Antichrist early gripped him. But there are other facts of his youth which seem to offset these things. For example, at the age of sixteen he made a collection of Scripture texts, chiefly with the aid of Scott's books, to prove the doctrine of the Trinity.(44) This is significant because we see that it was not the exclusively Protestant tenets, such as justification by faith, which interested him, but rather those which are common to all forms of Christianity. Then too, no true Evangelical can read the works of Payne without a feeling of disgust at the misunderstanding of the grounds of faith; yet Newman read these with relish.(45) Above all, in Milner's history are long extracts from the writings of the Church Fathers, and Newman declared that he was nothing short of "enamoured" with these passages.(46) Now by the time the Fathers wrote, the Church had lost its earlier Gospel zeal, and their writings were, what may be called, "theological". Consequently, to the average Evangelical they

will be dry and uninteresting. But they did not seem so to Newman. At an early age, moreover, he got a clear-cut idea of the function of the Church and its relation to Scripture. The Church was a living body which existed chiefly for the purpose of prescribing the creeds; while Scripture was never intended to teach doctrine, but merely to verify the creeds. This idea is one of the cardinal points of both Anglo-Catholicism and Romanism, but not of Protestantism. But although there was little in Newman's early surroundings, or in his traits of character as shown in his boyhood, to establish him in the Evangelical faith, and certain things which show a decided tendency towards High Churchism, there was, nevertheless, one influence of his schooldays which was clearly in the direction of the Low Church position.

Towards the close of his time at Ealing, Newman was left more or less alone at the school during the late summer after all his intimate companions had gone home; and a friendship arose between the boy and one of the younger masters. Rev. Walter Mayers was a graduate of Pembroke College, Oxford, and had joined the staff at Ealing as one of the classical teachers. Although he had a strong distaste for his work, feeling it to be a waste of time and injurious to his ministerial duties, he was, nevertheless, able to reach the hearts of his pupils. Practically by themselves in the building, he and Newman enjoyed many a long conversation, chiefly upon religious topics. "The result of this intimacy was that Newman passed through the spiritual crisis which he called conversion, and emerged a

definite Evangelical".[47] When the friends separated, Mayers gave Newman a copy of Beveridge's "Private Thoughts",[47] but, though the boy read and cherished it, he wrote on the fly-leaf in 1874 that he had not mentioned it in the "Apologia" because its influence upon him had been negligible. His acquaintance with Mayers, however, must have affected his beliefs to some extent, at least at the time. But it was soon after this that Newman, at the age of seventeen, went up to Trinity College, Oxford.

Newman's mind matured late, and, therefore, was at this time still in a plastic condition, so that it was capable of being moulded into almost any shape according to the influences under which it might come. We have seen that the Evangelical furrowing which he received in youth was not deep. Had another man of the type of Mayers, however, taken Newman under his wing in his early years at college, his biography would be much different, perhaps much less interesting too, than it is. It was not immediately, however, that his thoughts turned to Via Mediaism. For a while he was strongly influenced by Whately and his school, so that he declared later: "I was beginning to prefer intellectual excellence to moral; I was drifting in the direction of liberalism".[48] But stronger influences were soon to seize his mind and turn it into the path which it was henceforth to follow, though of course it did not immediately reach the point where it could find solace in nothing other than, what Francis Newman disparagingly termed, "monkery, nunnery and celibate clergy",[49] but rested for a time at the stage of

the Prophetical Church.

Among the less well-known forces which shaped Newman's mind during these years, several stand out prominently as having contributed to the form and substance of his thinking. Perhaps first among these Dr. Hawkins ought to be mentioned.(50) He afterwards became Provost of Oriel, but at this time he and Newman were intimate friends and saw a great deal of each other, especially during the vacations. From Hawkins Newman got chiefly two things: his ideas of the importance and use of tradition; and his method of reasoning. Of the two, the latter was by far the more important. This reasoning was what appeared like casuistic subtility in Tract 90. It was the distinguishing between two ideas which were not the same but very nearly so; a close comparison of words and thoughts,which, once mastered, Newman took a genuine enjoyment in. Thus, although this method of reasoning savoured so strongly of the polemics of Rome, Newman had really acquired it from one of the most respected leaders of Anglicanism. Richard Hutton observed in this connection: "It seems to me that no greater mistake was ever made than in ascribing to the influence of Roman Catholic craft and casuistry that delight which Cardinal Newman has always taken in distinguishing between closely related yet quite different thoughts, and which he learned at Oxford, mostly from Dr. Hawkins, partly from Dr. Whately".(51) One other important acquisition came indirectly from Hawkins. This was Newman's belief in Baptismal Regeneration, of which he became convinced through reading a book of Sumner's given him by Hawkins.(52) Of the other beliefs

which Newman gleaned from less well-known sources, those of Apostolic Succession and of the visible Church should be mentioned. The former he picked up quite suddenly in 1823 from Rev. William James, during an afternoon walk in Christ Church meadow.(53) The latter he gained in the course of reading Bishop Butler's "Analogy".(54)

By far the most important source of Newman's thoughts, however, was the mind of Richard Hurrell Froude, brother of the historian. From others he gained an idea here and there; from Froude he received the bulk of his religious views. As for Keble, his influence upon Newman was indirect, for the two were never intimate. But Keble was Froude's master, and so in this way Newman was affected by his opinions. Pusey's influence is negligible, for by the time he joined the Movement Newman was already in advance of his thinking. Newman has himself so well described in the "Apologia" the articles of faith which Froude held that it hardly seems necessary to enumerate them here.(55) Suffice it to point out the chief ideas which Newman absorbed from him. First of all, he stirred in him a hatred of the Reformers and of Protestants with their Bible-only religion. With Newman this developed into opposition to Ultra-Protestantism. And while Froude turned the gaze of his friend away from Protestantism, he, at the same time, pointed him towards Rome. He aroused in him, too, by his own love of it, an admiration for hierarchical Church government and sacerdotal power. But all of these things might have been gained by Newman from other men. It took a Froude, however, with his zeal and force of

personality, to break down his belief that the Pope was Anti-christ, and to inculcate into him a devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and a faith in the doctrine of the Real Presence. Although Froude died young and his beliefs never matured, his influence in shaping the course of Newman's life can hardly be overestimated. The views of the two men were not identical. For example, Newman stressed the importance of the doctrine taught by the Church Fathers, while Froude had no taste for their writings. Nevertheless, without Froude's planting, and harrowing, and cultivating in Newman's mind the beliefs which he did, the Oxford Movement would never have taken place, and the theory of the Via Media would never have been reformulated.

It seems clear then, from what has been said, that the real situation in Newman's early life was this. At home his religious interest was aroused by reading and by his mother's teaching, but he received few definite doctrines to bias his mind in one direction or another. When he went up to Oxford his mind was susceptible to any teaching which he might come under. Liberalism very nearly won him over, but the reactionaries finally got hold of him and pushed him behind the High Church line. With his mind within Anglo-Catholic territory, he, along with others, published at Oxford the theory of the Prophetical Church to fight off the constant siege carried on by the errors of Rome, on the one side, and the falsehood of Protestantism, on the other. This Via Media theory kept a strong grip upon Newman's mind for a time; but after 1839, and especially after the publication of Tract 90 in 1841, it began to lose its hold

and to wane. The process by which it waned, and the new theory of the Church which took its place, must next be considered.

Chapter 2.

THE HISTORICAL CHURCH.

Early in the autumn of 1845 John Henry Newman was received into the fold of the Roman Church by Father Dominic, the Passionist.[1] His "perversion" did not come as a complete surprise to those looking on at Oxford and throughout the English Church, but few really understood what had brought it about.[2] As always in such cases, ridicule was heaped upon him by cartoon and doggerel verse, while tirades of abuse were levelled against him in Sunday sermons.[3] But what had caused the tremendous revulsion in Newman's belief during the last few years? How had he so recently championed a movement which had been as violent in its declamations against Roman distortions as it had been against Ultra-Protestant untruth, and now run into one of the very traps against which he had warned others? How was it that in one of the early Tracts,[4] written but twelve years before, he had declared of the Catholic Church that the "communion is infected with heresy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence", yet now he fled to it as to an angel of light? Many thought that it was mere superstition and reaction. The story even gained currency that Newman had gone mad.[5] As the years rolled on,

however, and people realized that his mind still retained all its Protestant power and vigour, it became clear that he must have some intellectual basis for his action. But it was not till the publication of the "Apologia" in 1864 that the public came to know what that basis was. In this book he accounted for his action of 1845 in these words: "When I was fully confident that the Church of Rome was the only true Church, I joined her".(6) But how had he become thus fully confident? What had been taking place in his mind since the collapse of the Oxford Movement? What was there in his make-up to warrant such a course of action? An examination of his new ecclesiastical theory, that of the Historical Church, will account for it. But before dealing with this, there are certain contributing facts and factors, which helped to bridge-over the seemingly impassable gulf, that require consideration.

Dean Inge has made the statement in his "Outspoken Essays" that, "Some temperaments are more suited to Catholicism, others to Protestantism".(7) And if the change in Newman's career at middle life is to be intelligible to us, we must ever remember that his temperament belonged to the former class. He was, undoubtedly, more suited to the ceremonies and saintly adoration of Romanism, than to the less formal Protestant worship. Even as a boy the superstitious trend of his nature manifested itself, and in one or two instances he showed a strange, unaccountable leaning towards actual practices of the Catholic Church. Thus, before he would enter a dark room alone he would always cross himself.(8) And at the time of writing the

"Apologia" he had before him a copy-book, which he had used at school, and upon which he found that he had sketched a cross, and beside it what appeared to be a rosary.(8) His imagination, moreover, was of a type which could only find complete rest in the traditions and rites of Romanism, for it ran on "unknown influences, magical powers, and talismans".(9) He read with ~~the~~ delight the fantastic Arabian Tales and wished that they were true.(9) Then too, his ideas of angels were not those of the ordinary child.(10) He conceived of them, not as mere heavenly messengers, but as the cause of light, motion, life, and other physical phenomena whose sources and reasons for existence do not trouble even the majority of adults. And besides the ordinary orders of angels there seemed to be a middle race, neither in heaven nor hell, partially fallen, who motivated the actions of institutions and nations, and thus explained why the policies of such bodies are often contrary to the nature of the individuals who compose them. Nor did he leave these ideas behind with childhood; but about 1834 he preached a sermon for Michaelmas Day which set forth similar conceptions of angelic beings. Newman had, too, an implicit trust in accounts of the most preposterous miracles of the Middle Ages, which were far too much for the majority of men to accept. Thus, J. A. Froude, the future historian, was unable to go on with his part of the "Lives of the English Saints", which were written by Newman's followers just before his conversion and edited by him, while Newman himself suffered no pangs of conscience at all.(11) The importance which he placed upon dogma, moreover, was also a Catholic characteristic. It was at

the age of fifteen that Newman received his "impressions of dogma",[12] which remained firmly fixed in his mind all through his life. Dogma and authority, for him, were the essence of religion, and without these there could be no religion. This idea, which was so fundamental for Newman, is certainly not a Protestant teaching. In true Protestantism there is little or no place for dogmatism. It offers a belief in the Bible, not upon an "ipse dixit" basis, but from individual conviction that the book is true; and faith in the Saviour because of a personal experience of the Risen Christ. But one of the most significant indications of Newman's inherent Catholicism is that even before he went to the University he had determined to live a life of celibacy.[13] Again, two poems, written at different times of his life and taken from the "Verses on Various Occasions", also bear testimony to Newman's nature. The first of these was composed at Oxford when he was seventeen years old, and entitled "Solitude", It shows the kind of serene religious joy which Newman was capable of experiencing, and which would naturally draw him to the quiet of the cloister to escape the materialistic struggle of the world around him. It reads in part:

> "And hence perchance the tales of saints who view'd
> And heard angelic choirs in solitude.
> By most unheard --- because the earthly din
> Of toil or mirth has charms their ears to win.
> Alas for man! he knows not of the bliss,
> The heaven that brightens such a life as this".[14]

More significant still is the "Good Samaritan", part of which we have already quoted, and which was written at Palermo during the Mediterranean voyage.

"Oh that thy creed were sound!
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
By thy unwearied watch and varied round
Of service in thy Saviour's holy home.
I cannot walk the city's sultry streets,
But the wide porch invites to still retreats,
Where passion's thirst is calmed, and care's
unthankful gloom".(15)

In this verse of the poem, written before the commencement of the Oxford Movement, Newman has shown the love of the daily services and hushed chambers for prayer and confession, which in his early life lay dormant in his nature, and which, when allowed sway, was not the least of the urges which drove him to Rome.

We must be careful, however, not to suppose that Newman instinctively agreed with all the practices of the Church of Rome. He was never, at any time of his life, a thorough-going Catholic. We will see in the next chapter that his stand upon the question of the Infallibility was by no means Ultramontane. The members of the Curia Romana, moreover, always suspected the orthodoxy of his views of the temporal power, and this was one reason why so many years passed before Newman's services to the Church of his adoption were recognized by the Papal authorities. Dean Inge suggests that at one time Newman was contemplating a return to the Anglican fold;(16) but there is probably no basis for this assertion, since Newman had been firmly gripped by the idea of the Historical Church. Protestants naturally looked and hoped for his reconversion until the day of his death, while Catholics feared it just as long; but there is not the slightest sign in the events of his life or in his writings that such a thing was ever within the

bounds of probability. The fact of the matter is that Newman was a man of ideas, original ideas, and it was precisely because of those ideas that he was led to give up all that was dear to him and transfer his religious allegiance. Newman was not what is commonly called a "good Catholic", for he did not feel bound to accept everything that was held by the starving Catholic washerwoman; and this made it easier for him to join the Roman Communion. He did not go into the Church blindfold; he saw its weaknesses and failures,and some of its corruptions, but overlooked these because it had in it more truth than did any other Church.

The Church which contained the largest measure of truth would be the one most nearly resembling the primitive Church. But the primitive Church, to Newman, was the Church of the Fathers, or the fourth century Church of the time of Athanasius. This is the key to the Historical theory. Newman always looked with fondness and affection, not to the true early Church, but to the Church as it emerged from the Arian conflict. As we have seen, he was "enamoured" during his school-days with the selections of the writings of the Fathers contained in Milner's history.(17) "I read them", he says, "as being the religion of the primitive Christians".(18) For a number of years, however, he lost touch with these formulators of Church doctrine, but in the summer of 1828 he took them up again and read them chronologically. From this time on the Fathers exercised an uninterrupted influence upon him. About 1830 he began the "Arians of the Fourth Century";(19) and in

1833 he gave a series of lectures upon the same period of history, which were published in the "British Magazine", and later collected as "The Church of the Fathers". But strangely enough, although Newman got such a large part of his belief from Froude, the two had nothing in common on this matter of the early Church; for while Newman looked back to the fourth century to test conditions in the ecclesiastical organization of the nineteenth, Froude's eyes did not revert so far into history, but rested upon the middle ages.(20) There is a passage in F. W. Newman's book which, though in the spiteful tone in which the whole thing is written, and showing that its author was unwilling to understand, nevertheless illustrates how arbitrary their choice of an ideal period of the Church appears to Protestants. The quotation is somewhat long, but well worth citing entire. He says: "You remember the showman with his box and spyglass, through which children look to see inside Blucher and Wellington with other officers after the battle of Waterloo. Of him a little boy asked: 'Which is the Duke and which is Blucher? The showman replies: 'Whichever you please, my little dear, you pays your penny and takes your choice'. This fairly typifies the relation of the 'Holy Mother' to Hurrell and John Henry Newman. They ask her: 'Which is the Starting Era of Orthodoxy? We two are puzzling about it.' John Henry Newman says the Nicene Church; Hurrell thinks it is at Hildebrand's, seven hundred years later. The Holy Mother replies: 'Whichever you please, my little dears; you pay allegiance to me and take your choice --- anywhere except too

near to Christ and the Apostles, for they cut me out entirely!"[21] But whether it was from freedom of choice granted by the Holy Virgin, or for some other reason, that Newman regarded the fourth century instead of the first or second as the beginning of true and authoritative Christian doctrine, it is impossible to say. Nevertheless, the fact remains that he did, and it is one of the cornerstones in his thinking. During the Oxford Movement he felt that the modern Anglican Church was the descendant and counterpart of the Church of Athanasius; but, towards the close of the Movement, it occured to him that this was a mistake.

During the long vacation of 1839 the thought suddenly flashed across Newman's mind that the Roman Church was the only ecclesiastical system which had come down in direct line from the Church of the Fathers.[22] At the time he was making an extensive study of the Monophysite heresy, and was absorbed in the doctrinal controversy. It struck him very forcibly that the fourth century was parallelled in detail by the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. History had repeated itself in the relationships and claims of the various parties. The Monophysites were the Anglicans in modern times; the Eutychians were the Protestants; Rome, at the Reformation and in the days of Victoria, was where she was in the time of Arius. In other words, the Monophysites were schismatics; so were the Anglicans. The Anglican Church looked to him now as it had never looked before --- a schism from the Universal Church, a mere political organization started by a sensual king to enable him to achieve

his own desires. Just at this time, moreover, a copy of the "Dublin Review" was sent to Newman by a friend who called to his attention an article on "The Anglican Claim", by Bishop Wiseman. The article dealt with the Donatists, and compared them to the Church of England. Newman read it, but was not much impressed, as he was already acquainted with the Donatists and did not consider the parallel between them and the Anglicans a close one. His friend visited him, however, and pointed out a quotation of St. Augustine which had escaped his notice. It was the words: "Securus judicat orbis terrarum". The sentence struck home to Newman's mind with great power, and rang in his ears over and over again. It was conclusive condemnation; the Anglican Church was without doubt a schism. Newman has compared this experience to seeing the hand of a ghost upon the wall; a man who has once seen it can never again be quite the same.(23) "The heavens had opened and closed again. The thought for a moment had been, 'The Church of Rome will be found right after all'; and then it had vanished. My old convictions remained as before". But if for a time his old convictions remained as before, this incident was the beginning of the end. He has told us that after 1841 he was on his death-bed as an Anglican.(24) But although the symptoms did not appear till 1841, and although several more years passed before the final dissolution of his Anglican personality took place, he nevertheless contracted the fatal disease at this time.

The years of Newman's decline, after the tempest which followed the publication of Number 90, were spent in seclusion at

Littlemore, near Oxford.[25] Here he had been in the habit for the last few years of spending the religious seasons; and he now had several adjacent houses fixed over until they strongly resembled a monastery, and retired there with some devoted followers. In the solitude of Littlemore Newman's wounds, inflicted by the lash of the authorities, could heal; and he was able to think through the new problem which was steadily causing him more and more concern --- which, after all, was the true Church, Roman or Anglican? "There was", he says, "a contrariety of claims between the Roman and Anglican religions, and the history of my conversion is simply the process of working it out to a solution".[26] He had ever kept before him the fact that there was something greater than the Established Church, that was the Universal Church, which was truly Apostolic, having been in existence since the time of the Apostles.[27] Throughout the Oxford Movement the Church of England had claimed, and seemed to command, equality with the catholic body as being part of it; now it appeared never to have been part at all, despite its claims. The trunk had disowned the branch. Two difficulties, however, wracked his mind and disturbed his peace during these years of doubt and indecision. The first was the effect of his impending secession from the Anglican Church upon those who had followed him believing that he was leading them away from, not to, Rome. The second was the desire to be perfectly certain that he was not again being deluded, as he had before been deluded by the Anglican divines. But as time went on, it became more and more clear

that there was but one course of action open to him. It was not that his beliefs had suffered any drastic transformation; they were the same as they had always been, and were unchanged.(28) What had changed was simply the way in which he regarded the Anglican and Catholic Churches; he had exchanged the theory of the Prophetical Church for that of the Historical. As a final assurance before making the great step he sat down to write the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine", to see how his new views looked on paper. While he was writing the Essay he ceased to use the term, "Roman Catholic", and boldly called the Romanists "Catholics!"(29) And before the book was completed he sent for Father Dominic, and it therefore remains as it was then, incomplete, though not so deficient but that we are able to get from it a clear conception of his Historical Church.

Newman had been gripped by the belief that the Catholic was the only existing branch of the true Church; and once this idea had taken firm hold of him, he was never able to drive from his mind the spectre of schism which seemed now to haunt the pews and pulpits of the Anglican Church. But convinced as he was of the Roman position, nevertheless, as he worked out his solution of the "contrariety of claims",(30) he was faced by the undeniable fact that the organization and doctrine of the Papal Church had not always been the same. Various teachings and a system of government which had not existed in the beginning had been introduced in succeeding ages. Now

if the Catholic Church was truth, eternal and unchangeable, how was this to be explained? What were the differences, and the reasons for them, between the Church as it existed under Pliny, and the Church of the nineteenth century? In answering these questions in the "Development", Newman became convinced that there was no real difference at all, but that the Church of his own day was identical with that of the second century, only developed; just as the personality of the man has not been changed since his school-days though his body has grown up. Mr. Bertrand Newman has called the "Development" Newman's "greatest though not his most attractive work".(31) The fact that Newman was essentially the Church historian has already been stressed; and it must here be kept clearly in mind that he never looked upon doctrines as isolated theological phenomena, but rather in the light of the experience of past ages. This is the crux of the Historical Theory. In 1834 Newman had stated his whole case against Rome in one of the early Tracts. "Considering the high gifts and strong claims of the Church of Rome", he said, "and its dependencies on our admiration, reverence, love and gratitude, how could we withstand it as we do; ..... How could we learn to be severe and execute judgement, but for the warning of Moses against even a divinely-gifted teacher who should preach new gods, and the anathema of St. Paul against even Angels and Apostles who should bring in a new doctrine".(32) This was Rome as he saw it at the beginning of the Oxford Movement; but by 1845 the Catholic Church seemed to him to have made no innovations at all, at least in any fundamental matters.

The theory of the "Development of Christian Doctrine" is based on the strong antecedent probability, and in fact the necessity, of doctrine developing.(33) Christian doctrine was first promulgated to meet the spiritual needs of a certain specific period in the history of man, and was intended to be applied, in its original form, only under the circumstances of a particular locality. As time went on, therefore, it was essential for modifications and extensions to be introduced. The text of Scripture in itself requires enlargement. The statement, for example, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us", cannot be understood as it stands. Three words in that brief sentence need exposition; they are: Word, made, and flesh. Then too, there are many great doctrines mentioned in Holy Writ which are not solved or carried to their logical conclusions. To clarify these there must be development in the teaching of them. Newman illustrates this by the doctrine of Baptism. Now Penance and Purgatory are usually considered to be additions to Catholic teaching, but in reality they are merely the complement of Baptism. (Of course, it must be remembered here that Newman assumes his reader's acceptance of the Roman view of Baptism.) The function of Baptism is cleansing of original sin; but what about sins committed after the sprinkling? These are removed from the individual's charge by Penance. And sins committed so late in the moments of a life as not to be covered by either of these means are atoned for in Purgatory. It is obvious, therefore, that Baptism by itself was an incomplete doctrine and development was

essential. If Christian doctrines had been intended to operate under static conditions they might have remained the same throughout every age; but the fact that they guide men in a world of activity and change demands that they be altered from time to time. But it is also clear that this development did not mean introducing anything new.(34) Penance and Purgatory were innate in the doctrine fo Baptism, but were not taught till later centuries. The many doctrines which were held back at first were not taught out of reverence for the doctrines, because people were not ready to receive them. To proclaim these before people were fit for them would be simply casting pearls before swine. All Christian precepts, then, have ever been in the Church, but many of them were hid from view until the time was ripe to reveal them. It is often said that a spring is clearest near the source, and, therefore, the Church must have been freest from corruption in the early centuries of the Christian era.(35) But while this may be true of running water, it is not the case with a philosophy or sect. Doctrine will be clearest when it has been applied and discussed through many years, when its stream has become broad and deep and full. An example of this is the rise of Wesleyanism.(36) When John Wesley and his companions started the movement they had no desire that it should ever break away from the Established Church. Wesley, moreover, travelled on foot to save money, and allowed his hair to hang loose about his shoulders when it was the universal custom to dress it. But as time went on and schisms arose in the body, the

original principles were modified and enlarged until the logical outcome of each of Wesley's ideas had been reached. Nor is this principle of development a"Roman" invention.(37) It was admitted in Britain when Jews were first allowed to hold municipal offices on the ground that this involved no new principle, but merely a development of one which had always been in existence. But if doctrines develop, might there not be such a thing as a false doctrinal development? Yes, there are many false developments, but certain tests will serve to distinguish the legitimate from the illegitimate.

There are seven tests which, when applied to any developed doctrine, will show whether it is still the original teaching or has become corrupted. Briefly, these are: 1. Preservation of type or idea,(38) as the child grows into the man. 2. Continuity of principle.(39) Thus, the Catholic Church has, in every age, insisted upon the mystical interpretation of Scripture, --- that is, allowing not only the text of Scripture, but the commentaries as well --- as opposed to the literal interpretation which has ever been employed by heretics. Thus Newman says: "A Development, to be faithful, must retain both the doctrine and the principle with which it started".(40) 3. Power of assimilation.(41) Numerous pagan rites and ceremonies have been adopted into Catholic worship, and these, instead of corrupting that worship, have been assimilated by it and have become Christian sacraments. 4. Early anticipation.(42) Sir Walter Scott, when at school, used to relate to his companions stories of adventures on the Scottish border; and the boy

Athanasius was ordained bishop by his playfellows. Thus both men in their youth anticipated the course of their future lives. 5. Logical sequence.[43] That is, one doctrine will be suggested by another which necessarily preceded it, or one part of a teaching will call forth another part which cannot stand without the first. The chief illustration which Newman gives of the application of this test is the worship of Mary and the saints. Since the condemnation of Arius, he claims, it is perfectly safe for the Church to allow this homage to dead human beings, for the true nature of worship of God has been set forth, and consequently no one can ever suppose that the Virgin and the saints are adored for their own sakes, but merely because of their proximity to, and influence with, God. 6. Preservative additions.[44] These are any additions to doctrine which tend to conserve what has gone before. Newman cites as an example of this the cultus of Mary; but, as Hutton points out,[45] it is hardly a good one, since the purpose of the cultus of Mary is not to safeguard what has been already revealed, but rather to reveal something new. Blackstone has provided Newman with a better example, however, in the rise of government in civilized society. 7. Lastly, chronic continuance.[46] Heresies are of short duration, or, if they do not soon die out, they are changed in course to perhaps the opposite direction, while the truth will continue from age to age. But when these seven tests of a true development have been stated, the question naturally arises, Who is to apply them? Who is to judge false from true doctrine?

It seems certian, therefore, that bound up with the very existence of Christianity is the need of some authority, an infallible authority, to decide what are true developments from out the mass of human speculations.(47) Thus Newman declares: "If Christianity is both social and dogmatic, and intended for all ages, it must, humanly speaking, have an infallible expounder".(48) Since, then, Christianity requires such an expounder, and since Christianity is in the world still, that authority must be in existence. But where is it? Which is the true Church appointed to be the judge of doctrine? It will be a Church which has been in the world throughout the Christian era, and one which is fundamentally the same now as at the time of its inception. Is it, according to this standard, the Protestant Church? No, for the Protestant Church has only been in existence for three centuries. "That Protestantism then is not the Christianity of history, it is easy to determine".(49) Is it the Roman Church? It appears to be, both because it is the only remaining branch of the early Church and because its doctrines measure up to all the tests.

Newman takes up much space in his book showing the application of the seven tests to the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome.(50) For our purpose, however, all but the first, "preservation of type", may be neglected. The application of this test is by far the longest and most important of all.(51) It shows clearly Newman's conception of the organic growth and continuity of the Catholic Church which has ever been the judge of true doctrine. It was this historic view of the Church which, more than anything else, carried

Newman away from Anglicanism to Rome. It is, moreover, worth noting that in numerous instances in which Newman traces a doctrine back to the "early Church", he follows it back only as far as the Church of the Fathers. This, of course, to him was the true early Church. His doing this is particularily noticeable in the case of the fourth test, "early anticipation".(52) In applying the first test, however, he starts with the true primitive Church. The whole application is treated under three divisions: The Church of the First Centuries; The Church of the Fourth Century; and The Church of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries.

In examining the Church as it was in the first centuries, Newman quotes the opinions of it which Tacitus, Suetonius and Pliny held.(53) This was the time when Christians worshipped in caves and cellars, and at quiet times of the day when they were least likely to be disturbed. Consequently, all three of these pagan writers regarded Christianity as superstitious and secret, while the refusal of the Christians to acknowledge the gods of the Empire caused suspicion that theirs was a subversive society. Any misfortunes which came upon the country were blamed upon the wicked acts of this sect. It was, moreover, thought to enslave both the mind and the body of those who adopted it. Now is there any form of Christianity in the world today, Newman asks, which is universally considered to be superstitious, to be ever striving to overthrow political governments, to be a burden upon the individual rights and mental freedom of its devotees? The Catholic Church, it cannot be denied, fits the description

perfectly. Then that Church has not changed in the course of the ages, but bears all the marks which were characteristic of the primitive Church.

Still more strongly, however, does the modern Church of Rome resemble the Nicene Church.(54) In the fourth century numerous schisms began to arise within the fold and press in from all sides upon the orthodox members. And various as were the tenets of these sects, they were united in one thing --- hatred of Rome. Yet while they looked upon her as their common enemy and strove to unite in opposition to her, they could not combine. And through it all the Catholic body continued uninterrupted and unified. To all the heretical factions, moreover, she, and she alone, was known by the name of "Catholic". Then too, each schism was peculiar to its own locality; but, in contrast to this, the Catholic body was universal, or coextensive with the Roman Empire. Does the Roman Church of the nineteenth century resemble that of the fourth in its relations to surrounding heretical sects, and in the extent of its boundaries? It does. Then Rome is the heir, not only of the Church of the first centuries, but of that of the fourth as well.

Passing on to the Church of the fifth and sixth centuries, Newman examines the histories of the great heresies of those years.(55) In the former century the great Arian heresy arose, which Athanasius dedicated his whole life to combatting. It riddled practically every part of the Church, and large sections were not only lost to the continuing Catholic body, but fiercely opposed it. And no sooner had Arianism been

suppressed than two other schisms arose in the sixth century. These were the Nestorian and the Monophysite. Now if the Roman Church in the nineteenth century in attacked by large religions which were once part of itself, and if they have gained the support of Nations in their war against her, then Rome is the successor of the Church as it existed in the fifth and sixth centuries as well as the preceding ages.

Newman sums up his view of the Catholic Church of his day being identical with the Church of past centuries in a striking passage. He says: "Did St. Athanasius or St. Ambrose come suddenly to life, it cannot be doubted what communion they would mistake for their own. All surely will agree that these Fathers, with whatever differences of opinion, whatever protests, if we will, would find themselves more at home with such men as St. Bernard or St. Ignatius Loyola, or with the lonely priest in his lodgings, or the holy sisterhood of mercy, or the unlettered crowd before the altar, than with the rulers or the members of any other religious community. And may we not add that were the two saints, who once sojourned, in exile or on embassage, at Treves, to come more northward still, and to travel until they reached another fair city, seated among groves, green meadows, and calm streams, the holy brothers would turn from many a high aisle and solemn cloister which they found there, and ask the way to some small chapel where mass was said in the populous alley or forlorn suburb?"(56) This, then, is the Historical Church; this the true Church; the one which has come down to us a development from past ages, but so little changed as to deceive the spirits of the Fathers come back to earth.

Newman's arguments, once one admits his initial premises, are faultless, and he employs his method of "accumulative persuasion"[57] to such good effect in this work, piling up facts upon facts, that one is carried away by the logic of his reasoning, and the weaknesses of the whole theory are not at first clearly evident. Nevertheless, weaknesses there are. Thus he asks which communion Athanasius would select as being most like his own, should he come back to earth, but does not ask which one Paul would choose if he were to return. This is what the Protestant wants to know. The adherent of the Reformed faith admires Athanasius for the noble fight he waged against Arianism, but feels that by the fourth century the Church had drifted from its early position, in organization and to some extent in doctrine. But for Newman, the Church of the Fathers was the beginning of orthodoxy and the Christian writers of that age were the first to formulate authoritative doctrine. And of course it is perfectly true that the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century bore strong resemblances to that of the fourth; and Newman felt that what was good enough for the Fathers was good enough for him. A second criticism which can be raised against the Historical theory is this. Is not Newman, after all, only admitting what Protestants have always claimed? When he insists that the few original doctrines have"developed" into the numerous teachings of the Catholic Church of today, that Baptism gave birth to Penance and Purgatory, and so forth, is that not coming close to acknowledging that the doctrine has been changed? The new elements

in the teachings may be "corruptions", as the Protestants claim, or "developments" sanctified by the recognition of the Pope, as Newman claims, but whatever they are, the fact remains that the doctrine taught today, though it may have been inherent in that of the second century, is not the same. And when it is demonstrated that the modern Church of Rome bears the characteristics of the Church of the second century, and those of the Church of the fourth century, as well as those of the fifth and sixth century Churches, can it be doubted that the Church today is not the same as that of the second century? It is the same --- plus the additions of the fourth century, plus those of the fifth and sixth centuries, which is much like saying that 2 equals 12, but 4 and 6 have been added. Nevertheless, if these objections invalidate the theory for the Protestant mind, they did not make it one whit less acceptable to Newman's.

It was this conception of the Historical Church, consequently, which, more than anything else, drove Newman to Rome. The supposition that he went in reaction to the times in which he lived has been over-stressed in the past. Without this theory in the background of his mind he could never have become a Catholic; with it there, he could not avoid it. Speaking of Newman's presentation of the theory of the "Development", Mr. Bertrand Newman says: "Nothing can deprive him of the credit due to a real originality of method".(58) But the theory was concerned wholly with the Church; the papacy, as Newman himself pointed out, did not figure in his Littlemore reasoning.(59)

Once in the true Church, then, how did he fit the claims of the Pope to obedience and Infallibility into his theory? To what extent would he recognize these claims? It is interesting and essential to investigate this.

Chapter 3.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

During his early years, and in fact till he had been some time at Oxford, Newman retained the view that the Holy Father was the incarnation of Antichrist, an idea which he owed to the reading of Newton's writings in his boyhood.(1) It was natural, then, that when Newman joined the Catholic Church, the members of the Curia Romana should be somewhat suspicious of his views upon the Infallibility and the Temporal Power.(2) Especially would this be so when they found few references to the Pope(a) in the "Essay on Development".(3) Had his opinions upon these matters really undergone any radical change, or had he only altered his outlook upon the Church itself? Could Newman be expected to give rise to heretical doctrines on these questions? And when in 1870 the great Vatican Council was deliberating upon the Infallibility, and there appeared in the newspapers a private letter of Newman's which had been

---

(a) Newman declared, with regard to his attitude towards the position of the Pope during his spiritual conflict in the Anglican Church: "In my view, the controversy did not turn upon it; it turned upon the Faith and the Church. This was my issue of the controversy from beginning to end". "Apologia" p 116.

surreptitiously published, in which he called the English advocates of an official definition of the Infallibility "an aggressive, insolent faction",(4) a cloud came to hang over Newman's orthodoxy in official Roman circles. Consequently, he was, in all probability, glad to get an opportunity a few years later to explain his position. It was the controversy with Gladstone which brought out his views upon the Infallibility.

In 1874 Gladstone published a pamphlet entitled, "The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance", in which he attacked what he considered the revived policy of Papal interference in affairs of the State. This "Expostulation" was the direct result of the defeat the previous year, through the influence of the Irish clergy upon members of Parliament, of the Liberal bill to establish a non-sectarian university in Ireland. Gladstone asserted that the failure of this measure to pass the House was proof positive that under Pius IX the Church of Rome had once again begun to assert her mediaeval policy of Papal domination in national matters; she had "refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused".(5) The declaration of the Infallibility in 1870, moreover, had not only blasted the worth of the assurances of Catholic civil loyalty, given by eminent priests at the time of the Emancipation Act, and upon which that concession had been granted, but it had made it impossible for a member of the Roman Church to remain a good subject of a Protestant State.(6)

This pamphlet ran into 140,000 copies and immediately provoked numerous replies from outstanding Catholics,

including Archbishop Manning and Lord Acton. But the longest and most comprehensive was that of Dr. Newman. His answer to the charges took the form of a "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk". The "Letter" is in no sense personal, and, with the exception of the opening paragraph and closing remarks, all thought of the Duke, and of Newman's relations to him, is left out. A large part of this pamphlet --- for pamphlet it really was --- is taken up with a refutation of Gladstone's immediate charges against the Papacy and its subjects. But we find in it also a clear and full statement of Newman's theory of the Infallibility, and of its effect upon the rights and duties of the individual.

In the first place, Newman declares, it is a mistake to suppose that the "Supreme direction"(7) of the lives of his subjects, which is claimed by the Holy Father, in any way reduces Catholics to moral slavery or deprives them of the right of discretion in their private lives. He demands "Supreme direction", it is true, but this does not mean "minute" direction.(7) It does not mean that the Catholic is told what time he shall rise and what time he shall go to bed, or what colour suit he shall wear. It is, moreover, merely "direction", and not "supervision" or "management".(7) The Pope lays down broad principles which all the faithful are to follow, but each individual must apply them in the particular circumstances of his own life."So little", says Newman, "does the Pope come into this whole system of moral theology by which (as by our conscience) our lives are regulated, that the weight of his hand upon us, as private men, is absolutely unappreciable".(8)

Occasionally the Catholic may be required to do something, or to refrain from something, because the Pope has commanded it, which is difficult and distasteful to him. But the same situation often arises when we are guided only by private judgement and conscience. Civil law, moreover, has supreme direction of our lives, and controls our actions; but no one ever feels that it is interfering with his private rights or burdening his comfort and conscience. Yet the restrictions of religious are far lighter than those of civil law. "Reducible as these directions (Pope's) in detail are to the few and simple heads which I have mentioned, they are little more than reflections and memoranda of our moral sense, unlike the positive enactments of the legislature".(9) Newman' refers also to Busenbaum's "Medulla",(10) --- a handbook for Confessors --- which shows that not only are the Papal injunctions dealing with private life much less personal and stringent than is commonly supposed, but the actual "authoritative enunciations" made in the past have been extremely few. Newman proceeds to give us an illustration. A business man has a medical adviser, who tells him, on occasion, that he must do this and must not do that. No one considers that these instructions for the man's welfare are in any way an interference with his rights as a private citizen. Why then, should the Pope's guidance be so considered? Nor is the Pope able to include any commands he likes under the heads of "faith and morals" --- in which he has a right to interfere --- as Gladstone suggested. He must abide by the definitions of these terms which are found in the theological works of the past, and his

commands must remain within their limits. But Newman not only attempts to explain to just what extent the Pope can interfere in private lives; he also shows the relationship of the Pope's authority to interfere --- the Infallibility --- to the individual conscience.

It must be admitted that Newman goes much farther in the matter of conscience than would most orthodox Catholics. "Conscience", he says, "is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas, and, even though the eternal priesthood throughout the Church should cease to be, in it the sacerdotal principle would remain and would have a sway".(11) But today, he feels, the term "conscience" is widely misused. It no longer has the "old, true, Catholic meaning" (12) of the rights of God in the life of the individual and man's duty to his Creator, but is made to imply the privilege of people to follow their own whims and humours, to write, speak, think, and act exactly as they want to. Now when Popes have condemned the guidance of conscience, it has been this false conception of conscience which they have had in mind. No Pope would oppose the rights of conscience in the true sense of the word. To do so would be fatal to his office, for the work of the Papacy is intimately bound up with conscience. Conscience is the light, perhaps undeveloped and untrained, which is born in the heart of every man and resides with him all his days. It is the 'light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world".(13) But this light is not sufficient of itself; it is only part of the light which God gives to man. The Pope, who

comes from God, is sent to complete it. His very existence, then, is based on the fact of conscience. "The championship of the moral law is his raison d'etre".(14) Nor is such a thing as conflict between conscience and Papal Infallibility possible. Conscience does not give us light on doctrinal matters or upon speculative truth; while these are the special province of revelation and the Papacy. The Pope, moreover, when he touches upon the sphere of morals, must do so through legislation, particular orders, interdicts and excommunication, and in these things he is not Infallible. It is possible, therefore, for a man at the bidding of conscience to oppose the Pope in a matter of morals, and be in the right. Newman's conclusion upon this question of conscience and the Infallibility is clear and concise. He says: "Certainly, if I am obliged to bring religion into after-dinner toasts, (which indeed does not seem quite the thing) I shall drink, --- to the Pope, if you please, --- still, to Conscience first, and to the Pope afterwards".(15)

But since, as has been said, the Pope is incapable of error in some things and not in others, Newman is led on to discuss a further question, namely, when is he infallible and when not? In other words, when does he speak ex cathedra? The conditions for this are four: "When he speaks, first, as Universaal Teacher; secondly, in the name and with the authority of the Apostles; thirdly, on a point of faith and morals; fourthly, with the purpose of binding every member of the Church to accept and believe his decision".(16) As Billuart pointed

out, he is not infallible in conversation, nor in explaining a definition, nor in discussion, nor in the interpretation of Scripture or the Fathers. It must be kept in mind, moreover, that neither Pope nor Ecumenical Council has the authority and unquestionable power which was possessed by the Apostles; and Papal Infallibility has always been, and must always be, inferior to inspiration. There are,too, cases when the Pope is not to be obeyed or believed. Such cases occur when he quotes an erroneous document, like that of the Areopagite, or when he condemns a truth, as Galileo's Copernicanism, unless indeed it has some bearing upon a dogma or doctrine. Dogmatic statements also appear from time to time in the letters of the Pope, but since these are only "obiter", or by the way, and without direct intention to define, it is not necessary to consider them as infallible. And besides the authoritative statements which a Pope can make, certain things limit the subject matter which may be included in infallible declarations. Such utterances, in the first place, must be referable to the Apostolic depositum of truth, either through Scripture or through Tradition. Moral declarations must be drawn from, and not contrary to, the Moral Law, for the Pope has no power over this Law. A declaration, for example, which made perjury permissible would not only be fallible, but would not have claim to acceptance at all, since the Pope has no power to alter the Moral Law. Then too, infallible statements must deal with matters relating to salvation, and, as a result, must be applicable to all men, because salvation is open to everyone.

And lastly, they must act in one of two channels, either in direct proclamation of truth, or in condemnation of error. A Pope is capable of mistakes in the reasoning by which he is led up to his infallible definition, and in explaining that definition. "What Providence has guaranteed is only this, that there should be no error in the final step, in the resulting definition or dogma".(17)

But what is the effect of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility upon the relations of Church and State? This was the question which had provoked Newman's statements upon the Infallibility. Gladstone had claimed that a nation could not depend on the loyalty of its Catholic subjects because the Pope in a crisis might release them from their allegiance. Newman, however, had demonstrated that the power of the Pope was not nearly as great as was thought. He had pointed out that the individual Catholic was not directed by the Pope in every little detail of his life; that conscience, under certain circumstances, demanded precedence over the commands of the Pope; and that only under particular conditions could the Infallibility be exercised. Hence, he claimed that Gladstone's fear was largely imaginary. If the nations would recognize the Papacy as they recognize other independent sovereignties all difficulties would vanish, for if friction should arise it would be smoothed over by negotiation. Neither the nations nor the Papacy are willing to give up their abstract rights, but in practice neither would demand their full recognition. What would be the action of English Catholics should Britain send ships to assist

Italy against the Holy See? Well, they would first try, by all constitutional means, to prevent their going; but, if they went, the Catholics would remain loyal subjects, only spending their energies of prayer and action to bring about a hasty termination of the conflict. There is, moreover, little likelihood of a Nation-Pope quarrel ever arising. "The circumferences of State jurisdiction and of Papal are for the most part quite apart from each other; there are just some few degrees out of the 360 in which they intersect, and Mr. Gladstone, instead of letting these cases of intersection alone, till they occur actually, asks me what I should do, if I found myself placed in the space intersected".(18) Neither Pope nor Queen could expect to receive from subjects an absolute obedience; it would be contrary to human nature and the laws of society. "I give", says Newman, "an absolute obedience to neither".(19) The doctrine of Papal Infallibility was, therefore, according to Newman's theory, in no way detrimental to the national loyalty of Catholics.

Newman's whole theory of the functions and value of the Pope's power of inerrant utterance may thus be summed up in a few words. The Pope lays down broad, general principles --- "supreme direction" --- of conduct, binding upon every Catholic. But each individual is not only free to, but must of necessity, apply these rules to the particular circumstances of his own life; and so his personal affairs are not interfered with. The work of the Holy Father is not to supersede, but to supplement, conscience; and so there can never be a real conflict between

them. But should the Pope overstep his bounds, then the dictates of conscience are to be given the preference. The Pope, moreover, can only exert his Infallibility under certain conditions and with strict limitations. Nor is the possibility great of the jurisdictions of Church and State overlapping, for neither Queen nor Pope can receive an absolute obedience from any subject. These views of the Infallibility, it must be admitted, are not those of a thorough-going Catholic; they are far from the Ultramontane position. They do form, nevertheless, the conception to which "the most illustrious of English converts"[20] moved after abandoning his early "Antichrist" view of the Pope.

Chapter 4.

NEWMAN'S INFLUENCE ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Dean Inge has observed that Newman "has left an indelible mark on two great religious bodies".[1] After reaching the pinnacle of his fame in the Anglican Church and leading a Movement which severely denounced Rome, and then, in middle life, himself becoming a Catholic, we should expect that his influence upon the Church of his adoption would be profound. And though it was great, yet, strangely enough, it has been wider in the Anglican Communion than in the Catholic, both before and after 1845.[2] As a Catholic, he was misunderstood for a time by his fellow-religionists, and feared by Papal authorities, so that it is only to be expected that he should have been unable to employ his talents to the fullest extent in shaping the organization and teachings of Rome. Thus, in 1857, we find him complaining in a letter to Ambrose St.John: "It was at Oxford, and by my Parochial sermons, that I had influence --- all that is past".[3] Again, he confesses to his diary: "Contemporaneously with this neglect on the part of those for whom I laboured, there has been a drawing towards me on the part of Protestants. Those very books and labours which Catholics did not understand, Protestants did. I am under the

temptation of looking out for, if not courting, Protestant praise".[4] Newman's elevation to the Cardinalate came too late in his span of years for him to leave his impress upon the administration of the Church, as he might have been expected to do in this high office.[5] During his lifetime, moreover, his usefulness was hampered largely through the efforts of one man who ought to have cooperated with him in every way. That man was Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster.[6]

Despite all that Cardinal Manning had in common with the great Oratorian, he was extremely jealous of him, and did all in his power to keep him from rising.[7] He, like Newman, was born into a staunch Church of England family; and like Newman,too, his father was a banker and financier, and in both cases their firms failed. It is, moreover, a curious coincidence that it took Newman and Manning the same length of time to get from Anglicanism to Rome --- Manning was born six years later than his "rival", and entered the Catholic Church exactly six years after him.[8] During the Oxford Movement, Manning, as a prosperous young rector of a country charge, supported the High Church cause which Newman represented. But after the conversions of the two men, and when Manning had gained prominence in the Roman Communion by sheer force of personality, together with what is commonly known as "wire-pulling", he sought by all means at his command to suppress and stiffle the activities of Newman which might bring him into prominence or ecclesiastical favour. An unusually cold and selfish disposition, it is true of Manning if of anyone that he was "without natural affection".[9]

His treatment of the memory of his dead wife, and of the mad man who, in his days of sanity, had made him all that he was, manifests the character of the man better than any description that can be given, and helps us to understand his attitude towards Newman. Manning pulled his oar in perfect unison with Monsignor Talbot, the Papal officer who had the ear of the Holy Father, and who described Newman as "the most dangerous man in England",(10) It was not difficult, therefore, for Manning to exert official pressure, and he succeeded in blocking or injuring practically every great endeavour which Newman attempted during his Catholic life. Six years of Newman's life were wasted, partly through Manning's efforts, in the ill-fated Irish University project; the Oxford Oratory scheme, so dear to the heart of the man who had risen to fame there, was frustrated in like manner; and the cardinal's hat, which was to soothe the decline of a life of sorrow, was almost knocked from Newman's head, just as it seemed to be settling upon it, by a skilfully-aimed blow of Manning's. During the lifetime of the two men, however, the public seems not to have suspected this antagonism between them. Jennings, writing Newman's biography while the latter was still alive, supposes that the offer of the cardinalate was at first declined out of modesty, and does not guess that it was due to a cunning ruse on the part of the Archbishop.(11) Newman's influence, therefore, particularily upon Catholic organization, might have been much greater had he not been living in the same age as Manning.

The practical undertakings which Newman was given

to perform by the Church were, in no instance, related to the already-existing Catholic institutions, but each was a new venture. This was unfortunate, for Newman was not endowed with great organizing or administrative ability. In the Oxford Movement, he had carefully avoided everything that savoured of party organization, prefering unity through spirit and purpose rather than through central committees. His first and only successful attempt to found a new institution, moreover, was not of a type to permit him to influence the History of the Catholic Church to any extent. This was the Oratory at Birmingham.[12] After his secession, he had first thought of becoming a Jesuit and teaching theology at Oscott;[13] and, had he done so, he might have left the impress of his views deep in the doctrine of the Church. But the authorities, disliking the ideas which he set forth in the "Development", would never have consented to this. He therefore turned his thoughts to the setting up of an Oratory, which would provide most of the social and intellectual features of the type of life he had been accustomed to at Oxford.[14] This strongly appealed to the Papal authorities, for they were looking forward to the return of England to the fold, and this move seemed a likely way of reaching the intellectual element of the country.[15] But the influence which Newman was able to exert from the Oratory did not radiate very far, and accomplished little towards the reconversion of England. Of course, the Oratorian Fathers made converts, but these were, with some exceptions, from the lower classes, and this did not greatly rejoice the heart of either Archbishop Wiseman or of the

officials at Rome.[16] If it was not a big catch, they did not consider the fishing good; and Newman and his followers did not land very many great "fish" for Catholicism after they left the Anglican Church. It is true that the Oratory Churches were filled from the beginning, Protestants as well as Catholics attending;[17] and Newman preached the sermons which he afterwards collected as "Sermons to Mixed Congregations".[18] It was at this time, too, that he delivered his King William Street Lectures on the "Difficulties of Anglicans",[19] which were addressed to the Tractarians who had remained within the Church of England. But Englishmen just then were not in a humour to listen to what he had to say. Much of his time, moreover, was occupied with the routine of administration and with pastoral duties, which not only prevented him from greater usefulness, but could have been done much better by a man of lesser intellect and a different temperament.[20] Mr. Paul Elmer More speaks of him as living in "ignoble obscurity".[21] Then too, during the greater part of the 1850's, Newman was occupied with the ill-fated attempt to found a Catholic university in Ireland. It is true that the "might-have-beens" of history are an unprofitable field of speculation; but one cannot keep from wondering how Newman's biography would have read had this venture proved successful, and what we would have had to record of his influence upon the Roman Church. He himself had visions of it becoming a second Oxford, the centre of Catholic learning in the English-speaking world. In fact, it was only this hope, and the knowledge that the Holy Father had himself expressed the wish that the institution should be started, that led Newman

to accept the Rectorship in the face of overwhelming odds and almost certain failure. For a time, however, as Newman laboured in Ireland, it looked as if his efforts would be crowned with success, despite the unfavourable circumstances; but the indifference of the Irish people, the opposition of the Catholic clergy, the Roman communications of Manning, and the apparent opposition of Dr. Cullen, all combined to show him the futility of his efforts. The only permanent result of these wasted years was the lectures on the "Scope and Nature of a University Education", which have contributed much to the theory of education, but little to the Catholic Church. In the years following his home-coming, Newman twice tried to return to Oxford by founding a branch of the Oratory there;[22] and, had he succeeded, this would have been one of the most effective blows which the Catholic Church has yet levelled against liberalism. Liberalism had taken complete possession of the University soon after the break-up of the Oxford Movement, and Newman was willing to cooperate with the Anglican Church in war against this tendency. But opposed to any such compromise were two men --- W. G. Ward, conscientiously, and Cardinal Manning, selfishly --- and they succeeded in forestalling the Oratory even after the site had been purchased. This added one more to the list of Newman's failures. But if he failed in most of his great practical undertakings in the Catholic Church, if he had little influence upon Roman institutions, nevertheless the effect of his Catholic life upon the people of England will never be lost. His influence upon his fellow-countrymen may be regarded from two angles ---

that upon Catholics, and that upon Protestants.

The Church of Rome is frequently represented, in contrast to Protestant denominations, as the great example of perfect unity and religious accord. It is supposed that all its members are joined together in a common bond of love, and with a single purpose; that from the Pope down to the humblest penitent there is complete harmony and cooperation. But this conception is far from the truth. In reality, the Catholic Church is so split up by factions holding various shades of opinion that below the surface it much resembles Protestantism. It is a group of sects joined together by a common allegiance to the Holy See. The Catholics of England were divided amongst themselves when Newman joined them, and this led to his being distrusted and misunderstood by most of them for some time. One would naturally expect that these Catholics would welcome with open arms the flood of converts who turned to the Roman Church during, and immediately after, the Oxford Movement. This, however, was not the case; but on the contrary, the "Old Catholics",[23] as they were called --- those who were descended from families which had been Catholic since the days of Elizabeth --- resented the presence of the former Tractarians in their midst. There were several reasons for this. In the first place, they and their families had remained true to the Roman Church during three hundred years, and had never wavered from the faith even in the face of persecution and the injustice of laws which discriminated against them. And now, just when the hardness of their lot was being alleviated, a number of former

heretics come to join them and to proclaim as things newly discovered the truths to which they had always clung. Then too, the Pope had seen fit in 1850, owing to the increase in the number of Catholics in England, to divide the country into dioceses and appoint Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop.(24) This not only led to the loud outburst of Protestants, headed by Lord John Russell, the prime minister, against Papal aggression; it also showed that the Pontiff had cared little about the Catholics of England in the past, but now that they were being augmented by outstanding men and women from the Anglican camp, he was becoming interested. The Old Catholics were also annoyed by the introduction of Italianizations --- eccentricities of teaching and ceremony which had never been in vogue with the unemotional Englishmen --- by the new Archbishop and the converts.(25) And finally, they were nauseated by the publication of the "Lives of the Saints" --- accounts of the most fabulous miracles in the legends of the Italian saints --- which were brought out by Faber and the Oratorian Fathers.(26) Newman, as the greatest of the converts, stood in the full glare of this unfavourable light in which the new Catholics were viewed by the old.(27) He had been unpopular in the Anglican Church, but had had a host of followers. Now he was again unpopular, but had no disciples, except among the converts. But the tide of Old Catholic sentiment eventually reached a turning-point and began to ebb; and Newman rose steadily in esteem until he became, not only the defender of their cause in England, but the champion of their faction within the Church as well. Thus we find Manning writing to Monsignor

Talbot: "What you write about Dr. Newman is true ..... He has become the centre of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, cold and silent --- to say no more --- about the Temporal Power, national, English, critical of Catholic devotions, and always on its lower side".(28) Those who held the "low views", and who rallied about Newman were the Old Catholics. In 1867, moreover, after the failure of the Oxford Oratory scheme, we find Lord Edward Howard, guardian of the young Duke of Norfolk, telling Newman in the Memorial Address to him: "Every blow that touches you inflicts a wound upon the Catholic Church in this country".(29) One of the things which had helped to swing opinion in Newman's favour was the action of the Oratorians during the cholera epidemic in September 1849.(30) There was a severe outbreak of the disease at Bilston, and the parish priest, though he put forth a noble effort, was unable to cope with the emergency. Newman, together with Father St. John and Brother Aloysius, went to the afflicted area to offer assistance, and though immediately after their arrival the epidemic subsided, nevertheless, their self-sacrifice in the face of danger was never forgotten by English Catholics. Thus, once the Catholics had come to trust Newman he gave them a new self-confidence which they had never known since the Reformation, and helped them to overcome their religious inferiority complex by showing them that their belief was capable of an intellectual apology.

As did the Catholics of England, so too the Protestants began by distrusting and scoffing at Newman, and ended by

regarding him with respect and almost veneration. It was the outcome of the Achilli Trial that first softened Protestant sentiment. Newman had taken the charges which he levelled at Dr. Achilli from an article in the Dublin Review by Cardinal Wiseman, and when the Archbishop came to look for his evidence, at Newman's request, he was unable to put his hands upon it. Consequently, Newman was forced to secure witnesses in Italy and bring them to England at greaf expense. But the testimony which these witnesses gave could not be corroborated. Nevertheless, the whole weight of the evidence supported Newman, and all that Achilli could do was to deny the charges brought against him. Yet, in spite of this, Lord Campbell gave his verdict against the Oratorian. All fair-minded Protestants immediately recognized the injustice of the decision. The "Times" denounced it in a leading editorial in which it declared: "We consider that a great blow has been given to the administration of justice in this country, and that Roman Catholics will henceforth have xx only too good reason for asserting that there is no justice for them in cases tending to arouse the Protestant feelings of judges and juries".(31) Thus educated Protestant opinion came to sympathize with Newman; and Newman himself felt, despite the verdict, that the outcome of this affair was favourable to him.(32) The trial, then, helped greatly to shake the anti-Catholic bigotry of the time.(33) A few years later came the "Apologia", which made Kingsley's charges appear very crude and ungentlemanly, and gave Newman the air of wronged innocence, completely swinging educated opinion to his favour.

One writer has expressed the effect of the book in these words: "The pathos, the delicacy, the charm of his self-revelation placed him high in the regard of his countrymen, and of the sounder elements in his own Church".(34) And with the rise in popular estimation of Newman, went a similar rise in the estimation of Catholics in general. It was found that Newman, after all, had not become a Catholic solely to be able to light candles and say masses, but had done so because he had a good reason. Perhaps, then, all Catholics had a good reason for being what they were. Carlyle's estimation of Newman, that he had no more brains than a jack-rabbit,(35) expressed what was once the common opinion; but after the appearance of the "Apologia" it no longer held true, and, when the aged Oratorian was honoured at the end of a sad life of disappointments with the cardinal's hat, even Protestants were pleased.(36) John Henry Newman, therefore, greatly raised the English Protestant regard for Catholics and Catholicism. It is perfectly true, then, that after 1866: "For the rest of his life he was an immense reserve force in Catholicism. He was believed to have an answer for every difficulty, and a policy for every emergency. He invested the Church with a glamour which effectively disguised her true features; her unreason appeared reason; her narrowness breadth. More than any one man, he destroyed the Protestant legend; more than any one man, he created the Catholic myth".(37) It was not only by the Achilli affair, however, and the "Apologia" that he made Roman unreason appear reason; he did so by his doctrinal and other Catholic writings as well.

Newman's theories, nevertheless, have not influenced orthodox Catholic teachings to anything like the extent that one would expect from a man of his originality and apologetic genius, owing to the attitude of Papal authorities towards them and towards their author. Newman was cramped because he feared Catholic officialdom, and Catholic officialdom feared him.(38) He dreaded the thought of being called to Rome to answer charges of heresy --- as was being done to some men in his time; and the members of the Curia Romana were unwilling, as well as unable, to comprehend his writings. As the Catholic ecclesiastics were incapable of reading the "Essay on Development" in the original, Dalgairns had to arrange for its translation into French.(39) Some Unitarians in the United States, moreover, had enthusiastically taken up Newman's arguments, and this prejudiced them against the work.(39) Newman had written the book just before he entered the Catholic Church, and when fulfilling his noviciate in Rome, he did his utmost to have it recognized by official sanction. The objection was persisted in, however, that since he had written it while in the Anglican Church, it would be understood from the Protestant viewpoint.(40) This was unfortunate, for Newman's theory is the only one which can be said to meet satisfactorily an obvious weakness in Roman doctrine.(41) The appeal of Catholic theologians has ever been to antiquity, and to the identity of the Church in all succeeding ages with it. "Quod semper, quod ubique et ab omnibus". But to anyone with a knowledge of history it is perfectly plain that the Church has not always been the same. It is necessary, then, to transport the modern Church

back to the early centuries. But Newman's theory of Development overcomes all difficulties on this point, if his initial premises are granted --- and Catholics will not scruple to grant these. Newman, of course, did not originate the theory.(42) It had been previously used by Petavius to reconcile ante- with post-Nicene doctrine, and Newman merely extended it to cover the whole course of Church history. Had the theory found favour with the Papal ministers it might have been adopted by many a young priest. In 1907, however, a Papal Syllabus officially rejected Newman's theory, though it did not mention him by name.(43) But not only did Newman's views of Church history remain in the background; his conception of the Infallibility did also. He declined to take any part in the great Ecumenical Council of 1870 because he felt that what he had to say would not be acceptable to the vast majority of Churchmen present.(44) Such a conference, the greatest in numbers ever held, must have strongly attracted him, for he loved the pomp and the ceremony.(45) It must have conjured up before his mind visions of the Councils in which Athanasius and the Fathers participated. He had, moreover, strong feelings about the undesirability of defining the Infallibility and enunciating it as a formal dogma. But what was the use of him presenting his views? Would he be listened to? Not as long as Manning and Talbot desired to see the thing carried through. When we read in the "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk", which he wrote upon the subject of the Infallibility a few years later, the statement with regard to the Popes, that he does not deny "that they

have never suffered from bad counsellors or misinformation",[46] we cannot but wonder whether he had Monsignor Talbot and the Archbishop of Westminster in mind. And once more it is perhaps regrettable, as far as the interests of Catholicism are concerned, that Newman's views upon this ticklish subject were not given greater consideration, but were cast aside as if unworthy of thought. He recognized the supremacy of the Holy Father,[47] and was willing to acknowledge the Infallibility when making official pronouncements; but at the same time he left room for the direction of the conscience of the individual in his personal affairs. If Rome was looking for the reconversion of the Protestant Churches[48] she was not bringing the realization of her dream any closer by defining the Infallibility and making it a necessary article of belief for Catholics. Newman realized this, and felt that a doctrine based on some such reasoning as he used would be much more likely to ~~attract~~ help Tractarians and others along the Romeward way. The Church, however, would not consider Newman's views of either the Development or the Infallibility; and consequently, in spite of the authorities and in spite of Newman himself, some of his ideas have become the basis of the teachings of a heretical faction which has grown up within the Roman Church and which may yet be the means of splitting it once more. Thus we read in the "Outspoken Essays": "It has been the strange fate of this great man, after driving a wedge deep into the Anglican Church, which at this day is threatened with disruption through the movement which he helped to originate, to have nearly succeeded in doing the same to the far more compact structure of Roman Catholicism".[49]

It is chiefly to the "Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent" that the Modernistic school in the Catholic Church traces back its origin.(50) It is strange that a man who unhesitatingly accepted accounts of the Liquification of the blood of saints and martyrs, should become the unwilling leader of thinkers of sceptical tendencies.(51) Huxley even claimed that he could compile a Primer of Infidelity from his writings.(52) But it was not his actual beliefs which made him the basis of Catholic Modernism, but rather the evidence which he produced for those beliefs. For "he was not, needless to say, what is now called a Modernist; he was not even, in the sense in which Acton was, a Liberal Catholic. He was, at most, a semi-Liberal".(53) Newman, through his intimate acquaintance with William Froude and other doubters, was well fitted to discuss Catholicism from the sceptical viewpoint; and W. G. Ward had long been urging him to write a book on the relations of faith and reason.(54) He had himself mentioned, moreover, in a letter to Dr. Meynell in 1860, the fact that he was considering the writing of a treatise to set forth "the popular, practical and personal evidence of Christianity".(55) The result of this was the "Grammar of Assent", published in 1870, in which Newman attempted to give an orthodox answer to a very real problem. That problem was this: how is the uneducated man, who has not got access to the historical and other evidences of Christianity, and who, if he had such access, would be incapable of utilizing it, how is he to have any certainty of the truth of the dogmas he is told to believe?(56) Newman answered this question with his "Personalist" theory, which is somewhat difficult to describe,

although his meaning is perfectly clear.(57) In a word, Newman claimed that though the uneducated man has not the intellectual evidence of Christianity, nevertheless, he has adequate and complete proof of his belief within his own being; he has a conviction within himself which supplies stronger evidence than argument and scholarship can possibly give.(58) And this "illative sense",(59) as Newman calls it, is not the proof of the uneducated alone, but is the ground upon which learned and illiterate alike base their belief. It is proof which the believer "knows within himself, an infinite something, unnamed, indefinable, the one absolute reality".(60) Newman felt that the common Catholic idea that the mere presentaion of the case for Christianity was conclusive proof of its truth, and that anyone who, on hearing of Christianity, did not accept it immediately was either dishonest or stubborn, was not fair or reasonable.(61) Faith was not such a cut and dried thing as to be capable of concise and conclusive intellectual presentation. On the contrary, the evidence for it was not clear on the surface, but apparent only to the believer. But for him, as Wilfrid Ward puts it, there are "grounds of conviction too personal to be adequately expressed".(62) Newman realized that a teaching of this kind was not in accordance with the traditional Catholic theology, and knew that he would be suspected, and charged with heresy, immediately the book appeared.(63) He was led, therefore, under the strain of suspense, and fear of the consequences of the publication of the work, to denounce bitterly to his friends the traditional theologians who moved in a

"groove"[64] and would not tolerate anyone who did not also move in that groove. "Our theological philosophers", he stated in a letter, "are like the old nurses who wrap the unhappy infant in swaddling bands or boards --- put a lot of blankets over him --- and shut the windows that not a breath of fresh air may come to his skin as if he were not healthy enough to bear wind and water in due season".[64] Consequently, he secured the help of Dr. Meynell, of Oscott, who was sympathetic, to read the proofs, and point out any words or phrases which in his scholastically-trained judgement might be offensive to the authorities.[65] Nor were Newman's fears without grounds. He found great difficulty in some quarters in making clear the necessity of such a work. Even Dr. Wiseman preferred to have people accept their beliefs on ecclesiastical authority rather than from the evidence of any "illative sense".[66] But to Newman, who was acquainted with the criticism of sceptics, such a defence of Christianity was essential. When the book appeared, moreover, severe attacks were levelled against it from several quarters. One of these quarters was Fraser's Magazine, in which both Leslie Stephen and Fitz-James Stephen wrote criticisms.[67] But more dangerous than either of these attacks was a series of articles by a Jesuit, Father Harper, who attempted to expose the fallacy of Newman's arguments by reasoning in the scholastic method.[68] Father Harper's discussions, however, were so involved and obscure to the ordinary reader that even Newman gave up trying to read them. In the face of this criticism one man defended the "Grammar", and put to an end any possible danger in which

the author may have stood.[69] This man was W. G. Ward, whose reputation for orthodoxy enabled Catholic minds to rest easy when his favourable appreciation of Newman's book came out in the Dublin Review. As a result of this defence"the book had a wide circulation, and was read in the families which specially loved its author, by those who did not understand it as well as by those who did".[70]

The loop-hole through which Modernism slipped into the argument of the "Grammar" was its "Personalist" element. Once it is admitted that there must be personal evidence to warrant belief, any variety of "Protestantism" may result,and the whole structure of the Roman Church is undermined. The "Grammar of Assent", therefore, as well as some phases of the "Development", have formed a basis for the theories of Catholic Modernists. Thus it has been truly said: "In the Church of Rome Newman's influence has been for breadth and moderation. His philosophy of religion has kept Catholics in the Church who would otherwise have fallen away from her".[71] Mr. More has thrown out the pregnant suggestion[72] that if Newman had not felt the need of returning to tradition and the authority of the Church Fathers, he might have become the avowed leader of the new Modernistic party; --- but here we are getting back to the "might-have-beens" again.

It is interesting and instructive, when studying the influence of Newman upon the Catholic Church, to turn one's thoughts in retrospect to the fourteenth century, and compare

him and his work with Wycliffe. So frequently did similar events occur in the lives of the two men --- sometimes with the same consequences, sometimes with the opposite --- that comparison seems almost fictitious. The first thing that strikes one is the similarity of Christian names --- John Wycliffe and John Henry Newman. Then we find that both were Oxford men, as students and also as members of the staff.(73) Wycliffe was for a time Master of Balliol College; Newman a fellow of Oriel. The influences which Wycliffe came under at the University were for the most part those of the rising Reform party --- he studied under Bradwardine and Fitzralph,(74) --- and these shaped the course of his life. The atmosphere which Newman encountered, on the other hand, when he went to Oxford, had a decided leaning towards Romanism. Both men differed with the University authorities and both were forced to leave. It seems strange that Oxford, which, in the fourteenth century was the hot-bed of Reformation teaching, should in the nineteenth century become the seat of reaction to Romanism; but such is the case. It is also a noticeable point of similarity, in comparing these ecclesiastical leaders, that the descendants of Wycliffe's family, as if in protest against their degenerate relative, have been noted as staunch supporters of the Papacy in England.(75) And likewise, the members of Newman's immediate family disapproved of his action. Not only did Francis Newman speak disparagingly of him in the "Early History", but he also says: "I darkly surmise painful collisions between my brother on the one side and my mother and elder sister on the other".(76) Each

of these reformers, moreover, made a trip to Europe, and these trips had exactly the opposite effect upon the two men. Wycliffe was one of the outstanding figures on the Commission to Bruges in 1374, headed by John of Gaunt, which met Papal delegates and attempted to settle England's differences with the Holy See.(77) The result of this acquaintance with the Pope's ambassadors and their ways was to disgust Wycliffe with the Roman system. In contrast to this, we find that when Newman travelled to Southern Europe with Hurrell Froude and his father, in 1832, he was not driven from the Catholic Church by seeing the parent organization in operation, but, instead, came back moaning: "Oh, that thy creed were sound". In their studies, too, the men show opposite inclinations. Whereas the one turned from the theologians and the scholasticists to the Bible, to reverence it with his whole heart and translate it for the benefit of his countrymen;(78) the other gave up his early interest in the Scriptures to make Church History and Tradition his particular field of study. In the lifetime of each man, moreover, a great Papal question arose, and the issues which were raised drew both men into the political arena. Newman's opponent, as we have seen in an earlier chapter,(79) was W. E. Gladstone, and their controversy was the direct outcome of the Proclamation of the Pope's Infallibility. The Papal friction which occurred in Wycliffe's day was due to the revival by Urban V, in 1365, of the claim of an annual feudal tribute of one thousand marks, stipulated in the agreement with King John.(80) Significant, too, is the fact that most of the great doctrinal and ethical questions

which came before Wycliffe were also faced by Newman in a later age. Chief among these were the teachings relating to the Church, transubstantiation, and celibacy of the clergy. Of course, it is not strange that these problems should have come before both men, for the one is the typical representative of Protesfants and Protestantism, while the other bears out many of the important characteristics of Catholics and Catholicism. Thus we observe that each took the opposite view in these matters. Wycliffe insisted, in spite of Papal claims, that a visible Church was not the teaching of Scripture, but that the true Church was composed of all believers down through the ages; a spiritual not a material thing; an organism rather than an organization.(81) But Newman, as has been pointed out,(82) got from Butler's "Analogy" the idea of a visible Church, and once this conception had gripped his mind, he could never again turn his eyes away from the picture of the Church as a historical growth. It is interesting also to read Wycliffe's words in denial of transubstantiation. He asked: "How canst thou, O priest, who art but a man, make thy Maker? What! the thing that grows in the fields --- that ear which thou pluckest today shall be God tomorrow! --- As you cannot make the works which He made, how shall ye make Him who made the works?"(83) But Newman accepted the doctrine even though it seemed unreasonable to other people. He said: "I cannot, indeed, prove it true; I cannot tell how it is; but I say, 'Why should it not be? What's to hinder it? What do I know of substance or matter? Just as much as the greatest philosophers --- and that

is nothing at all'. ..... The Catholic doctrine leaves phenomena alone ..... it deals with what no one on earth knows anything about --- the material substances themselves".(84) And upon the important matter of celibacy of the clergy also, both men had clear-cut ideas. Wycliffe, after much thought upon the subject, came to the conclusion that it was perfectly permissible, according to Scripture, for priests to marry, and wrote his treatise on "Wedded Men and Wives" to set forth his reasons for believing this.(85) Newman, on the other hand, by the time he had reached the age of fifteen had determined that he would never marry. And a last point of difference between the two Oxford Reformers is in the character of the movements which they started. The contrast is as striking as that between the two men themselves. The Oxford Movement was carried on by highly cultured University Fellows, through the preparation of learned theological Tracts, and through discussions amid the diversified chatter of the common rooms. It is impossible to picture these dignified Tractarians in the place of the Lollards; going about from town to town, barefoot and with staff in hand, preaching in Churches and in Church yards, in the dwellings of the rich and in the crowded market-places, not arguing over theological terms and opinions, but proclaiming a living Message which had an appeal for all classes.(86)

Chapter 5.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM.

"Yet sad he was that his too hastie speed
The faire Duess' had forst him leave behind;
And yet more sad, that Una his deare dreed
Her truth had staind with treason so unkind".
"Faery Queene".

Thus did Edmund Spenser represent the religious attitude of England as it was, at times at least, in the age of Elizabeth. But there is a striking resemblance between this allegorical picture and conditions in the Church of England today. Once more the Redcross Knight of England is wondering whether he was not too hasty when, in the sixteenth century, he fled from Duessa of Rome; and whether, after all, Anglican Una's honour, which once appeared spotless, is not stained with the blot of heresy. And it is due to John Henry Newman, more than to any other man, that this question has been stirred up in the minds of a large part of the laity, and a larger part of the clergy.(1) It was the Oxford Movement, looking as it did, if not with passionate eyes, yet with fond and loving glances, towards many of the long-abandoned doctrines and ceremonies of Rome, that has given rise to the Anglo-Catholic party of our time.(2)

Without Newman the Oxford Movement could never have had the influence it did have, and, consequently, without him

Anglo-Catholicism would not have become what it is today.(3) Slowly but steadily High Church clergymen have been adding more and more Roman doctrines to their teaching, and introducing more and more Roman ritual into their services. In 1853 vestments were first worn by a clergyman at Oxford, and since then ritual has been increasing until the Communion Service in many Churches bears an exceedingly lifelike resemblance to the Mass.(4) Numerous books have appeared, moreover, for the guidance of priests in celebrating the ceremonial of Low Mass.(5) And side by side with these books for the clergy, there has been given to the public a large body of literature instructing them in such doctrines and rites as Mariolatry, Auricular Confession, the Real Presence, Purgatory, and Invocation of the Saints.(6) It is not surprising, therefore, to find one eminent Anglican making the statement that "Ritual, vestments, and ornate ceremonial are no longer so offensive to the English conscience as they once were".(7) But not only has the present-day formalism of Anglo-Catholicism grown out of the love of Newman and the Tractarians for ritual, but the interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, which Newman worked out in Tract 90, is still used by High Churchmen to justify to their consciences their remaining in the Church of England.(8) The case of Rev. H. M. M. Evans, Vicar of St. Michael's, Shoreditch, which arose in 1902, bore this out very forcibly.(9) On the threat of prosecution for employing Roman ritual in services, Rev. Evans seceded to the Catholic Church and explained that he had always accepted Newman's interpretation of the Articles,

but now, when forced to look into them for himself he found the High Church claims to be groundless. The controversy over Prayer Book revision, moreover, which is going on in England at the present time, and which may again reach a crisis at any moment, can be traced back directly to the Oxford Movement.(10) It is felt at the present time that a new Prayer Book is needed to sanction and supplement Romanized ceremonies already in use. And while Anglo-Catholicism has not yet gained favour with the great mass of the laity, it has won over the majority of the clergy.(11) One eminent authority on the question has said: "With the aid of theological colleges devoted to their interest they have made a deep impression upon the clerical body, which is rapidly, as much by reason of fashion as of solid conviction, becoming indoctrinated with Anglo-Catholic ideas".(12) Thus Newman simply declared what time has proven to be correct when he said that the movement which he piloted was not a party with fortunes, but rather a spirit.(13) Rev. A. Fawkes has obviously put the case mildly when he stated with regard to Newman that, "Anglicanism of the ecclesiastical type owes much to him".(14)

Now after glancing over the present situation in the Church of England certain questions inevitably arise. One asks: What is to be the outcome of the Anglo-Catholic movement? Where is it leading? Is is a permanent resting-place? In answering these questions, one must know how far the movement has gone in accomplishing its aims in the past. In 1833, when it began, it had two objectives before it.(15) One of these was to stem the rising tide of liberalism; the other, to resuscitate and strengthen

the National Church. With regard to the first aim, it must be confessed that Anglo-Catholicism has proved ineffectual. Soon after the breakup of the Tractarian Movement, there was a decided reaction to the teaching of Newman, Pusey, and the others, and Oxford swung to the opposite extreme of religious thought.(16) Thus, in Newman's own college,Tractarianism went for nought. With regard to this tendency outside, as well as inside the University, it has been said: "He (Newman) left this Liberalism triumphant all along the line".(17) Nor has the second objective been fulfilled either. Instead of strengthening the Establishment, the movement has weakened it, and the last hundred years have been a period of Anglican decline.(18) Dissent is stronger, and the Church is weaker and nearer a split, or perhaps disestablishment, now than it was in 1833. Then if Anglo-Catholicism has failed in its original objectives, what has all the activity which it has shown been accomplishing? Where has it been leading?

In speaking of the Via Media theory, Hutton calls it Newman's "earlier conception (of the Church) which led so inevitably to the later".(19) The Via Media eventually became the Historical Church. Anglo-Catholicism was bound to lead Newman, sooner or later, to Rome. And if it led Newman there, may it not someday carry that whole section of the Church to its logical place? The effect of this High Church teaching upon individuals, both before and after Newman's secession, has shown conclusively the direction in which it leans. A number of men at that time --- "perverts", as they were contemptuously

called[20] --- who allowed themselves to be gripped by the Via Media, found that it was not a final resting-place, but only a means to an end; simply a landing in the flight of stairs leading to the Roman chambers.[21] With regard to the "perverts", Jennings says, "Never had so large a body of the English clergy seceded since the Reformation".[22] Newman himself, in later life, came to regard Anglo-Catholicism as a hoax, and to feel that it only required to have its true position pointed out for it to appear a fiction. Thus, in a letter to one of his frequent correspondents, Mrs. William Froude, Newman declares: "The hollowness of High Churchism (or whatever it is called) is to me so very clear that it surprises me, (not that persons should not see it at once) but that any should not see it at last".[23] The very interpretation of the Articles, moreover, which he had maintained so stoutly, and upon which he had staked his reputation, afterwards appeared to him completely without foundation,[24] and he came to feel that even Liberalism was preferable, and possessed of more reality, than Anglo-Catholicism.[25] In 1868, therefore, he said: "I can understand a Catholic turning Liberal; my imagination fails as to the attempt to turn him into a Puseyite".

Newman, then, was convinced that all that was necessary to lead an honest-minded High Churchman to Rome was to point out to him the fiction of his ecclesiastical theory. It was this belief that led him in 1850 to deliver a series of twelve lectures upon "Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching", and to address them to the members of the

Oxford Movement who had continued in the Church of England.[26] The first seven of these were intended to prove that "Communion with the Roman See" was "the legitimate issue of the religious Movement of 1833".[27] In Newman's effort to make this clear, five principal lines of argument may be noted. First of all, he claims that the historic grounds for their position, insisted upon by High Churchmen, is without basis in fact. Instead of actually tracing the Via Media back to the Church of the Fathers, they assume its antiquity, and then proceed to adorn it with all the majesty and beauty which belonged to the Church of the fourth century.[28] But in reality, the Via Media had connection neither with the Church of the early days, nor with the nineteenth century branches of the ecclesiastical body in other lands.[29] The party, therefore,which was most at home in the Establishment was not the High Church party, but the Evangelical.[30] Anglo-Catholics, moreover, desired the elaborate ritual and ceremony of the Church of the Fathers; but they must seek it in vain in the Church of England, for the Reformers eliminated much of it and mutilated the rest.[31] The fact of the matter is that the Anglican Church is not,in reality, a Church at all, but apostasized at the time of the upheaval in the sixteenth century.[32] The second line of argument is that the Oxford Movement was from the beginning foreign to the National Church;[33] and, just as does the human body, so the Church sought to cast out this foreign substance. This was apparent from the course of events, both at the outset of the Movement and as it progressed.[34] In fact, the principles for which the

Anglo-Catholics stand are much more Roman than Anglican; and Newman advises his former colleagues to "seek those principles in their true home".(35) Thirdly, the Movement and the Church were diametrically opposed to one another because of their attitudes towards the State. One of the things which the Tractarians hated most was Erastianism --- control of ecclesiastical affairs by a political body, --- but to a State Church this is one of the fundamental principles of organization.(36) "The Movement, then, and the Establishment, were in simple antagonism from the first".(37) Only if they give up their views upon this matter can Anglo-Catholics consistently remain within the fold of the Church of England.(38) Fourthly, the Tractarians wish to remain as they began, a party within the Church; but though it was possible to maintain this status when the Movement started, it can be done no longer.(39) The reason for this is the authority upon which they base their divinity. Anglo-Catholic writers have ever repudiated private judgement, and have looked back to the theologians of the seventeenth century as their authorities.(40) And to avoid private judgement in deciding which writers were authoritative, only those were accepted whose position was acknowledged by all.(41) But even the word of the seventeenth century theologians was not considered as the ultimate basis. The Fathers of the early Church stood behind them to support their doctrines and conclusions.(42) The works of the Fathers, moreover, were all printed for everyone to read, so that there could be no question as to which of them should be accepted as authoritative. Now this was all

right in 1833; but, in reality, the Fathers do not support the Anglo-Catholic position, but rather "tell for the Church of Rome".(43) And since the Anglican bishops have recognized this, and denied that the Fathers are the basis of Church of England doctrine, private judgement alone can claim them as authoritative. But private judgement is at variance with Anglo-Catholicism. Consequently, it is impossible for the High Church supporters to remain a party in the Establishment, as they set out to be in 1833.(44) And lastly, the Tractarians cannot form themselves into a branch Church as the alternative to being a party. This is because history and experience show that a branch Church is bound to become a National Church, and a National Church cannot have the freedom in matters of faith and doctrine and worship which the Oxford Movement required.(45) Complete independence can be found only in Rome. "The Catholic Church, and she alone, from the nature of the case, is proof against Erastianism".(46) Thus Newman declares to his former co-religionists: "You can have no trust in the Establishment or its Sacraments and ordinances. You must leave it, you must secede; you must turn your back upon, you must renounce, what has --- not suddenly become, but what has now been proved to you to have ever been --- an imposture!"(47)

This insistence, moreover, that the logical outcome of High Churchism is the Church of Rome has been largely borne out by subsequent events. When the Oxford Movement was at its height, Newman expressed the opinion that, "No party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes

noise, than the Roman Party".[48] But this has not proved the case. Immediately after the explosion occasioned by No. 90, and the subsequent secession of Newman and a number of his followers, the Movement lulled;[49] but later on it picked up again, and has steadily been gaining momentum, until today it is both prosperous and making noise. But it has not turned out that Rome looks upon this movement with fear and trembling, or regards it as the stumbling block which may at any time bring about her downfall. In fact, two events in recent Anglican history have shown clearly that Anglo-Catholicism is carrying the Church of England in no other direction than that of Rome. One of these is the revision of the Prayer Book;[50] the other, the "Malines Conversations".[51] It is commonly asserted that the revision of the Prayer Book is merely a bringing-up-to-date of the old one, which has not been altered since 1662.[52] But that bringing it up to date, in the commonly accepted sense of the phrase, is not the true motive behind the action is made clear by the fact that some twenty-nine names or commemorations have been added, most of which are taken from the Roman Calendar; while the names of the great Reformers, including Wycliffe, have been omitted altogether.[53] A statement, moreover, by Father Woodlock, a well-known Jesuit, recognizes the tendency of the book.He says of the alterations in the Communion Service: "These changes are radical and they seem to me to make the new Office a definite approach to the Catholic Mass".[54] The other incident --- the publication of the text of the Malines Conversations --- has heaped up evidence for the assertion of the

Romeward direction of the movement.[55] These Conversations arose out of the meetings of representatives of the Church of England and Cardinal Mercier at Malines to discuss the possibility of reunion of the two Churches. Thus we see from these astounding happenings of our day that Newman was not mistaken when he claimed that the logical outcome of High Churchism is the Roman Communion.[56]

Many people are at a loss to comprehend the appearance of such a reactionary movement as Anglo-Catholicism within a Protestant Church in an age which is essentially radical. But the explanation seems to be that it is a part of the world-wide revival of Romanism which has been gaining momentum for the last hundred years. This revival has long been expected by students of the Bible.[57] In fact, Protestants look forward to a time in the not-very-distant future when Rome will again be the dominating power both in religion and international affairs. Moreover, Newman, too, looked expectantly for the swing of the pendulum back to Catholicism. One prediction of his, referring to the loss of Temporal Power by the Pope, has been strikingly fulfilled in our day. He said in 1875: "A state of such secular feebleness cannot last forever; sooner or last there will be, in the divine mercy, a change for the better, and the Vicar of Christ will no longer be a mark for insult and indignity".[58] Then too, he forcast in his great sermon upon "The Second Spring", occasioned by the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in England, the return of the country to the fold, basing his hopes upon the analogy of nature. He scans nature,

and finds that change is the order of the universe; change and repetition. The May flower fades and succumbs to the chilling breezes of November; but time will avenge it, and it will bloom again. The sun sinks, only to rise after a few hours. Day is swallowed up in night, but appears fresh again next morning. So too, he feels, it will be with the religious persuasion of England. The Victorians were still living in the winter of Catholicism, but the coming of spring was inevitable.(59) And the facts of the situation in the present day seem to be bearing out his expectations. One eminent Protestant writer of New York, after giving statistics showing the amazing increase in the number of Catholic institutions, priests, nuns and adherents in the United States and other countries in the past century, calls our attention to what is taking place in England. He says, in part: "A year ago all London poured into the streets to see for the first time since the Reformation the triumphant march of a Roman Catholic procession extending for miles, while thousands on either side of the immense column bowed the knee in adoration as the sacred symbols of the Church were held aloft. Recently, in this same London, there has been dedicated with imposing ceremonies a stupendous and costly cathedral. Everywhere throughout England the Romish priest is a power, the chapels and churches are filled to overflowing; daily, converts from the Church of England go over to the Church of Rome, and that by easy steps, as though the English Church itself had become a half-way house. The non-conformist oath once administered to English kings on the day of coronation has been

repealed. The official head of English Protestantism has ceased to protest. Enthusiastic Romanists consider the day not far distant when England will return officially to the faith and be recieved by Rome as a long wandering, but sincerely repentant and beloved daughter of the Church!"[60] Thus England within the last century has altered her regard for the Roman religion.[61] Once it appeared pagan; now it seems a thing of beauty. Once it was despised; now it is respected and even revered. Once it bore the semblance of vile deception; now it is very truth. And the reason for this changed regard for Catholicism is that, while once it seemed merely an intellectual monstrosity and a gross perversion of Christianity, the discovery has now been made that it is capable of adequate defense. And it has been truly said that, "To (Newman), if to any one man, the world owes the intellectual recovery of Romanism".[62]

Newman's influence is felt today throughout the whole Anglican Church.[63] He has been largely responsible for the rise of the Anglo-Catholic Party, which is a mighty and a disturbing force within the Church. But though we can see the tremendous effect which his work in the Oxford Movement, and especially his dramatic conversion, has had up to the present time, it remains for our children to form the final judgement as to the full extent of his influence.[64] Thus, the words of Gladstone, though writfen in Newman's lifetime, are still applicable today. He said: "In my opinion his secession from the Church of England has never yet been estimated among us at anything like the full amount of its calamitous impor-

tance. ..... The ecclesiastical historian will perhaps hereafter judge that this secession was a much greater event than the partial secession of John Wesley, the only case of personal loss suffered by the Church of England since the Reformation, which can be at all compared with it in magnitude".(65)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

All Newman's thinking centered around his theories of the Church, and the direction and extent of his influence in both the Anglican and Catholic Churches has been the outcome of those theories. In his boyhood, despite the fact that he did much theological reading, he really had no clear-cut idea of the ecclesiastical organization. But soon after going to college, the conception of the Via Media gripped his mind, and motivated the Oxford Movement. After 1839, however, this began to give place to the theory of the Historical Church; and, consequently, there was nothing for him to do, if he would be true to his convictions, but leave the English Church and join the Roman. But once in the Catholic Church, how did he regard Papal Infallibility? It is impossible to have a satisfactory theory of the Church of Rome without fitting the Pontiff into it somewhere, and Newman had not included him in his Development apologetic. But the theological and political discussions upon the Infallibility, centering around the great Ecumenical Council of 1870, forced him to clarify his thoughts upon this important question. His considered opinions were made public during his controversy with Gladstone.

The Via Media idea --- the theory of the Church

which Newman first held --- was neither "Protestant" nor Roman, but attempted to express the true "Catholic" conception of the Church. Rome had erred in the late middle ages, and especially after the Council of Trent; but Ultra-Protestants, on the other hand, had gone too far in the opposite direction. They had mutilated the Sacraments, they had abandoned Apostolic Succession, they had adopted private judgement. The Via Media was the Church which followed the middle course between these two extremes in religion, the true Apostolic position. It was identified, moreover, with the Church of England; not, indeed, as it was in the nineteenth century, but as it had been in the seventeenth, and as its formularies proclaimed it to be. The Oxford Movement, therefore, was an attempt to lift Anglicanism to the full stature of its doctrines; to raise it to the position it had held two centuries before.

But the question is often asked, Where did Newman get his theory of the Via Media, and what made him pass from his early Evangelical training to High Churchism? As a matter of fact , he was never an Evangelical. His home, though it had certain Calvinist leanings, was really nondescript; the father being somewhat of a sceptic, and the mother talking about a visible Church. The only truly Evangelical influence which Newman ever came under was that of Rev. Walter Mayers, with whom he had an intimate friendship for a short time during his latter school-days. When he went up to Oxford, therefore, he was still open to accept almost any doctrine which might be current, as has been the case with many another boy both before

and after his time. His intimate acquaintance at Oxford with Hurrell Froude, and other men of Roman tendencies, led him to forsake the view that the Pope was Antichrist, and to adopt the Real Presence, Apostolic Succession, and the other essentials of the Via Media.

The opposition to Newman and his theory, however, especially after Tract 90 appeared, made him doubt whether his theory was really part of Anglicanism after all; and when, in 1839, the thought flashed across his mind that the Church of England was really a schism from the true Church, as the Monophysite heresy had been, he began to move slowly but surely away from Anglicanism, until in 1845 Father Dominic gave him absolution and received him into the Universal Church. His new theory, that of the Historical Church, which justified the Roman position in his mind, is set forth in the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine". The idea is that though the doctrine and ritual and organization of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century is not on the surface the same as that of the early Church --- the early Church being the Church of the Fathers --- nevertheless, it is a natural and true development. The doctrines and practices of the modern Church were, every one of them, dormant in the teaching of the early centuries. In the "Essay" and in the "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk", moreover, the place of the Pope in this ecclesiastical scheme is set forth. The Pope's work is to judge true from false developments of doctrine. When he does this, or when he makes other ex cathedra pronouncements, he is infallible; but there is no assurance that

he will be free from error in the reasonings which lead him to make his official utterances. Only in their actual pronouncement, in its final shape, is he infallible.

Newman's influence upon the two Churches of which he was a member at different times of his life has been very great. In the Roman Church, although he affected its actual institutions but little, and although his views upon doctrine were never accepted by the authorities of the Church, nevertheless, the impress of his personality has been deeply stamped upon it. He lifted the Catholics of England from the place where they were regarded as mere "Papists", until they have come to be looked upon as intelligent people, with an intellectual theory behind the belief which they hold. A further influence upon Catholicism has been the result of the "Personalist Theory" of the "Grammar of Assent". This, by admitting a form of private judgement, has paved the way for the rise of the Modernist school within the Church. In the Church of England, on the other hand, Newman's influence has been felt chiefly in the growth of Anglo-Catholicism, which today seems to be drawing the Establishment closer and closer to Rome, manifestations of which we have had in our own day in the Prayer Book controversy and the "Malines Conversations". Thus, it is plain that Newman's religious and ecclesiastical theories, which played such a large part in shaping the course of his own life, are influencing directly or indirectly countless people in practically every part of what is commonly miscalled Christendom.

What shall we conclude, then, in our effort to get

a better understanding of John Henry Newman in order to have a fuller appreciation of his literary work? It must be this, that it is hopeless, for Protestants at least, ever to comprehend completely this unusual and fascinating man. He must always remain, to some extent, an enigma. We can trace the reasoning which he followed consistently after he had adopted certain basic assumptions. For Newman, if anything, was consistent in his thinking. But when we ask ourselves why he made those basic assumptions, we are at a loss to find answer. We must simply recognize that he did make them, and that all his reasoning was built upon them, and then his "Apologia", his poems, and his other writings become intelligible to us; he is no longer the traitor working for the disruption of the Church of his birth until opinion forced him to forsake it, but he is the earnest seeker after truth, ever following the leading of the "Kindly Light".

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1.

For editions of Newman's works used see Bibliography, p 103.

(1) Bertrand Newman, "Cardinal Newman" p 192.
(2) "Apologia" p 69.
(3) Ibid p 112.
(4) "The Good Samaritan" in "Verses on Various Occasions" p 153.
(5) "Apologia" p 70, and Tract 15.
(6) Tract 38 p 1.
(7) Ibid p 11.
(8) Ibid p 2.
(9) Ibid p 3.
(10) Ibid p 2.
(11) Ibid p 4.
(12) Ibid p 5.
(13) Ibid p 6.
(14) Ibid p 9.
(15) Tract 41 p 10.
(16) Ibid p 2.
(17) "Apologia" p 193.
(18) Tract 41 p 3.
(19) Tract 38 p 6.
(20) "Apologia" p 83.
(21) Tract 1 p 1.
(22) Ibid p 1.
(23) Tract 41 p 2.
(24) Ibid p 1.
(25) Tract 38 p 11.
(26) Henry Tristram, "The Schooldays of Cardinal Newman" in the Cornhill Magazine, June 1925.
(27) R. H. Hutton, "Cardinal Newman" p 148.
(28) Tract 90 p 59.
(29) "Apologia" p 92.
(30) Hutton, op. cit. p 144.
(31) Tract 38 p 9.
(32) "Apologia" p 90.
(33) Ibid p 19.
(34) Tract 1 p 3.
(35) Tract 38 p 2.
(36) "Apologia" p 22.
(37) F. W. Newman, "Contributions to the Early Life of Cardinal Newman p 73.
(38) Ibid p 72.
(39) Hutton, op.cit. p 16.
(40) Sieveking, "Memoirs of F. W. Newman" p 20.
(41) F. W. Newman, op. cit. pp 6-7.
(42) "Apologia" p 33.
(43) Ibid p 29.

(44) "Apologia" p 31.
(45) Ibid p 31.
(46) Ibid p 33.
(47) Tristram, op. cit.
(48) "Apologia" p 39.
(49) F. W. Newman, p 64.
(50) "Apologia" pp 34-35.
(51) Hutton, op. cit. p 22.
(52) "Apologia" p 35.
(53) Ibid p 36.
(54) Ibid p 36.
(55) "Apologia" p 47.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2.

(1) Bertrand Newman, "Cardinal Newman" p 97.
(2) Ibid p 95.
(3) Jennings, "Cardinal Newman" p 58.
(4) Tract 20.
(5) Jennings, op. cit. p 55.
(6) "Apologia" p 154.
(7) Essay on "Cardinal Newman" p 201.
(8) "Apologia" p 31.
(9) Ibid p 29.
(10) Ibid p 50.
(11) Bertrand Newman, op. cit. p 86.
(12) "Apologia" p 31.
(13) Ibid p 33.
(14) "Verses on Various Occasions" p3.
(15) Ibid p 153.
(16) Dean Inge, "Outspoken Essays" p 177.
(17) Above p 16.
(18) "Apologia" p 33.
(19) Ibid p 48.
(20) Ibid p 47.
(21) F. W. Newman, op. cit. pp 70-71.
(22) "Apologia" pp 121-123.
(23) Ibid p 122.
(24) Ibid p 147.
(25) Ibid p 198.
(26) Ibid p 116.
(27) Ibid p 53.
(28) Ibid p 67.
(29) Jennings, op. cit. p 49.
(30) Above p 32.
(31) "Cardinal Newman" p 86.
(32) Tract 24 p 7.
(33) "Development of Christian Doctrine" pp 94-101.
(34) Ibid pp 25-26.
(35) Ibid p 38.
(36) Ibid p 39.
(37) Ibid p 48.

(38) "Development of Christian Doctrine" p 64.
(39) Ibid p 66.
(40) Ibid p 72.
(41) Ibid p 73.
(42) Ibid p 77.
(43) Ibid p 80.
(44) Ibid p 80.
(45) Hutton, op. cit. p 183.
(46) "Development" p 90.
(47) Ibid p 116.
(48) Ibid p 128.
(49) Ibid p 7.
(50) Ibid pp 204-453.
(51) Ibid pp 204-369.
(52) Ibid p 369.
(53) Ibid p 204.
(54) Ibid p 242.
(55) Ibid p 270.
(56) Ibid p 138.
(57) Above p iii.
(58) B. Newman, op. cit. p 93.
(59) "Apologia" p 116.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3.

(1) "Apologia" p 1.
(2) Lytton Strachey, "Eminent Victorians" p 89.
(3) "Apologia" p 116.
(4) Hutton, op. cit. p 239.
(5) W. E. Gladstone, "Vatican Decrees" p 6.
(6) For the circumstances of the Gladstone controversy and the issues involved see B. Newman "Cardinal Newman" pp 184-7.
(7) "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" p 52.
(8) Ibid p 55.
(9) Ibid p 55.
(10) Ibid p 55.
(11) Ibid p 73.
(12) Ibid p 74.
(13) Ibid p 77.
(14) Ibid p 78.
(15) Ibid p 86.
(16) Ibid p 150.
(17) Ibid p 153.
(18) Ibid p 66.
(19) Ibid p 69.
(20) Article on Newman in "Catholic Encyclopedia" p 794.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4.

(1) "Outspoken Essays" p 204.
(2) Ibid p 178.
(3) P. E. More, "Shelburne Essays", Series VIII, p 62.
(4) Inge, op. cit. p 178.
(5) Ibid p 174.
(6) Ibid p 173.
(7) The facts of Manning's life are taken from Mr. Strachey's admirable discussion of the relations of these two men in "Eminent Victorians" pp 3-130.
(8) Newman was born in 1801 and joined the Roman Church in 1845; Manning was born in 1807 and seceded to Rome in 1851.
(9) Romans 1:31.
(10) Inge, op. cit. p 173.
(11) Jennings, "Cardinal Newman" p 141.
(12) Wilfrid Ward, "Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman" v.1,p 218.
(13) Inge, op. cit. p 174.
(14) Ward, op. cit. v 1, pp 176-7.
(15) Rev. Fawkes, "Studies in Modernism" p 40.
(16) Ward, op. cit. v 1,p 235, and v 1, p 215.
(17) Ward, op. cit. v 1, p 205.
(18) Ibid v 1, p 228.
(19) Ibid v 1, p 232.
(20) Ibid v 1, 226.
(21) More, op. cit. p 62.
(22) Inge, op. cit. p 180, and Strachey, op. cit. pp 85-91.
(23) Strachey, op. cit. p 56.
(24) Ibid p 55.
(25) Fawkes, op. cit. p 32.
(26) Inge, op. cit. p 175.
(27) Ibid p 173.
(28) Fawkes, op. cit. p 33.
(29) Strachey, op. cit. p 91.
(30) Ward, op. cit. v 1, p 227.
(31) Ibid v 1, p 292.
(32) Ibid v 1, p 294.
(33) Ibid v 1, p 303.
(34) Fawkes, op. cit. p 42.
(35) J. C. Powys, "In Defence of Sensuality" p 9.
(36) Fawkes, op. cit. p 45.
(37) Ibid p 42.
(38) Ibid p 41.
(39) Ibid p 35.
(40) Advertisement to the "Development" p 10.
(41) Fawkes, op. cit. p 35.
(42) Ibid p 36.
(43) Ibid p 38.
(44) Inge, op. cit. p 181.
(45) Strachey, op. cit. p 99.
(46) "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" p 47.
(47) See above Chapter on "Papal Infallibility", p 46.
(48) Above p 59.
(49) P 197.

(50) Fawkes, op. cit. p 33.
(51) Ward, op. cit. v 1, p 189.
(52) Fawkes, op. cit. p 38.
(53) Ibid p 33.
(54) Ward, op. cit. v 2, p 242.
(55) Ibid v 2, p 243.
(56) Ibid v 2, p 244.
(57) Inge, op.cit. pp 190-202.
(58) Ward, op. cit. v 2 p 244.
(59) Ibid v 2, p 246.
(60) More, op. cit. p 72.
(61) Ward, op. cit. v 2, p 246.
(62) Ibid v 2, p 244.
(63) Ibid v 2, p 253.
(64) Ibid v 2, p 254.
(65) Ibid v 2, p 255.
(66) Ibid v 2, p 244.
(67) Ibid v 2, p 268.
(68) Ibid v 2, p 271.
(69) Ibid v 2, p 271.
(70) Ibid v 2, p 274.
(71) Fawkes, op. cit. p 46.
(72) More, op. cit. p 74.
(73) "Life and Times of John Wycliffe" p 27.
(74) Ibid p 25.
(75) Ibid p 23.
(76) I 144.
(77) "Life and Times of John Wycliffe" p 46.
(78) Ibid p 31.
(79) Above p 47.
(80) "Life and Times of John Wycliffe" p 33.
(81) Ibid p 138.
(82) Above p 20.
(83) "Life and Times of John Wycliffe" p 71.
(84) Fawkes, op. cit. p 36.
(85) "Life and Times of John Wycliffe" p 40.
(86) Ibid p 106.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5.

(1) Sir William Joynson-Hicks, "The Prayer Book Crisis" p 53.
(2) Ibid p 52.
(3) Ibid p 54.
(4) Ibid p 58.
(5) Ibid p 65.
(6) Ibid p 67.
(7) Bishop of Durham. Ibid p 148.
(8) Ibid p 55.
(9) Ibid pp 57 and 81.
(10) Ibid pp 112-113.
(11) Ibid p 151.

(12) Ibid p 150.
(13) Church, "The Oxford Movement" p 172.
(14) Fawkes, op. cit. p 47.
(15) Above p 1.
(16) "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" p 93.
(17) Fawkes, op. cit. p 27.
(18) Ibid p 46.
(19) Hutton, op. cit. p 2.
(20) Jennings, op. cit. p 54.
(21) Ibid p 53.
(22) Ibid p 54.
(23) Ward, op. cit. v 1, p 240.
(24) Joynson-Hicks, op. cit. pp 55-56.
(25) Ward, op. cit. v 2, p 71.
(26) Title page of the Lectures.
(27) Lectures p xv.
(28) Ibid p 5.
(29) Ibid p 6.
(30) Ibid p 14.
(31) Ibid p 16.
(32) Ibid p 32.
(33) Ibid p 35.
(34) Ibid p 36.
(35) Ibid p 65.
(36) Ibid p 101.
(37) Ibid p 105.
(38) Ibid p 122.
(39) Ibid p 129.
(40) Ibid p 137.
(41) Ibid p 139.
(42) Ibid p 143.
(43) Ibid p 145.
(44) Ibid p 153.
(45) Ibid p 195.
(46) Ibid p 196.
(47) Ibid p 124.
(48) Tract 38 p 11.
(49) B. Newman, "Cardinal Newman" p 101.
(50) Joynson-Hicks, op. cit. p 134.
(51) Ibid p 161.
(52) Ibid p 46.
(53) Ibid p 134.
(54) Ibid p 144.
(55) See correspondence between Sir William Joynson-Hicks and the Archbishop of Canterbury upon this subject. "The Prayer Book Crisis" pp 161-171.
(56) Above p 83.
(57) I. M. Haldeman, "The Revival of Romanism" p21.
(58) "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" p 45.
(59) B. Newman, op. cit. p 116, and No. X. of "Sermons Preached on Various Occasions".
(60) Haldeman, op. cit. p 22.
(61) Jennings, "Cardinal Newman" p 57.

(62) Ibid p 56.
(63) Ibid p 53.
(64) Ibid p 56.
(65) Ibid p 52.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Newman's Works.

Unless otherwise mentioned the edition of Newman's works used was the authorized standard published by Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co.

"The Arians of the Fourth Century".

"An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine". (James Toovey, Lond. 1845.)

"Difficulties of Anglicans". Vol. 1. (Twelve lectures)

"Apologia Pro Vita Sua".(J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd. Everyman Library)

"Historical Sketches". Vol. 3. (Church of the Fathers)

"Letter to the Duke of Norfolk". (Catholic Publication Society, N. Y. 1875.)

"Lives of the English Saints". (Edited by Newman)

"Oxford University Sermons".

"Tracts for the Times". Nos. 1, 38, 41, 90. (J. G. and F. Rivington, Lond., J.H.Parker, Oxford. 1833-41. 1st Edition)

"Verses on Various Occasions" (including the "Dream of Gerontius".)

"Via Media". Vol. 1. (Prophetical Office of the Church)

Biographies.

Dictionary of National Biography, "Newman".

Bertrand Newman, "Cardinal Newman".

Jennings, "Cardinal Newman".

R. H. Hutton, "Cardinal Newman".

William Barry, "Newman".

Wilfrid Ward, "Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman". 2 Vols.

Miscellaneous.

Church, "Oxford Movement".

Lytton Strachey, "Eminent Victorians". (Cardinal Manning)

F. W. Newman, "Contributions to the Early Life of Cardinal Newman".

Leslie Stephen, "An Agnostic's Apology". (Newman's Theory of Belief)

Dean Inge, "Outspoken Essays". (Newman)

Cecil and Clayton, "Our National Church".

W. E. Gladstone, "The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance", and "Vaticanism".

T. B. Macaulay, "Gladstone on Church and State".

Sieveking, "Memoirs of F. W. Newman".

P. E. More, "Shelburne Essays". Series VIII. (Cardinal Newman)

Rev. A. Fawkes, "Studies in Modernism". (Newman)

Sir W. Joynson-Hicks, "The Prayer Book Crisis".

H. Tristram, "The Schooldays of Cardinal Newman" in the Cornhill Magazine for June 1925.

I. M. Haldeman, "The Revival of Romanism".

A. Macphail, "Essays in Puritanism". (Wesley)

Encyclopedia Britannica. (Wesley)

Anon., "Life and Times of John Wycliffe", (Religious Tract Soc.)