

THE CONVERSION OF CARDINAL NEWMAN

BY THE
REV. LUKE RIVINGTON, D.D.



EIGHTEENTH THOUSAND

LONDON
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E. 1

Price One Penny.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
OF CANADA
87 BOND ST. - TORONTO

By CARDINAL NEWMAN

Price 2s. 6d. net, cloth; wrapper, 1s. net.

**LECTURES ON THE
POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND**

With Introduction by the
Very Rev. CANON BARRY, D.D., and Portrait.

The Nine Lectures can also be had separately, price One Penny each.

Price 1s. 3d. net, cloth; wrapper, 6d.

THE BENEDICTINE ORDER

Price Sevenpence, cloth.

THE DREAM OF GERONTIUS

Two volumes, cloth, 1s. 3d. each, net.

SELECTED SERMONS

(from the undermentioned)

One Penny each.

The Stations of the Cross.

The Religious State of Catholic Countries no Prejudice to
the Sanctity of the Church.

The Social State of Catholic Countries no Prejudice to
the Sanctity of the Church.

Faith and Private Judgement.

Faith and Doubt.

The Analogy between the Mysteries of Nature and of Grace.

Christ upon the Waters.

The Glories of Mary for the Sake of her Son.

The Fitness of the Glories of Mary.

The Second Spring.

Nature and Grace.

God's Will the End of Life.

Prospects of the Catholic Missioner.

Saintliness, the Standard of Christian Principle.

Illuminating Grace.

Perseverance in Grace.

The Conversion of Cardinal Newman.

BY THE REV. DR. RIVINGTON.

ON the 9th of October, 1845, the following letter was posted by John Henry Newman to a number of his friends, having been written the day before :

"LITTLEMORE, *October 8, 1845.*—I am this night expecting Father Dominic, the Passionist, who, from his youth, has been led to have distinct and direct thoughts, first of the countries of the North, then of England. After thirty years' (almost) waiting, he was, without his own act, sent here. . . . He is a simple, holy man, and withal gifted with remarkable powers. He does not know of my intention; but I mean to ask of him admission into the One Fold of Christ. . . .

"P.S.—This will not go till all is over. Of course it requires no answer."¹

Speaking of that same year, Dean Church writes, "It was not till the summer that the first drops of the storm began to fall. Then through the autumn and the next year, friends, whose names and forms were familiar in Oxford, one by one disappeared

¹ *Apologia*, ed 1887, p 234.

2 *The Conversion of Cardinal Newman.*

and were lost to it. Fellowships, livings, curacies, intended careers, were given up. Mr. Ward went; Mr. Capes, who had long followed Mr. Ward's line, and had spent his private means to build a church near Bridgwater, went also. Mr. Oakeley resigned Margaret Chapel [the forerunner of All Saints, Margaret Street, London] and went. Mr. Ambrose St. John, Mr. Coffin, Mr. Dalgairns, Mr. Faber, Mr. T. Meyrick, Mr. Albany Christie, Mr. R. Simpson, of Oriel, were received [into the Church] in various places and in various ways; and in the next year, Mr. J. S. Northcote, Mr. J. B. Morris, Mr. G. Ryder, Mr. David Lewis. On the 3rd of October, 1845, Mr. Newman requested the Provost of Oriel to remove his name from the books of the College and University, but without giving any reason. The 6th of October is the date of the 'Advertisement' to the work which had occupied Mr. Newman through the year—the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. On the 8th he was, as he has told us in the *Apologia* received by Father Dominic, the Passionist. To the 'Advertisement' are subjoined the following words:

“‘*Postscript*.—Since the above was written the Author has joined the Catholic Church. It was his intention and wish to have carried his volume through the press before deciding finally on this step. But when he got some way in the printing, he recognized in himself a conviction of the truth of the conclusion, to which the discussion leads, so clear as to preclude further deliberation. Shortly afterwards circumstances gave him the opportunity of acting on it, and he felt that he had no warrant for refusing to act on it.’”¹

¹ *The Oxford Movement*, by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's, 1891, p. 341.

The same writer has said of the Oxford Movement that "Keble had given the inspiration, Froude had given the impulse; then Newman took up the work, and the impulse henceforward, and the direction, were his."

The letter of October 8, 1845, contained the judgement of its leader on the true goal of that movement. It meant "Rome." Mr. Gladstone, many years afterwards, speaking of Newman's relation to "the religious mind of England," says, "Of this thirty years ago he had the leadership; an office and power from which none but himself could eject him. It has been his extraordinary, perhaps unexampled case, at a critical period, first to give to the religious thought of his time and country the most powerful impulse which for a long time it has received from any individual; and then to be the main, though no doubt involuntary, cause of disorganizing it in a manner as remarkable, and breaking up its forces into a multitude of not only severed, but conflicting bands."

Of course we, as Catholics, believe that it was Almighty God Himself who removed John Henry Newman from his position as leader of the great religious movement which began at Oxford, and who placed him in the one fold of His Eternal Son. The influence of that act of October, 1845, has by no means spent itself; had Newman done nothing else but make that decision, he would have influenced the religious thought of England as no other individual has in this century, the more so as it has pleased God that we should know more about this one conversion than we know of almost

4 *The Conversion of Cardinal Newman.*

any other since St. Augustine wrote his Confessions. At Oxford Newman's influence was different from that of any other man, and to this hour his name exerts a spell over English minds which is quite peculiar. His sister wrote in 1841, "I am sure it is a great gift, that insight you show into human nature. When I think of people whom one calls decidedly 'clever men,' I see what I estimate in you is not their sort of talent; it is nothing intellectual, it is a sort of spiritual perception; and I wonder whether it is anything like the gifts in the Corinthian Church."† Principal Shairp has said, "The influence he gained without apparently setting himself to seek it, was something altogether unlike anything else in our time. A mysterious veneration had by degrees gathered round him till now it was almost as if some Ambrose or Augustine of older ages had reappeared. . . . In Oriel Lane light-hearted undergraduates would drop their voices and whisper, 'There's Newman.' When, head thrust forward and gaze fixed as though on some vision seen only by himself, with swift noiseless step he glided by, awe fell on them for a moment, almost as if it had been some apparition that had passed." And of Newman's sermons, the same writer observes, "Since then many voices of powerful teachers may have been heard, but none that ever penetrated the soul like his."

It was in the heyday of his influence, when deep in the study of the Fathers, that the first shock came, which ended, nearly six years after, in his

† *Letters and Correspondence of F. H. Newman*, vol. ii. (1891) January, 1841.

conversion. The Church of England is not strong in history: she has produced no single Church historian of eminence in three hundred years. She has been passed in this respect by German Protestantism, which has had at least a Neander.¹ In the year previous to that of which I speak Newman had answered a proposal to reform the Roman Breviary by saying, "I do not think it will do to attempt to correct it by history. None of the parties concerned are strong enough, in fact, to do so." It was Newman who really broke the ice. He plunged into the history of the fourth and fifth centuries, by which the real character of the Church must ever be determined, embracing as they do the Church's settlement of her doctrine on the Incarnation. He noticed in the history of the Eutychian controversy of the fifth century "the great power of the Pope (as great as he claims now, almost)," and although he seemed to see also a "marvellous interference of the civil power," he was destined soon to discover that whilst the latter was not really submitted to by the Church, the former fact was of vital import in the controversy between England and Rome. This was in the year 1839, and the light which found its way into his mind came not when he was ill at ease or already distrustful of his position, but in the course of his historical studies. The same year there appeared an article in the *Dublin Review* in which the author (Cardinal Wise.

¹ Perhaps one ought to name Milman's *Latin Christianity*. From a literary point of view it is a book of great excellence, but it is so tinged with semi-Arianism that it cannot be placed on a level with even Neander.

6 *The Conversion of Cardinal Newman.*

man) showed that the mere fact that the Church of England was out of communion with the rest of the Christian world, was its sufficient condemnation. She indeed judged the rest of the Church, but the rest of the Church judged her. St. Augustine had insisted on the principle, "the world judges in security," as being fatal to the Donatists. He could point out that they had no letters of communion to the rest of the Episcopate; the Christian world did not recognize them. St. Optatus had led the attack, pointing to the fact that the Donatists at Rome had no access to the chair and tomb of the Apostle Peter. St. Augustine added that round that See was gathered practically the whole world, and the Donatists were not in touch with this world. It was this that Cardinal Wiseman pressed home the most.¹ Newman felt the force of the argument. He said in plain English that the article gave him "a stomach-ache." It was, he says, "the first real hit." "We are not," he says, "at the bottom of things." In the autumn of 1839, he tells Archdeacon Wilberforce that two things have disturbed him—(1) "the position of Leo in the Monophysite controversy," and (2) the principle *securus judicat orbis terrarum* used in the Donatist controversy. In other words, the history of the early Councils revealed the fact that Rome had some right to the claim of antiquity, and the actual

¹ It has been said that the existence of the Greeks in separation from Rome alters the state of the question; but the same argument applies to those Easterns who are out of communion with Rome. The Catholic and Roman world outnumbers all the other Christians put together.

state of affairs before his eyes, viz., the isolation of the Church of England, could not be reconciled with St. Augustine's arguments as to the universality of the Church. How could England be right, and the rest of the Christian world wrong? But in September of this same year he wrote a sentence which forms the key to his real character—a resolve which carried with it the secret of his conversion: for two things are required for conversion—the grace of God and the correspondence of man. Newman expressed the latter when he said, September 22, 1839, "I will not blink the question—so be it." He describes his mind in that year as being in presence of a "vista, opened, the end of which I do not see"; but he had determined not to "blink the question."

It must not, however, be supposed that Newman was actually fearful, at this time, as to the claims of the Church of England on his allegiance. It was more the effect on others that he dreaded. How could he satisfy them and make clear the strength of the Anglican claims, when in all honesty he must admit the Papal character of the Church in the fifth century, and when in all probability Cardinal Wiseman's article would infuse doubt into the minds of others?

The first antidote that he relied on was the suggestion that the children of the Church of England would best fulfil their duty to their [supposed] mother "not by leaving her, but by promoting her return, and not thinking they have a right to rush into such higher state as communion with the centre of unity." This, of course,

8 *The Conversion of Cardinal Newman.*

was dangerous ground to tread ; it was making acts of humility at the expense of what he called his mother. It also shirked the question, Was the centre of unity Divinely appointed? If so, how could our Lord have placed us in separation from it, except that we might return to it by an act of obedience?

Another salve to be applied to the minds of those who might be disturbed in the Church of England was to be found in the idea that "the Catholic Church" had "not commanded their return at once"—an imagination which would necessarily be dispelled by the reflection that the Catholic Church has received the Bull *Unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII., and has always taught that there is no salvation out of the Church.

But in the same year he strikes a keynote, that was destined to lead to much, when he says, "Our Church is not one." It may seem strange that any one should have supposed it was ; but, in fact, so long as the Church of England was fast asleep, it had some appearance of unity. A heap of sand looks at one with itself until it is moved by the wind or the spade ; movement is fatal to its unity. It was the same with the Church of England ; any movement in religious matters was bound to make clear its lack of real and living unity. It would reveal that there was no centre of gravity.

The following year, 1840, witnessed the greatest intellectual effort that had yet been made in defence of the Church of England. It was a long and brilliant article in the *British Critic*. Newman spoke of it as "almost my last arrow." It was

intended to set at rest the minds of those who were, or might be, disturbed by the *Dublin Review*. No one, I imagine, could read it at this distance of time without feeling its power, and without perceiving that it has served as an armoury from which Anglicans have drawn most of their weapons, directly or indirectly, ever since.

He maintains in that article that each diocese is a perfect independent Church, sufficient for itself; the essential communion of Christians lies in what they are, not in mutual intercourse, which is, if obtained, a happy accident, not of the essence. This was the burden of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* twenty-six years later. In this same article, Newman quotes, but misinterprets, St. Cyprian, and admits that St. Augustine is against his interpretation. He falls back on Gallicanism for support, but it is Gallicanism shorn of a vital principle, which was bound to bring its best members into line with the Church, viz., the necessity of communion with the Pope, whether immediately or immediately. In Newman's hands Gallicanism yielded the theory that Catholicity, not the Pope, is of the essence of the Church; the Church is, primarily and fundamentally, a united congregation, a thesis which he thinks, strangely enough, dispenses with the necessity of a visible head in the person of the Pope. Then he suggests that St. Augustine appealed to the state of perfect intercommunion, because it existed in fact, but that it does not follow that it is an indispensable mark—forgetting that Augustine again and again insists that the absence of intercommunion is fatal to the

unity of the Church as understood by St. Cyprian, who is clearly speaking of an essential feature of her life.

Further, Newman throws out the idea that "development" will cover the Anglican position; and insists that life being a note of the Church, the Anglican communion has sufficient marks of life to secure her inclusion amongst the various branches, as he deemed them, of the Catholic Church. Lastly, he takes refuge in the case of St. Meletius of Antioch, whom he erroneously supposes to have died out of communion with Rome,¹ and whose temporary isolation he compares to the three centuries of separation between Rome and England.²

In November of this same year he is still full of the difficulty of answering Wiseman's article, for he says, "the only vulnerable point we have is the *penitus toto divisos orbe* [isolation from the rest of the Church]. It is the heel of Achilles; yet a person must be a good shot to hit it." But Cardinal Wiseman had achieved the feat.

At the end of this month he consoles himself on three grounds in accepting Keble's decision that he ought to remain in charge of St. Mary's, Oxford (which he had thought of resigning). (1) "We don't know what the English Church will bear.

¹ Cf. *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, by the Rev. Luke Rivington, chap. xiii.

² In a note to this Essay, when re-published in 1890, Cardinal Newman speaks of this interpretation of the case of St. Meletius, so universally adopted by Anglicans, as being an instance of what they so frequently impute to others, *i.e.*, "a perversion of history in the interest of controversy." *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 105.

We are, as it were, proving cannon . . . one has no right to assume that our Church will not stand the test." (2) The sympathy towards Rome, evidently created by his teaching, was also created by Hooker and Taylor. (3) He might be destined to ward off Rationalism by remaining at St. Mary's; and "I am more certain that Protestantism leads to infidelity than that my own views lead to Rome." He still harped on Meletius: "I think that though St. Austin is against us, yet that the case of Meletius is certainly for us, and that our position is much more like the Antiochene than the Donatist." His anxiety in the matter was still mainly that he might be able to convince individuals that they were "not bound to leave the English Church." And he exhibits exactly that misapprehension which has appeared of late in so many Anglican writings as to the centre of unity. He says, "It is quite consistent to say that I think Rome the *centre* of unity, and yet not to say that she is infallible, when she is by herself." Of course, if she is the *divinely appointed* centre of unity, she cannot be by herself; the faithful must consist of those who are in union with her.

But all this time a stream of intercession had been going on, of which we are reminded by an incident in the beginning of the year. In January Newman had met Father Spencer, the saintly convert who spent part of his life in inducing bishops, priests, and laymen all over the Continent to intercede for the conversion of England, and one of whose Order was destined to receive Newman into the Church. The latter accuses himself of being

somewhat rude to Father Spencer when he met him at Oxford. Many a convert will understand the meaning of this. It is difficult to be all one would wish to one who is praying for something about which we think he has no business to pray with such assurance. But the prayers went on, and it is to these that Dr. Pusey, in a letter since published, attributed Newman's conversion.

The year 1841 was an important one for the Church of England. In February, Tract XC. made its appearance. So much has been written on this subject, and the storm which it raised is so well known, that it is only necessary to say here that its object was not so much to satisfy Newman that he could himself remain where he was, as to satisfy others that they might do the same. The traditional interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles had been, up to that time, on the whole distinctly anti-Roman, in the sense that they were held to condemn the Sacrifice of the Mass, Invocation of the Saints, and Masses for the Dead, whatever else they might permit or condemn. Here and there, *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*, an Anglican divine had ventured on a timid suggestion that they might be held to condemn only certain abuses of these and other doctrines, and not the doctrines as taught by the "Church of Rome" in general, or officially. Such an interpretation might be said to have been "implied in the teaching of Andrews or Beveridge"; but, as Newman observed, "it had never been publicly recognized." He made the trial. He claimed the right for himself or his friends to hold that interpretation.

He was already at Littlemore in the midst of quiet study and prayer, taking charge of that *dependance* of his Church of St. Mary, Oxford, when the storm burst. For himself, although "not confident about his permanent adhesion to the Anglican creed," he was at first "in no actual perplexity or trouble of mind," even when denounced from end to end of the land. The episcopate, indeed, simply flung his method of interpretation out of the window; but it did not trouble Newman; he thought the episcopal denunciations did not censure any one doctrine. It does not seem to have occurred to him that they were censuring Catholic doctrine all along the line.

But something else did seriously trouble him. In the course of his reading in Church history another ghost appeared. In the great Arian struggle he saw the Church of England reflected in that third party, which condemned, indeed, the Arian impugner of our Lord's Divinity, but stood aloof from Rome, whilst Rome represented the "extreme party" in her unbending orthodoxy. In these semi-Arians he saw the spirit of Anglicanism, the spirit of compromise and comprehensive toleration, at work; and it was unequal to the task of preserving the revealed deposit. Rome, he saw, is now what she was then, and the truth lay not with the *via media*, which was the way of compromise, but with the extreme party, that is to say, with Rome.

And now it was becoming evident that, as the bishops went on with their condemnations, the Catholic interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles was in real jeopardy. And there was one funda-

mental difference between Newman and Pusey, which was bound to lead him further when the latter might feel it possible to stay where he was. Newman, in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford on Tract XC., says, "The Church is emphatically a living body." Consequently, it could never suffice in the long run that he should be allowed to teach this or that, when the Episcopate were teaching its contradictory. A living Church must be a teaching Church, and the teachers of the Church are her Bishops. The fact that the Prayer-book contained statements which could be said to enforce Catholic doctrine would never make *the Church of England* a teacher of such doctrine, so long as her authorized interpreters declared against the orthodox teaching supposed to be enforced in that Book of Prayer; never, that is, supposing the Church to be "emphatically a living body." It was in this that Pusey and Newman really differed at bottom; it was nothing to Pusey that the Episcopate was against his interpretation of the documents of his Church, it was everything to Newman. He could not accept the position of representing the Church in opposition to the Episcopate. It was not, to his mind, a position consistent with the fundamental virtue of the Christian life. And without recognizing it, he was acting throughout the matter in accordance with the dictates of that virtue. Dr. Pusey recognized this in his friend, for he writes, "They who have read what Newman has written since on the subject [viz., Tract XC.] must be won by his touching humility." He was, indeed, as the whole history of these five years shows, possessed

with the spirit of submission. The lightest word of his bishop was to him a serious matter. This is, in truth, the only consistent attitude towards authority in those who adopt the Anglican interpretation of St. Cyprian's teaching. The Catholic interpretation understands the doctrine of that Saint on the Church, viz., that it is founded on the Bishops, to mean the Bishops as welded together by the See of Peter; the Anglican took the Bishop of each diocese as the foundation, and involved himself, logically, in the necessity of almost unqualified submission to each bishop. "It is our theory that each diocese is an integral Church, intercommunion being a duty (and the breach of it a sin), but not essential to Catholicity." Hence he argues that he will not resist his bishop when his will was made plain.

And now came a third blow. Newman had so far taken refuge in what may be called the continuity theory. He had said, "People shrink from Catholicity and think it implies want of affection for our National Church. Well, then, merely remind them that you *take* the National Church, but only you do not date it from the Reformation." It must be remembered that, up to this time, although Newman saw that the position of the Papacy in the early ages was something far beyond that which is assigned to it in the highest Church of England teaching, he did not yet see that that position rested on the belief of Christendom that the supremacy of the Pope was of Divine institution. Especially he did not realize what has become so evident since the publication of the Rolls Series

of Chronicles, viz., the peculiar attachment of the Church in England to the Papacy, which prevented it from breaking with the Holy See when that attachment was strained almost to bursting by demands for support in the difficulties in which Popes often found themselves in their struggles for the freedom of the Catholic Church. Accordingly, Newman suggested to Mr. Bowden the publication of a life of St. Anselm by way of bolstering up an assertion of Laud's that Anselm was his predecessor. It was with such champions of the faith as St. Anselm and St. Thomas à Becket that Newman wished to be one, and his estimate of the so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century had proportionately sunk. It was at this time that he said of Dr. Pusey, "We differ historically." And, again, "I do fear that his historical view of the Reformation is his great bulwark against Rome which is not a comfortable thought."

But Newman's idea of continuity was now destined to receive a rude shock. It was decided by the authorities of the Church of England to consecrate a bishop for Jerusalem. This was not really a more schismatical proceeding than the consecration of a bishop for Quebec; but it brought into startling evidence the true genius of the Establishment. "Our Church seems fast Protestantizing itself," he says. It was really only showing itself what it had been from 1558 onwards. But the dream of continuity had blinded the Oxford people to the facts of her history. There were in Jerusalem "perhaps half a dozen converted Jews" — "we are sending a bishop to *make* a communion.

not to govern our own people." It was "the corroboration of a present living and energetic heterodoxy." On the usual Anglican theory this would not seriously affect the question; for, as already observed, so long as some sentences remained in the Book of Common Prayer, it mattered not whether the episcopate and the whole teaching body inculcated heterodoxy—the book, not the teaching body, constituted the Church of England on that theory.

But Newman had already imbibed a truer idea of the Church. She was not a book, but a living body; and if the living body went wrong the Church of England went wrong. "I distrust the bishops altogether, *e.g.*, the Bishop of Lincoln told a person from whom it comes to me, that when he was appointed bishop he had not read a word of theology, but, since that, he had begun studying Scott's Bible." Again, "The Bishop of London has rejected a man for holding (1) *any* sacrifice in the Eucharist; (2) the Real Presence; (3) that there is a grace in Ordination.

He had, however, two refuges in this night of confusion in which for the moment he took shelter. One was that he and his friends might be in the position of the heathen woman, who was content to pick up the crumbs under the table, and might hope that in the acceptance of their position as dogs, they would be blest beyond their deserts. They had not even (on this theory) heard the command to sit down in the lowest place at the King's table, but they might have a good hope that they would some day be called to a place at the

great feast. The other was that they might wait for something like corporate reunion. He told a lady at this time that she, as an individual, should not seek great things for herself but wait, for three thousand at once were converted at the day of Pentecost. Both these ideas were doomed to a speedy end. He tells us later in life that he never could understand people being "converted in couples." And his subsequent conversion means that he had felt the call to sit down at the feast of good things prepared by the King here as a preparation for the Eternal Feast hereafter.

But during this period there appears a slight confusion in his mind, due to Protestant training, as to the nature of conscience. He says wisely, "I wish to go by reason, not by feeling." But he also says of his conscience, "That was a higher rule than any argument about the notes of the Church." He does not seem quite to realize that conscience is light, and an exercise of the reason, and that when the reason, exercising itself, with the use of prayer, on the credentials of the Church, sees that she possesses the true notes of heavenly origin, this insight comes from God—and nothing remains but obedience to the voice of God.

He managed, however, to comfort himself with the thought that the Church was like the Turkish Empire—a dismembered body. "Our Lord founded a kingdom; it spread over the earth and then broke up. Our difficulties in faith and obedience are just those which a subject in a decaying empire has in matters of allegiance." And then he compared the difficulties in which he found himself with the

imaginary difficulties in the Church of Rome as to the seat of infallibility—evidently showing that he was drawn towards Rome and had to erect safeguards against any impulsive action in that direction. Indeed, it seems as if Newman were destined to sound to its depths every reason for staying where he was, that no one who came after him might be able to say that he had discovered a reason for remaining which was not at some time or other present to Newman's mind. In the following year his sister wrote to him thus: "Dear John,—I feel it cannot be otherwise; whichever way you decide it will be a noble and true part, and not taken up from any impulse or caprice or pique, but on true and right principles that will carry a blessing with them."

On September 25, 1843, he preached his last sermon at St. Mary's, Oxford. It was of this that Principal Shairp has said, as quoted above, "Since then many voices of powerful teachers may have been heard, but none that ever penetrated the soul like his."

He now drew the curtains round his life to be more alone with God. During this time he seems to have laid the greatest stress on the note of sanctity. He thought he saw a want of it in the political action of Rome. He felt glad not to have to attack her doctrines; but had she the note of sanctity? And, on the other hand, had the Church of England any note except that of accordance with antiquity? Had she even that? He defines Anglican principles as "taking antiquity, not the existing Church, as the oracle of truth, and hold-

ing that the Apostolical succession is a sufficient guarantee of sacramental grace, without union with the Christian Church throughout the world." It was the exact position afterwards elaborated by Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon*. Newman, as many Anglican teachers since, compared the position of the Church of England to that of the ten tribes of Israel, who, he says, were "not in the Church, but had the means of grace and hope of acceptance with their Maker." St. Cyprian denies that the Church can ever be thus divided, but his passage alluding to the ten tribes seems to have escaped both Newman and Pusey.

One barrier, however, to Newman's submission needs special mention. He was, he says, "in a serious state of doubt," but "I could not go to Rome while I thought what I did of the devotions she sanctioned to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints." It is well for us Catholics to remember this fact when dealing with our non-Catholic friends—to remember how deeply-rooted their prejudices are on this particular subject. Some centuries of non-Catholic life have done their work. But in Newman's case the difficulty was now in part removed by something which he had taken with him into his long retreat. He had met Dr. Russell, of Maynooth, at the end of 1842, and of him he says that "he had more to do with my conversion than any one else." He did not speak on religion when they met, but he sent Newman some cheap tracts. These were destined to enlighten him as to the true character of Catholic devotion to our Lady and the Saints.

And now it was that the genius of Newman showed itself. His standpoint had been antiquity; he had sought for Rome in the primitive Church and not found her. He had imagined that he had seen something like the Church of England there. But it was the Church of England, not as he saw her before his eyes, but as he had idealized her in his hopes. Was she there at all? If not, was Rome there? It now occurred to him that in seeking for Rome in antiquity, he was seeking for her clothed in the accidents of her present position. Divest her of her accidents, and was she there in essence, in substance? Was not this all for which a rational historian could look? It was an inspiration. The note of antiquity could not mean, in either case, that Rome or England were to be found in the primitive Church just as they are seen in the nineteenth century. Was it not a sound principle that we should expect some kind of development? What, then, are the natural laws of development, and is Rome, according to those laws, to be found in the primitive days? The further he pursued the matter, the clearer it became that the Supremacy of the Holy See was there, in the earliest days, in substance. It acted then as we might expect it to act, and its action then was the natural counterpart, given the change of circumstances, of its action now.

He had begun his inquiry with saying of the Roman question, "I will not blink it." Now in the life which he led of prayer and mortification, away from the distractions of other work, he bent his whole self to the work before him. He was, in

fact, working for others in the future. His long, patient waiting at Littlemore was to be a vicarious sacrifice. It would lessen the work of others after him. He says, "I gave my mind to the principle of development." He saw that "the question simply turns on the nature of the promise of the Spirit made to the Church." He began to see that—(1) There is more of evidence in antiquity for the necessity of *unity* than for the Apostolical succession, (2) more of evidence for the *See of Rome* than for the Presence in the Eucharist, and (3) more for the practice of *Invocation* of the Saints than for certain books in the present Canon of Scripture. We believe the latter, why not the former set of truths?

Still quietly, with perfect self-control, with a clear conviction of the danger there would be in impatience, precipitancy, or indulgence of irritation, he proceeded, until in 1844, he speaks of a "deep, unvarying conviction that our Church is in schism, and that my salvation depends on my joining the Church of Rome? Can *I* (it is personal, not whether another, but can *I*) be saved in the English Church? Am I in safety were I to die to-night?"

And now he began his famous Essay on Development, and sounded the real meaning of the appeal to antiquity. The See of Peter stood out as a divine foundation, and the Church then, in communion with that See, was seen to be the same in substance from end to end of her career; and on October 8, 1845, John Henry Newman, the great religious genius of this century, the brilliant,

humble, self-sacrificing, patient scholar, divine, historian, could say of himself in reference to his nearly completed work, "Since the above was written, the author has joined the Catholic Church."

P.S.—I subjoin what Cardinal Newman wrote in answer to the plea of Anglicans that they feel the effect of Sacraments in their hearts and lives, and that therefore theirs must be true Sacraments. "You tell me," he says, "that you have the clear evidence of the influences of grace in your hearts, by its effects sensible at the moment or permanent in the event. . . . You tell me of the peace, and joy, and strength which you have experienced in your own ordinances. . . . Why should I deny to your memory what is so pleasant in mine? Cannot I too look back on many years past, and many events, in which I myself experienced what is now your confidence? . . . Can I wipe out from my memory, or wish to wipe out, those happy Sunday mornings, light or dark, year after year, when I celebrated your communion rite, in my own Church of St. Mary's [Oxford]; and in the pleasantness and joy of it heard nothing of the strife of tongues which surrounded its walls? . . . Oh, my dear brethren, my Anglican friends! I easily give you credit for what I have experienced myself. . . . Yet what has this to do with the matter in hand? . . . Whatever be the comfort or the strength attendant upon the use of the national ordinances of religion, in the case of this or that person, a Catholic may admit it without scruple, for it is no evidence to him in behalf of those ordinances themselves. It is the teaching of the Catholic Church from time

immemorial, and independently of the present controversy, that grace is given in a sacred ordinance in two ways . . . Grace is given *ex opere operato*, when, the proper dispositions being supposed in the recipient, it is given through the ordinance itself; it is given *ex opere operantis* when, whether there be outward sign or no, the inward energetic act of the recipient is the instrument of it. . . . It is plain from this distinction, that, if we would determine whether the Anglican ordinances are attended by divine grace, we must first determine whether the effects which accompany them arise *ex opere operatis* or *ex opere operato*—whether out of the religious acts, the prayers, aspirations, resolves of the recipient, or by the direct power of the ceremonial itself—a nice and difficult question, not to be decided by means of those effects themselves, whatever they be. . . . Let me grant to you, then, that the reception of your ordinances brings peace and joy to the soul; that it permanently influences or changes the character of the recipient. . . . There is nothing to show that the effects would not have been precisely the same on condition of the same inward dispositions, though another ordinance, a love-feast or a washing of the feet, with no pretence to the name of a Sacrament, had been in good faith adopted" (*Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. i. Lect. iii. Longmans. 1885).

. Cardinal Wiseman's article "The Anglican Claim of Apostolical Succession" (see p. 5), has been reprinted in pamphlet form by the Catholic Truth Society, price 3d.

NARRATIVES OF CONVERSION

Cloth Volumes, Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. each, net.

THREE CONVERTS

Father Thayer, Miss Trail, Mrs. Howitt.

A PROTESTANT CONVERTED BY HER BIBLE AND PRAYER BOOK

SOME CONVERTS

FIRST SERIES, containing—

- Cardinal Newman.** By Canon William Barry, D.D.
Cardinal Manning. By Aimée Sewell.
Canon Bathurst. By the Rev. Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P.
Confessio Ylatoris. By C. Kegan Paul, M.A.
Why I left the Church of England. By James Britten, K.C.S.G.
How I Came Home. By Lady Herbert.
The Conversion of Miss Drane. By the Rev. Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P.
Mary Howitt. By James Britten, K.C.S.G.

SECOND SERIES, containing—

- How I became a Catholic.** By Dr. G. J. Ball.
A Son of the Manse. By Gordon T. Mackenzie.
Reminiscences of an Irish Convert. By Sir Henry Bellingham, Bart.
Why I became a Catholic. By Horace E. Chapman, M.A.
From Darkness to Light. By Mgt. Croke Robinson, M.A.
"The Truth Shall Make You Free." By F. Duncan Boothman, M.A.
A New England Conversion. By Miss J. M. Robins.
"Seek and You Shall Find." By Don Norbert Birt, O.S.B.

Price 9d. net, cloth; 3d. net, wrapper.

THE TRUE RELIGION

Being the Grounds of the Catholic Faith

By the Rev. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.B. (Louvain)

CONTENTS :

Introduction.—Part I. RELIGION IN GENERAL. I. Religion
II. Revelation.—Part II. THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. III. The
Authority of the Gospels; IV. The Divinity of Christ; V. The
Resurrection.—Part III. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. VI. Church
or Bible? VII. The Unity of the Church, and Primacy of St.
Peter; VIII. Infallibility; IX. Scripture and Tradition as Source
of Doctrine.—Appendix. The Argument from Prophecy.—
Bibliography.

PRESS OPINIONS.

“Deals in clear and simple language with the elementary truths of
Christianity. It should be a useful help for the instruction of converts, and
contains much that would interest and instruct Catholics whose occupation
preclude the study of more elaborate works.”—*Westminster Cathedral
Chronicle*.

“We welcome to the ranks of Catholic apologists the Rev. E. C.
Messenger, whose little book, THE TRUE RELIGION, is as powerful intrinsically
as it is full of promise of strong future work. It is a most useful summary
of fundamental theology, packed full of matter and covering the whole ground
in logical order, simply, concisely, and clearly.”—*Month*.

“A graduate of Louvain and a convert from Nonconformity, Father
Messenger combines the advantages of a careful study of his subject with
a knowledge of those who are too often unacquainted with its claims; and
may be confidently hoped that so clear a statement, produced at a price which
renders it available for distribution, may bring a knowledge of the truth into
quarters where it is at present lacking. . . . The style throughout is clear and
simple, with a laudable absence of technicalities or long words; the numerous
quotations of Holy Scripture should commend the book to those for whom
it is primarily intended.”—*Catholic Book Notes*.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE RD., LONDON, S.E. 1