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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

different lesson, the condescension of Christ to men of low estate. He will come to a Gentile and heal a slave. And yet there is an earnest humility which ought not to be constrained. Jesus yields to the urgency of lowliness, and perhaps feels that to insist further on a personal visit would be misconstrued by the bystanders. The servant is made whole at once.

G. A. CHADWICK.

CARDINAL NEWMAN.

NEARLY thirty years ago, Mr. Kingsley accused Dr. Newman of something like indifference to truth and sincerity. He brought into the field, in reply, both Newman's extraordinary power of effective statement, and his dexterity in seizing an opportunity. Newman virtually said, "Well, I will retrace the history of my mind, I will show how my opinions have come and grown; I will reveal the reaction created in my mind by all the events which have moulded my history; and then I will await the world's judgment upon my integrity." So there came out the *Apologia*, the history of his Religious Opinions. It was much more than an answer to Kingsley. It was an appeal, in a singularly effective form, as to the worth of the convictions which had mastered his life. In his perspicuous, nervous English, Newman told his tale, and allowed the story to ask its own questions and press its lessons on the public mind. Nobody thought any more about Kingsley's charges. The interest and the pathos of an unworldly and unique life alone remained. The book is one of those rare Confessions which men never will forget. Ever since then, Newman, who was remarkable enough before, has had a quite special hold of the interest of his generation.

Lately, at a great old age, the Cardinal passed away. Of

course his death once more called general attention to the efforts and experiences of his life. The man and his work have been canvassed on different sides. But the subject will yet bear, perhaps, to be rapidly reviewed.

Let me sketch the framework of the story. There are three main landmarks: his epoch of religious decision in 1816; his journey with Froude in 1832; his reception into the Church of Rome in 1845. He was born in 1801. Brought up under a Calvinistic theology, and under the influences commonly called Evangelical, both of them in a sincere, but not an extreme or rigid form, trained to "take great delight in reading his Bible," and brought into contact with books of practical religion, Newman's religious life, as life in earnest, began at the age of fifteen. The change was due to the conversation and preaching of a clerical friend—Mr. Mayers, I believe—and to the writings of Thomas Scott. "To the latter," he said, "I almost owed my soul." Long afterwards he spoke of this change as "the inward conversion of which I was conscious, and of which I still am more certain than that I have hands or feet." From this period he dates his impressions of dogma, especially of the doctrine of the Trinity, and a profound sense of the reality of the Divine existence, the facts of heaven and hell, divine favour and divine wrath.

Some other characteristics of his younger days should be noted. His mental development was precocious. He stood easily at the head of his schoolfellows. He took no part in games, but at ten or twelve he wrote little poems, masques, idylls, and the like, and later he brought out a weekly school newspaper. He has recorded that before the period of his religious decision, he had a strong tendency to superstitious fancies. Also, with a vivid realisation of the unseen world, he combined, as imaginative boys have often done, the disposition to question the reality of material things. His imagination ran upon magical powers. He

thought "life might be a dream, or I an angel, and all this world a deception, my fellow angels, by a playful device, concealing themselves from me, and deceiving me with the semblance of a material world." The strong impressions of his conversion also did something in the way of "isolating me from the objects which surrounded me, confirming me in my mistrust of the reality of material phenomena, and making me rest in the thought of two, and two only, supreme and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator." Later, at the University, his thoughts took a course thus explained. "The material system seems to be economically or sacramentally connected with the more important, the spiritual; and of this conclusion the theory to which I inclined as a boy, the unreality of material phenomena, is the ultimate resolution." He found that the Fathers thought some fallen spirits are not so far fallen as others; and as Daniel speaks of each nation as having its guardian angel, so in 1837 Dr. Newman began to regard these less fallen spirits as the animating principles of many institutions and races. "Take England, with many high virtues, but a low Catholicism. It seems to me that John Bull is a spirit neither of heaven nor hell." I specify this thought because it reappears again and again in different writings.

In noting these things, I have anticipated to some extent. Now we come to his earlier Oxford life. He was undergraduate and scholar of Trinity, became in 1823 fellow of Oriel, which was then the college of independent and advanced thought, and in 1828 he became vicar of the Oxford parish of St. Mary's. He exchanged some of the tenets of his early Evangelicism for beliefs of a more "Church" type; but, at the same time, in his own opinion, the atmosphere of Oriel, as it then was, injured his faith, and inclined him towards theological "liberalism." But his liberalism was not destined to go far. "Illness and

bereavement," he says, awoke him in 1827; and other influences were about to come into play to intensify his preference for a very different line of things.

During this period Newman began to show his qualities. Modesty, and no doubt the consciousness of a high and steadfast mood, not often shared or comprehended by those around him, may have isolated him in the earlier years. He was "rather proud of Oriel than at home in it" when he first became a fellow. But ere long ties began to multiply for him, both with his seniors and his juniors. His life had been rather silent and solitary. But "things changed in 1826." His tongue was loosened, and he spoke spontaneously and without effort. Also he had become conscious of power; and that led him to lay his hand on men, to divine a mission for them, and to cheer them on to the accomplishment of it. He was becoming a centre of influence. At the same time Newman already began to manifest the capacity for a certain hardness and ruthlessness in steps which his views suggested to him; a certain summariness, too, in dismissing men out of his life when he found them not likely to co-operate; and this even in cases where old ties might have been expected to suggest more forbearance. Newman had in him an element of imperiousness, and it co-existed curiously enough with the undoubted kindliness, and, in most ordinary senses, the unselfishness and humility of the man.

It was in this period too, especially from 1828, that Newman began to exert influence in the pulpit—as vicar of St. Mary's.

Some features of his preaching may be indicated. He contemplated men, as living in a dangerous world, assailed by temptation, and in too many cases trifling fatally with their opportunities and responsibilities. He had a vivid impression that Christian attainment, as it actually existed, was commonly precarious and low. Virtually he said to

men, "The redemption with which we rightly claim connection as baptized Christians, lays us under the gravest obligations, as it offers us the needed help, to depart from sin and to follow Christ. How far we are doing so shall be clear one day, but let us look to it now." He put this question in many forms; but always two things remarkably appeared. On the one hand he apprehended the Lord's will as to the life of His followers with an intense simplicity. The ordinary objections, and compromises, and explainings away, seemed to have no power to divert or bewilder his steady contemplation of the high calling. On the other hand he dealt with men about it, as one who perfectly understood the ordinary way of thinking on these subjects, the moods, the temptations, the secularising influences of the average life. He put in play an extraordinary perception of ordinary life, its motives and its working, and unveiled its too common sincere estrangement from the aims and the rules of Christ. In all this the usual pulpit exaggerations were absent. His pictures of the common character and way of living came home to men as undeniably true. And always beyond, with whatever encouragements and hopes for the penitent, came the prospect of judgment. It was the austere and severe side, mainly, of the New Testament, which he set himself to compel men to take seriously.

These reasonings and remonstrances were conveyed in an English style, clear, nervous, characterised sometimes by a surface negligence, and by the freest use of unconventional language, carrying always the suggestion of a mind that lived its own life and saw from its own viewpoint. It was lighted up by just as much allusion and illustration as a master of sentences found to be conducive to put and press his case, and it rose into eloquence whenever some sublime or beautiful thought required it. The hearer felt a mind to which worldly interests were insigni-

ficant, and spiritual interests supreme, holding the most serious converse with his own mind about its history and its destiny.

Newman's style strikes one as a perfect instrument, wielded with the utmost ease and certainty. It is interesting to know that it received incessant correction whenever he had time to give it. I have heard that there was the most complete contrast between copy for the press supplied by Faber and by Newman. Faber's MS. was like copperplate, unblemished; Newman's was crowded with obliterations and corrections, running over the whole sheet.

A great speaker has described Newman in the pulpit, reading his sermons "with not much inflection and no action, but with a stamp and a seal upon him, a solemn sweetness and music in the tone—a completeness in figure and tone and manner which made even such a delivery singularly attractive." But the truth is Newman was able to produce effects by reading in a way peculiar to himself. In speaking he was not successful; he hesitated and was ineffective: but he could read so as to produce almost any pitch of effect. I have been told that in the lectures in which he attacked Achilli, the audience fairly quivered and shuddered under some of the passages. No doubt ordinarily in the pulpit he might impose upon himself more restraint.

I have mentioned that according to his own later opinion, Newman, about the third or fourth year of his Oriel fellowship, was verging towards "Liberalism." By liberalism he means that way of looking at things and judging of them which leads or tends to rationalism. One does not well know in what this "liberalism" consisted in his case; but it soon ceased. His religious earnestness was deepened by trials, and liberalism in politics and in the community was taking forms which speedily repelled him. Newman himself recalled as a kind of era, the part he took against Peel

in an Oxford election in 1829. But he also tells us, which is much more to the point, that he had come under the influence of Keble and of Froude. Each of these remarkable men impressed him in his own way—the one full of the poetry of Christian associations, as these grew up around the institutions and modes of thought of the early Church; the other charmed rather with the vision of the Church of the middle ages, as it dominated the world, beating down the pretensions of secular ambition, and bridling the wild beast, man, with a strong hand. Newman had already embraced many elements of his final scheme. Now it began to put itself firmly together in his mind. Now he began to read the Fathers regularly through; now he laid the foundations of his work upon the Arians; and now he began seriously to take antiquity as the true exponent of Christianity, and the basis of the Church of England.

The feelings with which Newman saw the stream running, as it then ran in secular and ecclesiastical politics, can readily be understood. That was the time when popular rights asserted themselves against old privileges, and seemed ready to sweep away all that stood on any ground *but* popular right. All institutions were put to trial, with this for a first principle, that no form of religious faith should claim advantage over another. The Church of England, as a great State institute, seemed liable to follow the fluctuations of the State, and it was directly threatened. The change in the constitution by which Roman Catholics became members of Parliament, told on the theory of legislation and on the instincts of public men. Parliament was no more a parliament of Established Churchmen. It was to legislate as representing all faiths, as well as all classes. Yet it still legislated for the Church; and the Crown, advised by the leaders of such a parliament, was the Church's supreme governor. What was to hinder the principle of no monopolies, of fair play for all parties, and so

forth, sweeping into the Church, making havoc of her creed and her institutions, and turning her into a mere reflex of parliamentary indifference? Men were already preaching up the unimportance of dogma, and advocating the widest liberty. How was the stream to be turned? How was the Church to be kept from being "liberalised?"

Froude's health was failing; in 1832 he went abroad, and Newman accompanied him. During this foreign sojourn the fermentation of Newman's mind went on, and his Church principles became his leading thought and his ruling passion. Away from the scene of conflict, and unable to strike in, he could still hear of the progress of principles he detested. The fearless decision of Froude's mind reinforced Newman's own convictions. He imagined to himself the Church of England swamped by liberalism; and as he mused the fire burned. A prophetic consciousness of a mission and a message grew on him, till he was weary with holding in. A trumpet call should wake the Church, and he would sound it. One clear strong principle being unheard, or only muttered in half applications, should rouse her to rise and roll back the invaders, furnishing her with courage and with weapons both. The thought thrilled through him that "deliverance is not wrought by the many but by the few." *Exoriare Aliquis* sounded in his ears. Froude and he began the *Lyra Apostolica,* and chose for motto the words of Achilles, "You shall know the difference, now that I am back again." Southey's *Thalaba* ("Remember destiny has marked thee from mankind") floated before his mind. As the consciousness of a message and the presentiment of a destiny increased it played strange pranks with his health, and words of augury escaped him which he could not himself interpret. To this period the composition of "Lead kindly light" belongs. He returned to England in July, 1833. All this explains a tone of conscious importance which rings through many

passages of Newman's life. He felt himself to be a man of destiny.

The situation he had to deal with was this. One evil dreaded was that the Church might be disestablished. For that in itself—except that he was ready to resist the Church's enemies on any issue—Newman cared little, and his friend Froude still less. But the steps taken, whether ending in that catastrophe or not, were likely to be guided by the mere politics of liberty and levelling, and the Church might be transmogrified on principles foreign to her constitution and her faith. On the other side the Church of England possessed immense potential resource, but she was discouraged, divided, bewildered. The Evangelical section, fresh from a remarkable experience of progress and success, had yet nothing in their principles to furnish a line on which to fight a great ecclesiastical battle. Besides, they could have no influence at Oxford. The old High Church had more prestige, and a stronger ecclesiastical tradition. But speaking generally their principles at this time were for them too much of a tradition, and too little of an inspiration. Yet sentiments of attachment to Church principles and Church piety, memories of an old and proud part in English life, traditions which had run for ages in Church channels, the consciousness of a type of feeling and character that was distinctive, and a fixed disdain for every way of religion that was not the Church's way—representatives of thoughts like these existed everywhere, only they were often not sure how much they could stand for. All parties were habituated to a parliamentary way of viewing things; they had become accustomed to live on compromises, and these now were breaking up.

Newman seemed to himself to know where the remedy lay. It lay in the realization of the claims and the true destiny of the Church of God. In the first place, Newman had always held Christian religion in the form of dogmatic

articles which expressed its essence. Next, he had moved steadily in the direction of emphasizing the place in Christianity of the visible Church, with her sacraments and institutions, as the channels of grace. That carried with it the notion that the Church is never suffered to go fatally wrong in her conception of Christianity. On the contrary, what she deliberately propounds as fundamental revealed truth, must have that character. That was the true Anglicanism; he was to maintain that it was. The grand thought of God's Church, freed and cleared of the compromises and infidelities of politicians and worldly wise men, was, he said, the proper inheritance of the Church of England; only, it had hardly ever been explicitly enough asserted; certainly it had never been carried consistently through. It had been lowered and corrupted by Protestantism and private judgment. Men, throwing themselves professedly on the Bible, really influenced by rationalism, had been judging and contemning the Church, which ought to be their teacher and mistress. It was time to sound a higher note. A great rally for the Church, not as unbelievers had debased her, but as God had planned her, was what the age needed. Unfortunately, at this point, it was impossible to escape one grave question. It was to be a rally for the Church; but men might say, Which Church? The claims of Rome came at once into the field. However, this could be met. The true way was to assert one Church of Christ, which, after long maintaining explicit unity, had suffered some loss by the separation of its branches. The branches were mainly three—Roman, Greek, and Anglican. The division was owned to be an evil for all parties. Still the Anglican was Christ's true Church in England; so also were the others, each on its own ground. All had suffered decay and come short, Rome sinning most deeply and offensively. Still each branch on its own ground was essentially Christ's true and one Church, for each was a

branch of the unity. And each should throw itself back on the true ideal, which might best be found in the undivided Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. That, at all events, was the message of the troubled times to the Church of England. First, she had to believe in herself; secondly, she had penitently to consider what faith and what works such belief implied; thirdly, she had to assert herself, by claims indeed, but also by life, by service, and by sacrifice, as Christ's only sacred ordinance for ministering truth and grace, and, in His name and strength, defy the world. God had set her forth to be the sacred ark for men, and the battle was the Lord's. Her business was to rise to her own calling—to be true to herself and Him.

I will not dwell on the immense attractiveness which this scheme has for many devout minds born within a hierarchical Church. It had also an immense recommendation in that it was so conveniently adapted to the present distress. That is, it at once singled out the Established Church as the Church which had the "Apostolical Succession," separated her case from that of every other, and supplied the most convenient ground for defending her and all that was hers against "liberalism." Yet, let it be remembered, that for Newman, and for the movement so far as Newman inspired it, the deepest thought of all was *bona fide* this, the calling of the Church to be out and out true to her Lord and devoted to her Lord. It was because this was believed to be authentically in the movement that so genuine an awakening of religious life followed in its train.

And it must be said that this deeper and better principle in the movement found one of its strongest supports in Newman personally. His remarkable preaching was going on with growing power. The unworldliness of his life, the sincerity and elevation of his conversation, joined with his ability, his sympathetic power, and the passion with which he held his principles, led to his being all but worshipped.

This, then, was in Newman's mind the heart of the business. But in the form of it came an immense and startling development of doctrines and practices alleged to have the sanction of the early centuries, tending generally to emphasize the highest views of Church and sacraments, and lying in the direction which had always been associated with Rome. Points of this kind, which, with particular English divines, had been matters of theoretic approval, or had been occasionally indicated as defensible, were now brought to the front, systematised, reduced to practice, and inculcated. This was all in the line of that *via media* which, as against (ultra) Protestants on one side, and against Romanists on the other, was set forth as the proper glory of the Church of England. Newman and party pressed on into the wide patristic field, not yet clear as to all that they might find, but assured that all would be triumphantly right, and that all would reveal more and more satisfactorily the true genius of the Church of England.

It was Newman's point to maintain that in all this he had not taken up new ground but old, approved by great Anglicans. I shall presently have to say a word on this part of the question.

I have spoken of the deep fountains of faith and fervour from which Newman, and many of those he influenced, drew. But there was, of course, an immense variety of elements in the great rally for Church principles and practices—conceived on this type—which went on, with Oxford for its centre, among the younger clergy and the cultivated classes. The principles preached, and the practices that embodied them, proved able to gather about them a good deal of speculation and a good deal of poetry. They were able to bear up the eagerness, prejudices, interests of a great party. They could combine with a great deal of devoutness, with a great deal of sentimentalism, and with a great deal of passion. You could fight with them and play

with them, you could be meek or arrogant with them, pious or unscrupulous. It is a great thing to have a cause which lends itself to the argumentativeness of the disputatious, and the enthusiasm of the excitable, and the aspirations, or even superstitions, of the devout. The work went prosperously on; Newman has confessed the "fierce" exhilaration of that time; the coach was driven with an almost rollicking confidence; and when sober churchmen shook their heads, they were answered with a fresh whirl of the whip, and a new flourish from the guard. It went on for seven years—"in a human point of view," Newman says, "the happiest years of my life."

Then, in 1839, a ghost arose; a great dread came shuddering over Newman. It passed, but by and by it returned again. Was the Church of England Christ's true Church in the sense of those principles on which Newman and his friends relied? Did not those principles require something very different? Did they not point, in fact, to Rome? It came to this: the objections to the Church of England seemed to grow in weight the more that Newman considered the scope of his principles, yet this was not conclusive, for there were also objections against the claims of Rome. Against Rome Newman and his friends conceived they could plead antiquity. Common Protestantism, in their opinion, fell far short of that standard; but Rome went beyond it, corrupting Christian truth and Christian worship, as these are seen in the Church of Athanasius and Chrysostom, by unwarrantable additions of her own. The additions could hardly be denied. But were they unwarrantable? Eventually Newman came to think of them as not unwarrantable. The theory of development came here to his aid. The Church has no power to add, in the strict sense, but she has immense powers of developing. The primitive truth and worship were seeds which were meant to grow. The active human mind, stirred by revelation,

must move, it ever moves; but the Church's part is to control the process. She chastens the petulance of erring minds, and she consecrates those growths which she judges to be genuine and authentic developments. What had been condemned as corruption, might pass as development. Newman's doubts ended in the decision to enter the Church of Rome in October, 1845. He had not hurried the final step; and the pain and weariness of the long debate had been patiently and piously sustained.

Newman's impression of the Church of England, when he looked back from his new standing ground, was not complimentary. "When I looked back upon the poor Anglican Church, for which I had laboured so hard, . . . and thought of all our attempts to dress it up doctrinally and esthetically, it seemed to me to be the veriest of nonentities. . . . 'I went by, and lo! it was gone; I sought it, but its place could nowhere be found.'"

Was this step of Newman's the legitimate result of the principles which his friends and he had so rigorously maintained? Many men of high character and great accomplishments refused to follow him here; and some of them since then have expressed their mind on the whole history. I will venture to say what it is that I miss, when they come to the point of regretting Newman's departure, and posing as more considerate men who have better kept their feet. I want to know how far they go with their Church principles, and with their deference to antiquity. Newman was a man who was in earnest with principles, and the question is how far they also were so. It is one thing to be of opinion that the visible Church was intended to fulfil essential functions in the economy of salvation, and that the ancient and undivided Church is very likely to have been right in its conception of Christianity, and in its ways of understanding the Bible, so that it may be counted a comfort and advantage to have the ancient Church on one's side,

and so that the Church of England, so far as it agrees with antiquity, may be held to be the stronger for the agreement. To hold all this is simply one form of the exercise of private judgment; and in that case it warrants no man to take any very high or peculiar position. It is another thing to hold that the visible Church has been commissioned and qualified to ascertain for us, in what it finds essential, the meaning of God's revelation, as well as to be the channel of grace and salvation; that it is in all ages Holy Apostolic Catholic and ONE; that we are to submit our private judgment, and are never to separate ourselves from its teaching and its ministration; that this was true of the undivided Church, and that in substance it must hold of Christ's visible Church to-day. This was the faith of the movement, and Newman found himself in presence of questions rising out of it. I find no sufficient account of how those who declined to follow him extricate themselves upon these questions.

But then—all the more if any one is disposed to think that Newman, when he went to Rome, interpreted his own principles aright, or at least, as little wrong as the oppression of circumstances permitted—one must smile at the course he had been taking all these years; and one must admit the censure it suggests upon the good conduct of his understanding generally. It is all but ludicrous to think with what confidence he and his friends had taken in hand to instruct the world as to the foundations of Christian faith, and most particularly (for nothing was more prominent) as to the true and safe ground for the Church of England as against the Church of Rome. In the first place, they had not understood the range of their own principles. Able and accomplished as many of them were, they were far behind in theology proper. They had not worked out the theological problems on which they pronounced. Neither could they point to any great theological school

in which those problems had been coherently wrought out. Many English theologians, whether for argument's sake, or as matter of conviction, had adopted or hazarded principles not unlike theirs. But the unsystematic character which English theological literature prefers had prevented any clear adjustment of results. Newman explains all this himself in the preface to the *Prophetical Office of the Church*, published in 1836. And he says that book was of a tentative and empirical character, though he "fully trusted his statements of doctrine would turn out true and important." Surely those who undertake to guide the world and the Churches should know first the range of their own principles. But, next, neither did they know their facts. They assumed antiquity as the standard. But what antiquity said in detail they knew very imperfectly. This also Newman himself plainly states. If it be said in excuse that the writings of the Fathers are so vast, that is the concern of those who take them for a rule. A man is bound to know what he authoritatively prescribes. As to this, however, Newman had another plea to offer. He says the Anglican writers misled him. He had assumed that the ancient teaching was correctly represented in the writings of those great Church of England men who had fought with the papists on the ground of patristic authority, or had brandished the Fathers at the Puritans and Nonconformists. And so he tells us that when he began himself to see antiquity with other eyes, he became "angry with the Anglican divines. He thought they had taken him in." But whatever their faults in this respect, the whole statement shows that here again Newman and his friends mistook the case. They mistook the attitude of their own divines. All the Protestant Churches claimed some benefit from the Fathers. It suited the Church of England to lay special stress on this, and with the development of High Church views in the seventeenth century Anglican asser-

tions about antiquity grew stronger. But, except in the case of a few extreme men, even those who went far, revealed in doing so only one side of their minds. The bias of their school enabled them to advance as far as they felt disposed, and some of them felt disposed to advance a long way, in the line of patristic thought and feeling. But there remained behind the Protestant tendency to use their own judgment and apply Scripture authority, so as to stop when antiquity threatened to carry them too far. Antiquity in the Church of England has generally been antiquity *cum grano*. To construe the whole body of writers who have offered to make good that Church's cause from antiquity, as meaning to commit her, out and out, to the traditional principle with all its consequences, was simply a mistake. Dr. Newman was chargeable not merely with ignorance of the range of his own principles, not merely with ignorance of the facts on which he claimed to rely, but he mistook the true consent of the divines of his own Church. He had selected one school; and even as to them he overlooked the thing about them which was *most* Anglican, *viz.*, their virtual adherence to TWO rules of faith.

ROBERT RAINY.

(To be concluded.)