

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

of men? This difficult question will, in a later paper, demand further attention.

In my next paper we shall consider the abundant and important teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

### CARDINAL NEWMAN.

#### II.

ALL this reveals the weak place in Newman's mind. He eagerly acted on what he took to be the moral signalling of God,—the beckoning of His finger—and counted on finding the facts conform to his anticipation. But when facts are accessible to patient study, we shall not be allowed to succeed in this method of settling them beforehand.

And yet, all through we must own in Newman a real intellectual continuity and consistency. He had undertaken to carry through a principle about the source of Christian knowledge, and about the administration of salvation. It seemed to him to be the only valid and the only safe principle, and he thought and hoped it was the principle legitimately dominant in the Church of England. He set out to make that good. But the truth was, that on these subjects two heterogeneous principles—not one only—are represented throughout the literature and in the precedents of the English Church; and many of her sons have thought it wisest to disclaim absolutely neither way of it, but to contend on both grounds against Rome on the one hand, against Puritanism and dissent on the other. The Bible accepted in the Protestant way, and tradition operating in what we may call the non-Protestant way, were worked alternately. Usually, care was taken not to drive conclusions from either side, so as to bring about fatal collisions. On either ground a great deal could be said in favour of forms of doctrine agreeing well enough with the

position and tendencies of the English Church. On either ground a great deal could be said, truly or plausibly, against Rome and against the dissenters. If either principle, fully carried out, should demand things which the Church of England had not, or condemn things which she had, why no Church is perfect : and it was easy to teach both Papists and Puritans that they lived in glass houses and should not throw stones. Moreover, in most of these cases, if you could not stand very well on the one leg, you were all the firmer on the other. But Newman and his friends had faith in principles; they wanted one principle, broad, simple, and distinctive, that would represent the Divine revealing process, and that would sustain and inspire a cause. It is not only intellectual scorn, but intellectual conscience, that spoke in Newman when he denounced men who balanced one admission against another without putting forward a clear principle,—who hold that Scripture is the only rule and yet the Church is to be deferred to—that bishops are a Divine ordinance, yet those who have them not are in the same religious condition as those who have—“the safe men to guide the Church through the channel of no meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of Aye and No.” And that was all well for himself if he was so persuaded; but if one insists on carrying abstract principles so faithfully through the life of the Church, it must at least not be attempted in Churches which by the circumstances of their origin have become the embodiment of a practical compromise. A man like Newman had, in the end, to leave the Church of England and go elsewhere.

I have found it difficult to dismiss as rapidly as I should have desired, matters which after all bear merely on domestic concerns of the Church of England. A question of far more Catholic interest and more worthy is raised by the great decision of Newman's life. Did he rightly

discern the conditions of faith? did he truly see the problem for a believing man? For Newman there was in the end one refuge only—Rome. He thought so. And it seemed to him that his experience ought to weigh with other minds. How far then does Newman's case throw reliable light upon the great problem? We are here in the presence of another question, *viz.* whether Newman was a man of an essentially sceptical nature, who threw himself on the infallible Church in order to lay spectres of doubt which otherwise he could not lay. It is this (it is said) that appears when he maintains that a perfectly consistent mind must embrace either Atheism or Catholicism. "I am a Catholic," he said, "by virtue of my believing in a God." And sometimes he prosecuted that argument in a way which, I believe, did great harm, and drove into Agnosticism men whom he desired to send quite another way. Hence Mr. Huxley has said that if he were going to compile a Primer of Infidelity, he would save himself trouble by making a selection from Newman's works. All this brings us back to the point: How are we to understand the manner in which Newman's mind reacted in the presence of the Christian religion, and how are we to appreciate the method in which he worked his conclusions out.

It does seem to me very clear that, especially from the time when religion became a serious interest with him, at the age of fifteen, Christian religion commended itself to Newman as wholly worthy to be received. Christian religion rose before him as that which had and which alone had the right to hold him. From the time when he so vividly realized the thought of "two, and two only, supremely and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator," the religion of redemption, as well as the records that embody it, received his entire assent and never lost it. It held him in all its main features for years before his "Church" period set in. And his subtle under-

standing was quite as likely to employ itself in overcoming any difficulties that might appear, as in sustaining them. So far, I should say that Newman was eminently believing—predisposed, by all his ways of conceiving the world and its Maker, to make room in his thoughts for the Christian teaching.

But then, on the other hand, Newman's mind was not one which easily came to rest with reference to debates which any way concerned the details of *this world*, its history, or its laws. The higher—the moral and spiritual world—disclosed to him great certainties, betokening a whole order of like steadfast certainties in that quarter. But of what may be called the material concrete certainties of the lower sphere he had a slight hold. This world might be all a dream, or it might be an allegorical fringe to the spiritual world. His singularity, or originality, involved among other things this, that in the lower region he lay open to endless possibilities, to which ordinary men would refuse a hearing. The probabilities which rose into his view in the moral world, were great, permanent, decisive; but in the lower region they were slight and debatable, subject to easy subversion. Newman had quite extraordinary power of putting a case, of marshalling materials so as to impress his jury. That is a quality that sometimes carries with it a difficulty for the man himself in coming to rest. The man who can put a case so well, feels how forcibly *any* case can be put. He does not like to rest his great interests in that region or on that foundation, for the ground moves under his own foot.

Well. Let it be considered that every believer, even if Christianity has struck him as a most credible whole of supersensible good, must come to the question of the standard of believing. For the question arises, how much to believe, within what limits to believe, how far to graduate belief, how to place oneself in the position

divinely intended so as to continue to perform duly, and also safely, the *duty* of believing. Whether the oracle is to be conscience, or Bible, or Church, or any combination of these or other elements, still the question rises about the standard.

The standard for Newman in the early days of his religious life was the Bible, into which was thrown no doubt the influence of the Church, that is, of the believing life of the Church of England as he then felt it. But by and by he passed, of course, into the region in which opinions and faiths are challenged—an experience which we may connect with his entrance on college life. He had to become more familiar with the debates which have gathered about the great truths—Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, Judgment,—truths which he has declared were all along of the essence of Christianity as he received it. He had to encounter also the debates that have gathered round the Bible itself. He was quite likely to look at these questions keenly. And there is no reason to suppose that his strong and subtle intellect, in the service of his faith, would find difficulty in arguing them out on his own side. But one can conceive the distaste with which he would find himself, however successfully, working out a case for Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, on the detailed material of texts and arguments, giving and taking, and, as it were, bargaining for his life on that field—the field of debate, where evidence is gathered by items. The like distaste would attend the process of debating and bargaining for his Bible, the Bible which he loved, on the field of history and of criticism. It is not that he would find any serious difficulty in building his argument. But then, what is the worth of any such argument? It is invaluable for repelling objections, if they are brought, and meeting difficulties if they are suggested; you can always put your adversary to the worse; but will that ground the kind of

faith one needs? For as to texts, does not that run you down to questions of words, and is not the human mind interminable in its ways of understanding words? And as to facts of history and criticism; is not all this concrete world a shadowy dubious business in which you cannot lay any foundations that will prove secure? There is no indication that on these points Newman feared debate or flinched from it. He kept the infidel writings of the period by him, and had studied them; indeed he had read Paine, Hume, and something of Voltaire, while he was still a boy. But there is much to indicate that he might detest the idea of having to make good his own right in a field like that, and in a method like that. So when in Dr. Hawkins' university sermon Newman found the view that Scripture was never meant to *teach* the fundamental doctrines, but to be the Church's means of proving them, while *she* teaches them by her Catechisms, Creeds, etc., he might at once begin to extend that view, and to think that this way lay an order of ideas full of satisfaction and relief.

Christianity was Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, Judgment, but it was also *Church*: not only great truths sent into the world and great forces, but a great form. The convincing force of the Christian religion might be held to apply to it in this form, as well as in any other view of it. Take it so; take Christianity in this form, in the living concrete Church, as it comes before you at the date when first it is fully revealed in history; when it has issued from the shadowy period of the first two centuries; when its embryonic time has passed; when it manifestedly knows and shows its own mind; when it has had time to assert its character, publish its message, and take ground in the world. Take it so, and you have the great Christian Church holding out to you the Bible, asserting the fundamental faiths, administering Christian grace. Is not this, historically, the Christian religion? Assume that the

Church was authorized to do that—to do what she did and to be what she was,—and then, many things may still be disputable, but not the main things. You may dispute about the first century or the second; but some things are plain on the face of the fourth. The Church is there, the Bible, the Trinity, the Incarnation, Redemption, the Sacraments. Own Christianity *in this form*, own it on those broad moral and spiritual grounds, in which you see the finger of God pointing you to this religion, but own it *in this form*, take it from history that this is Christianity in God's conception of it, written broad on the face of history, and how secure the great interests become! Now, while history, and criticism, and interpretation, and polemics pursue their interminable babel of conflicting speech, you simply feel secure that they shall never shake your certainties. How idle now the busy process that pursues its way, with no end of arguments, no end of conjectures! "They say, let them say." Easy enough it will prove, when you think it worth while, to knock down one dexterous argument with another. But you don't seek your main certainties in this field. For your faith this is all pure surplusage. Your faith regulates itself by a standard, which, upon the main points, has no ambiguity at all.

Later, Newman became convinced, that the Church of which all this held in the fourth century, the Church of which it holds still, was and is, exclusively, the Church that is in communion with the Roman See. But my point is, that his alternative, "Catholicism or Atheism," is first of all this, the Authoritative Church or Atheism. Now he reached that by postulating that the main dogmatic certainties of the Christian religion must be certified, or measured, by a standard that admits of no debate. That alone is Revelation. Without that you have no revealing God. It is only if he is right here that his further experience is authoritative. Therefore I have tried to indicate



the features of his mental constitution which peculiarly disposed him in this direction.

The course which Newman's mind took on a large class of topics corroborates this view now given. He took little interest in historical or critical questions; as far as concerned his own faith, apparently none at all. He had reached, on wings, the accredited Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, of which he subsequently came to think the Roman was the sole authentic continuation. But, apart from the special studies he had made in those two centuries, he did not care about minute and accurate knowledge of the Church's history; Döllinger and he, when they met, found little common ground. So he read his Bible, which he loved, without troubling himself about criticism of text or otherwise. Both in history and in criticism he held the keys which are possessed by men of general culture; and he was quite willing to enquire so far as to take up provisional positions on debated details, and provide shelter for the faith of people that might be open to dangers on this side. That he could do with great acuteness. But for himself, it did not seem to interest him. He took history and he took his Bible wholesale, as sufficiently guaranteed.

Looking to the history of Newman's mind on the main question, one asks, Was this a convincing experience? I may have leave to say that to me it is not convincing; indeed, the very process of Newman's mind is proof to me that such a Church as his principles require does not exist and never did exist. More particularly it is very irrational to assume that a Revelation and a Rule of Faith must be such as sin and folly cannot misapprehend, or involve in debate. I am not going to dilate on it. Here I can only refer in a sentence to the other way of viewing things. According to it faith begins with Christ, who reaches us through His word; and Scripture becomes authoritative as the authentic witness to Christ and the embodiment of His Spirit's teach-

ing. On this view too a great place may be given to the Church. But it is supposed that the Church's work is to show to men how the Scriptures, with Christ in the centre, authorize what she holds and teaches, that their faith may rest there. On these terms it could be argued that a discipline in revealed truth and duty will proceed, more divine at once, and more human than Newman's thought supplies. But that argument would carry us much too far.

Still looking, however, to the question whether Cardinal Newman's experience is a convincing one, I ask whether it was not at least misleading, in so far that it led him to that indifference to history and criticism, which distinguishes his mode of view. Doubtless all Christian men are agreed in the heart of the business. There is a vision of Divine righteousness and Divine love relating themselves to human nature and human need, which holds and masters them all. And it may be felt a painful and a perilous necessity to come down from it to debate questions of interpretation and of history and of criticism, and even to ask sometimes how far these threaten to be life questions. It may be painful; but not without a Divine wisdom and a Divine purpose was the true religion made as no other is, a historical religion, woven into the texture of human story, and meeting us everywhere on the plane of facts, of events, of actual forces. In claiming this place Christianity has contracted heavy responsibilities. Yet how much of its life and power and glory depend on this! The good cause may indeed seem to incur anxiety, nay loss, in the relentless processes which take place here. But in reckoning with this side of things Christians are going through a needful part of their spiritual discipline; and in resigning her pretensions here Christianity would renounce her concern in the currents of thought that most deeply move the minds of modern men.

When Newman had passed into the Church of Rome,

he became a student of their theology—never, it is understood, a great master of it in the technical sense—and in due time a priest. He elected to enter the order of Priests of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and became the head of a house of that order in Birmingham.

He continued to be an impressive preacher,—according to Mr. R. H. Hutton, preaching with increased fire and verve, as if he had thrown off a burden—but I should say, also, with less power to charm and hold thoughtful ears. He took part for a time in founding the Catholic University in Ireland, which gave rise to his lectures on the idea of a University. His power of putting a case was illustrated in various controversial utterances; for example, in “Lectures on Anglican Difficulties,” which was a reasoning with his old friend in the English Church on the position they continued to occupy. In his *Grammar of Assent* he once more discussed the subject which had exercised his mind from youth to age—the process of the mind in its assent to truth. In *Callista*, a tale of Christianity in the third century, he entered with ease and grace on a new field. And in the *Dream of Gerontius* he produced a poem more sustained than any of his earlier efforts, and in power, unity, and impressiveness, certainly very remarkable. Also there was the *Apologia*. Especially the latter two among these efforts are very distinguished, each in its kind. Without undervaluing the ability of the others, I should venture to say that the change of position had carried with it a certain relaxation. His utterances *had* been in a manner events, and now they had ceased to be so. Of that freer play of faculty alluded to by Mr. Hutton, a proof occurs in the development of his satirical powers. He comes not far short of Pascal in this gift; and perhaps it was not the only point in which he resembled him.

Here, for instance, is his remonstrance with those who had agreed with him in the common principles of the party,

who found, like him, that the teaching of the Fathers went farther than they at first supposed, found also that they could not claim the authority of the Church of England for their way of it, but who still refused to join the Church of Rome. They proposed, Newman thought, to live on as a party in the English Church, occupying ground not supplied to them by that Church, nor by the Church of Rome, nor by any Church. And yet they had started with him, as disowning private judgment, and as professing in all matters to hear the Church. How was their attitude to be regarded now?

“You seem to say, I began myself with doubting and enquiring; I departed from the teaching I received; I was educated in some older type of Anglicanism, in the school of Newton, Cecil and Scott, or in the Bartlett Buildings school, or in the Liberal Whig school. I was a dissenter, or a Wesleyan, and by study and thought I became an Anglo-Catholic. And then I read the Fathers; and I have determined what works are genuine and what are not; which of them apply to all times and which are occasional, which historical and which doctrinal, what opinions are private what authoritative; what they only seem to hold, what they ought to hold; what are fundamental, what ornamental. Having thus measured, and cut, and put together my creed, by my own proper intellect, by my own lucubrations, and differing from the whole world in my results, I distinctly tell you, I solemnly warn you, not to do as I have done, but to accept what I have formed, to revere that, to believe that, to use that, for it is the teaching of the old Fathers, and of your mother, the Church of England. Take my word for it, that this is the very truth of Christ; deny your own reason, for I know better than you, and it is clear as day that some moral fault in you is the cause of your differing from me. It is pride, or vanity, or self-reliance, or fulness of bread. You require some medicine for your soul, you must fast, you must make a general confession, you must look very sharp to yourself, for you are already next door to a rationalist or an infidel.’ My dear brethren, what am I to say in answer to conduct so preposterous? Say you go by any authority whatever, and I shall know where to find you, and I shall respect you. Swear by any school of religion, old or modern, by Ronge’s Church, or by the Evangelical Alliance, nay, by yourselves, and I shall know what you mean, and will listen to you. But do not come to me with the latest fashion of opinion the world has seen, and protest to me that it is the oldest.” . . .

---

“In some points you prefer Rome, in others Greece, in others England, in others Scotland, and of that preference your own judgment is the ultimate sanction. Life is not long enough for such trifles.”

We need not meddle with Newman's relations to questions and parties in the Church of Rome. There is reason to believe that he was not much in favour at head-quarters in the days of Pio IX. ; and the approving recognition of the present Pope came to him as a very grateful experience in his latter days. An idea existed, and was once or twice expressed, that he chafed under the obligations of Romish faith. He energetically repudiated that imputation, and there is really no reason to believe it. Newman was not a man to find difficulty in believing on authority, if the authority had been accepted as competent. His acuteness was then employed, when necessary, in clearing away difficulties, and none could do it more ably. But it is true that he desired to maintain in the Church of Rome as much of theoretic liberty as possible. He wished champions of the Church, himself included, to be unembarrassed in the cause they had to plead ; he wished to have no needless difficulties, and to leave all doors open. But he did not want this liberty for himself—it was only for other people.

Still, with all his genuine loyalty to the authority he had owned, and even a great apparent satisfaction in throwing himself without reserve into the ways and worship that were approved, whether positively prescribed or not, Newman's singularity was always felt. He was from the beginning set on a key of his own ; his habits of thought and feeling had been worn deep, and he had long been accustomed to set the law for others. His special friendships continued to lie in a circle that was exclusive, and the old imperiousness and indisposedness to be troubled with opposition, came curiously into manifestation. Also in the Church of Rome as in the Church of England, while his

high sincerity was above all impeachment, yet his subtlety of thought, and some peculiarity in the way in which his mind met other minds produced an impression of difficulty in being sure where one stood with him. Recently Dr. Abbott has borne hard on his treatment of ecclesiastical miracles, as having all the effect of deception while no doubt intended in good faith. And that, whether a just imputation or not, may illustrate the kind of questions which sometimes arose about Newman, even in his own Church.

An admirer of Newman, and a very competent judge, has rated him as one of the greatest men of our time—appealing especially to this as the standard of greatness, *viz.* the ardour and energy which a man devotes to adequate objects.

He asks where we can find a more striking example of this than Newman. And in special illustration he points to the fact that a man possessing gifts so remarkable as a writer and a poet, should during a great part of his life have refrained from putting them in play, simply because they did not fall in the line of his main object. For even his early poems would have remained, for the most part, unwritten, had not his journey with Froude separated him from his usual work, and rendered poetry on sacred themes, as it were, the proper industry of some spare hours. I have a very deep impression of the unity of Newman's life and the consecration of his powers, very uncommon powers certainly, to the question of faith. I acknowledge also that everywhere Newman strikes one as unique, having something that separates him from other men. But I am withheld from setting him so high as this writer does by the consideration that so long a devotion to the highest themes does not appear to me to have yielded, in his case, any remarkable contribution of fresh and original thought. His conception of the way of approaching human minds by

preaching was certainly fresh and most effective; but that applies rather to method than to material. The only achievement that catches the eye, of the kind I speak of, is the *Essay on Development*. I by no means underrate the skill and suggestiveness with which he handles that theme. But his whole situation, with its difficulties, precisely shut him up to development as the clue of escape. And Petavius and Möhler had substantially shown him the way. It appears to me rather that Newman's characteristic was the insight with which he selected his line, among the lines that were available; and when he had selected it, the intensity with which he threw himself on it, so as to make it more significant, more operative, more available for many minds, than ever it had been before. That is significant of great moral force and great intellectual keenness.

After all has been said one comes back to that which from youth to age governed the activities of that singular and busy mind. He lived a life not only true to his highest convictions but devoted to them. He lived as in God's presence, and the common interests of life were all but nothing to him. His strength was given to a public purpose of Christian usefulness with a rare persistency; and that purpose was meant to draw its inspiration from a fresh and higher vision of Christian truth and Christian institutions. It cannot be said that he succeeded. In its first form his effort became a confessed mistake; he found himself wrong in his theory. In his second stage, if his theory became satisfactory to himself, results seemed denied him. But this broken life has still its laurels and its sheaves. He served two great Churches, of England and of Rome. That such a man came to her feet is a legitimate boast to the second of them. That the great party in the first, which once followed Newman, has united with its more debatable qualities so much of high faith and high purpose, so much

devotedness, and diligence, and achievement, is surely in some part due to their early leader. He built on the foundation much that some of us must reckon to be wood and hay and stubble; but at least, he never forgot, nor suffered those whom he influenced to forget, that the things which are seen are temporal, the things which are not seen are eternal.

ROBERT RAINY.

*THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY  
LAND.*

V. SAMARIA.

FROM Judæa we pass to Samaria. Halves of the same mountain range, how opposite they are in disposition and in history! The northern is as fair and open as the southern is austere and secluded, and their fortunes correspond. To the prophets Samaria is the older sister,<sup>1</sup> standing nearer to the world, taking precedence alike in good and evil. The more forward to attract, the more quick to develop, Samaria was always the less able to retain. The patriarchs came first to Shechem, but chose their homes about Hebron; the earliest rallies of Israel's worship and patriotism were upon Mount Ephraim, but both Church and State ultimately centred in Jerusalem; after the disruption of the kingdom the first prophets and heroes sprang up in the rich life of Northern Israel, but the splendour and endurance both of prophecy and of kingship remained with the barer Judæa. And so, though we owe to Samaria some of the finest of Israel's national lyrics, she produced no literature of patriotism, but the bulk of the literature about her is full of scorn for her traffic with foreigners,

<sup>1</sup> Jeremiah iii.; Ezekiel xvi. 46, and especially xxiii.