A Thesis presented to the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Edinburgh in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

- by -

Walter E. Brown, B.A., B.D.

1953
To my Wife, whose patient help has made this work possible

--- end ---
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. THE LIFE OF FRANCIS W. NEWMAN - 1800-1833</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. THE LIFE OF FRANCIS W. NEWMAN - 1833-1897</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. A THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT SIN</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT CHRIST</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT GOD</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT THE CHURCH</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The idea of the genetic character of history belongs to the nineteenth century. The development of this view is reflected in political and social events, but is perhaps most clearly indicated in the lives of the men who centred their theology in their belief in progress. One of these men was Francis William Newman.

However, it is difficult to understand fully the life and teachings of Francis Newman without relating him to the course of events which were so important in shaping the history of the first half of the nineteenth century in England. For Newman's thinking was a product not of tradition but of the day in which he lived, a product derived from the conflict between his Evangelical creed and the effects resulting from (1) social and economic conditions in England following the French Revolution, (2) scientific discoveries, and (3) the advance of Biblical criticism.

The tragedy which reveals the evil of war is best seen in the social conditions which follow in its wake. Few wars ever affected such calamitous unrest and misery as that produced in England by the French Revolution. For it came at the time when the nation was passing through its Industrial Revolution. Thus the mass social upheaval, which would have occurred normally, was greatly accentuated. The suffering which this double transformation caused plunged the nation into such an abyss of fear and disorganization that for a generation after peace was declared violent revolt seemed to be a constant possibility.

Watt had perfected his steam engine in 1776. By 1730 utilization of other inventions in the cotton industry had given rise to the rapid spread of factories for spinning. Road-building and construction of canals to handle the increased merchandise had criss-crossed the country. Demands from domestic/
domestic industrial needs had swelled the output of coal enormously. The Enclosure Movement had never been more intense, driving thousands of poor farmers into towns in search of work; all over England the labouring class was moving into factory and mining areas. These social changes, which were disrupting old familiar patterns of life, were taking place over the cauldron of moral and spiritual disintegration stemming from the French Revolution. Then came the first general economic depression in the history of modern industrialism.

From 1815 to 1820 a fearful season of lawlessness swept over England, which was a reaction to a way of life that had become intolerable to the masses. The Church was all but powerless because of its inability to be of service, and thus alienated the great working class from its shelter. After 1820 the economic situation improved somewhat. However, the Church, instead of demanding reforms in ruling circles and help for the poor, left the field open to organized groups among the working class (such as the "Owenites") to exhibit devotion to the cause of the people. Francis Newman was so deeply influenced by the plight of the downtrodden and the reaction of the Church to it that he not only spent fifty years seeking, as he put it, "the betterment of mankind", but he attempted to organize a new church to deal with the matter.

However, scientific discoveries had a far more powerful effect on Newman's thinking. Laplace's works, published between 1799 and 1825, brought to the intellect of those who dared to consider it, a new vision of the vastness of the universe and the earth's place within it. Cuvier's studies in comparative anatomy presented demonstrable proof of earlier theories of mechanism. Between 1802 and 1803 Dalton developed his atomic theory and the laws of the expansion of gaseous fluids which gave men new insights into the workings of the laws of nature. In 1801 Young announced his discovery of the properties of light, as Davy unveiled many of the mysteries of electro-chemistry. By 1826/
1826 Liebig had founded modern organic chemistry, and Sir Charles Bell had published his findings on the structure and function of the brain and the nature of the sensory and motor nervous systems.

Science had found a practical method for research and, apparently, all that was needed to understand every mystery of the universe was the development of new techniques in furthering research. Each year new answers were given to old questions and more clearly than ever before man was seeing the world in which he lived. Hutton developed his uniformitarian theory in geology which led geologists quickly to abandon the catastrophic theory; biology became the science of life when Schwann and Schleiden discovered the cellular nature of plant and animal organization. Embryology came into being under the able ministrations of Mechel and Von Baer, and the ever-present argument between science and theology quickly became a raging torrent.

Behind the work of the scientists lay a desire to make science an independent field of investigation, freed from the restrictions of theological first principles. For their method was developed not to glorify the God who created the universe but to discover facts about the universe itself. Within this framework, mechanism became the prevailing world view and guiding principle of science as each new discovery seemed to verify the idea of the universe as a self-contained whole.

The advance of scientific discoveries forced Newman to clarify his thinking about such tenets as the validity of miracles, supernaturalism, divine providence and human freedom. He finally came to the point where he accepted all facts which could be demonstrated by the scientists and, through the use of their own method, managed to adapt his theology to these facts. However, it must be noted that the process of accommodating his religious beliefs/
beliefs to scientific discoveries covered a period of several years, years of intense inner struggle with the Evangelical Creed which he had accepted as a boy.

However, Biblical criticism presented a more formidable challenge to Newman's faith than did any other factor. For he believed that Christianity rested squarely on divine revelation, and the Scriptures were the divinely revealed Word of God. He could imagine neither a failure in judgment nor an erroneous statement to be contained therein. However, Bishop Herbert Marsh's work on the Synoptic Problem, Connope Thirwall's translation of Schleiermacher's book, "A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke", and Milner's "History of the Jews", raised issues which could not be ignored, and which could be met only by men of strong intellectual power. And Francis Newman was among the most brilliant scholars of his day.

These were the major influences which led Newman from his Evangelical beliefs to the position which he called "Hebrew Theism". The study, here presented, of his life and works will be divided into two sections. The first, containing the first two chapters, will deal with the life and times of Newman. The second, including the remaining five chapters, will be a presentation of Newman's "Theism", or his ideas which developed as a result of his attempt to correlate the many divergent areas of events, discoveries and advances in scholarship, into a coherent system of thought.

In the first chapter we shall outline the various influences mentioned above, together with pertinent features of Newman's biography, as a background against which Newman can be seen as a young and sincere Evangelical, struggling against the swift currents of the times.

We shall be concerned, in Chapter Two, mainly with the way in which
Newman adapted his thinking in such a manner as to enable him to rise above the inconsistencies which had caused him to battle with the changing times. We shall see that the basic shift in his thinking came when he accepted the view that the "essence" of Christianity rather than its miraculous origin was the fundamental base on which all other ideas must rest. This "essence" he believed was the principle of moral perfection. To this he attached the theory of the progressive character of divine inspiration. Thus he was enabled to accept the findings of the Biblical critics. This radical shift in thinking came as a logical conclusion derived from his understanding that love for God was more important than dogma. For, as he interpreted it, love for God is to be identified with desire for moral perfection rather than with the acceptance of an intellectual creed. We shall note that he was forced to revise his ideas about faith and reason in order to make room for the discoveries of science, and from the relationship he found between faith and reason, he was able to hold cogently to the view that consciousness rather than the Scriptures, is the final authority in establishing the truth of all judgments.

The latter half of the chapter will be devoted to an account of Newman's reaction to the social and economic factors of his day in order to illustrate his belief that a struggle to improve the condition of the poverty-stricken and the helpless is the only practical expression of modern Christianity.

In Chapter Three we shall endeavour to show that Newman's new theology became the task of extracting the "essence" of Christianity, expounding its intellectual content, and justifying his conclusions with the aid of the faculties of consciousness and religious experience. We shall trace in detail his view of the manner in which consciousness, in the natural course of events, develops into its role of judge. We shall see how he justifies his belief that faith and/
and reason become unified as one act of consciousness. The basic presupposition on which Newman rests his case, as we shall point out, is that the barrier raised between the mind of man and objective truth exists in the mind as the result of an unnatural development of consciousness.

In Chapter Four we shall attempt to explain Newman's ideas about sin, which were logical conclusions stemming from the method he brought to his study of theology. That is, since his theory of knowledge was grounded in the human consciousness we can anticipate that he will centre his ideas about sin in the human will. Because of the limitations of his method, Newman is unable to deal with such problems as the nature of sin which imputes no guilt, the universality of sin, or original sin. We shall observe the way in which this type of approach to the subject forces Newman into the view that sin is merely that which acts as a barrier to the improvement of character.

In Chapter Five attention will be called to Newman's efforts to dispose of the Christological problem which such a system as he proposed would inevitably raise. For, if moral perfection in the life of man is the end toward which God is striving and the human consciousness determines the standard of perfection to be achieved, if love of God is the means for achieving this end and love of God comes as a natural event in the normal development of consciousness, then Christology has no logical function. We shall try to present Newman's arguments fairly and objectively, remembering that his fundamental presupposition on which they rest is that every effect in nature has a natural cause.

In Chapter Six an analysis will be made of Newman's attempt to establish the attributes of God by reasoning entirely from the human consciousness and natural law, while Chapter Seven will outline his views on the church and its place in the future of mankind.
My purpose is to present an historical study of a remarkable man in the hope that information may be added to our knowledge of the development of Rationalism in England during the nineteenth century.

I wish to express my gratitude to Principal John Baillie, and to the Reverend Professors J.H.S. Burleigh and William S. Tindal of the New College faculty; to Canon R.K. Wimbush, Principal of Theological College, Edinburgh, whose guidance has been greatly appreciated. I further wish to acknowledge my debt to Miss E.R. Leslie, New College Library, for her kind assistance.

Walter E. Brown.
CHAPTER I.

The Life of Francis W. Newman - 1800-1893.

Cardinal Newman labelled his brother an infidel, while George Eliot called him "Saint Francis." The novelist thought of him as a saint because the compelling power of his moral convictions led him to seek the way of rectitude. The Cardinal, on the other hand, looked on him as an unbeliever because he championed the cause of rationalism; for to John Henry Newman belief in the traditional dogma of the church was the standard by which all who professed Christianity must be measured.

In our time many would attempt to refute the Cardinal on the ground that his brother had discovered the central fact of Christianity, namely, the soul confronted by the holy presence of God in Christ. They would urge that Francis Newman could never have enjoyed his profound relationship with God had he not been led by the revelation of Him in Jesus Christ. Though Francis Newman found no place for Christ as Mediator in his theology, these observers would argue that Christ was evidently in his life, else God would not have been so real to him, and that we cannot condemn a man because of an intellectual error. As we consider the life of Francis W. Newman in retrospect, we cannot help but feel that this refutation is not altogether unjust. Though we shall see that his morbidly introspective mysticism and ingenious:


2. A.C. McGiffert, Christianity as History and Faith, p. 166. McGiffert insists that what Christ has done is essential; it makes little difference how we interpret the fact of His Person and Works. (pp.108-109).
ingenious dialectical ability made it extremely difficult for him to view the true source of his spiritual power, none can deny that the power was a vital part of his nature.

One would expect to find traces of this introvertive tendency in Newman as a boy, within his family relationships. Yet, search as we may, we look in vain. In fact, the evidence points in the other direction. Francis constantly mingled with the other children,1 never preferring solitude to the company of John Henry. For John Henry, the little house at Ham was a place of enchantment in which lived the "angel faces" of "Lead Kindly Light"; and for Francis, as an old man, no memory was cherished more tenderly than his recollection of "the dear, sweet influences of home"2.

It is true that many have attempted to show that John and Jemima Newman were Calvinists, and that they surrounded their children with the emotionally disturbing influences of excessive "enthusiasm", but nothing could be further from the truth. John Newman came from Cambridgeshire, of yeoman class; and, though he was a firm-minded and honest Englishman, he learned his principles of morality more from the plays of Shakespeare than from the admonitions of St. Paul. He gave no indication that he desired a life of piety3. In fact, Francis once remarked that he heard his father say, "I do not pretend to be a religious man"4.

Mrs. /

1 Francis was the youngest of three sons born to John and Jemima Newman: John Henry, the eldest, was born the first year of the century; Charles Robert, the following year; and Francis William on June 27, 1805. There were three daughters; Harriet, Jemima, and Mary.


3 Loc. Cit.

4 Loc. Cit.
Mrs. Newman came from a Calvinist background in that her grandfather, Paul Fourdrinier, was a Huguenot, who had come to England in 1720 from Holland where the family had fled for protection from religious persecution in France. However, the usual Evangelical distaste for worldly pleasures, such as an evening at the theatre, was not shared by her. She led the family in creating an atmosphere of gaiety in the home quite out of character with the usual somberness and dignity which marked the average Calvinist family. There were friendly disputes between parents and children; dancing and singing were frequent occurrences in the evenings; and "play-acting" was a favourite pastime. Francis, in later years, could remember nothing Calvinistic about his parents or his home life.

Francis and John Henry were both enrolled at Ealing, one of the elite private schools of that day. The rapid way in which they moved ahead of their fellow students in academic work is shown in the frequent reports sent to their parents by the principal, Dr. George Nicholas. Francis became a leader in school games as well as in dramas, and was elected captain during his last year. Shortly after entering Ealing he began to show an interest in religious matters; he developed a love for the Bible, and at the age of eleven began praying.

1 There are many references to the theatre in letters from different members of the family. While John Henry was at Trinity College, Oxford, his mother wrote: "We were fascinated by the Dutchman (Beethoven) and thought of you and your music party frequently." (Maiie Ward, Young Mr. Newman, p.11).

2 Loc. cit. Miss Ward notes that John Henry would write "mock-drama" and the entire family would produce them. His father would often contribute a prologue.

3 Harriet depicts the family religious background as moderate Anglicanism in one of her novels, The Fairy Bower.
praying in secret. Three years later, he tells us, he was soundly converted. We know nothing of the spiritual change which took place in Newman at this time other than the fact that his conduct underwent a remarkable metamorphosis. Of this experience he wrote: "... my religion then certainly exerted a great general influence over my conduct; for I soon underwent various kinds of persecution from my schoolfellows on account of it: the worst kind consisted in their deliberate attempts to corrupt me."2

At this time Francis Newman came under the influence of the Reverent Mr. Walter Mayer, Classical tutor at Ealing and a "high Calvinist", who led the boy to adopt in full "the creed which distinguishes that body of men"3. Evangelicalism made a deep impression on the immature mind of the young scholar at Ealing, for it was taught by men who were the heirs of the eighteenth century revival, with its flaming individualistic spirit and its impregnable faith in the truth of the creed it embraced. To a young boy, living within that spiritually and morally decadent age immediately following the close of the French Revolution, the Evangelicals held out a message of deliverance in teaching that religion was an "earnest" of the divine existing in the midst of evil.4

For the next ten years Francis Newman held to their insistence on clarity of belief in Christian doctrine. He believed that the cause of religious

---

1 F.W. Newman, Phases of Faith, p.l.
2 F.W. Newman, loc.cit.
3 Loc. cit.
4 A.M. Fairbairn, The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, p.176.
religious apathy in most churches could be traced to errors in thinking resulting from what Wilberforce called "mistaken misconceptions entertained of the fundamental principles of Christianity". The most important of these "fundamental principles" for Newman were: the position given to Christ, the relation of the Atonement to all other doctrines, and belief in the total depravity of human nature.

In August, 1816, John Henry entered Trinity College, Oxford. Francis remained at Ealing until his confirmation in 1821 by Bishop Howley of London; and in August of that year he went to Oxford to read with John Henry in preparation for entrance into Worcester College the following year. The brothers were so deeply engrossed in the Evangelical faith by this time that their parents were becoming disturbed over the odd behaviour of their brilliant sons. John Henry wrote in his diary: "Aug. 13, 1821. In consequence of w/1 William Wilberforce, A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious Systems of Professed Christians, etc., p.64.

2 Charles Simeon had but one message for his confused age: "Jesus gave Himself for me". (C.J. Morton, et.al., Charles Simeon, p.25). All other doctrines were put into subservient relation to the Atonement, for the salvation of the soul from a state of misery to an eternal state of blessedness was above all other interests. (cf. Isaac Milner, Sermons, I, p.345). The doctrine of human depravity was preached as the ground and opportunity for achieving our redemption: "We can only teach that every man... is wholly corrupt, utterly impotent, under the wrath of God". (John Overton, The True Churchman Ascertained, p.157)

3 For the first time Francis began to see a formality and artificiality in the church. Of his confirmation he wrote: "Everything in the service was solemn to me except the Bishop. He seemed to me a made-up man and a mere pageant.... I felt keenly the chasm that separated the High from the Low Church; and that it was impossible for me to sympathize with those who imagined that forms could command the spirit". (F.W. Newman, op. cit., p.2.)

4 During his last few weeks at Ealing, John Henry, too, had come under the influence of the fervent Rev. Mayer. He wrote in the Apologia: "When I was fifteen a great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influence of a definite creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured." (p.4.)
my informing my mother of my intention of taking the Sacraments once a fortnight.

she seemed to think I began to be righteous oversuch and was verging on enthusiasm. I was also leading Francis with me. 1 In actual fact, Francis was the leader at this stage. 2

From the very beginning of his career at Oxford, Francis Newman showed great promise as a student. John Henry wrote to his parents in January, 1822:

He has improved of late wonderfully. I have been astonished ever since he has been with me, at the way in which he has dived into things, and the vigour with which he has scrutinised them. In mind he seems to resemble the description I heard of Mr. Wood, who got two First Classes the other day; for he reads in the way of business, and, while others stop to admire the beauty of a passage, he has examined it as a critic, not as a poet, observed it in its bearings, and travelled on some way with the author of it. I was astonished, for instance, at the way in which he analyzed the Greek metres. He made himself master of them, reset a great part of Aeschylus, corrected Schutz, and I really believe, discovered facts no one had ever known before. 3

In April of 1822 John Henry received one of the finest rewards Oxford had to offer when he was elected to a fellowship in Oriel. In November of that year, Francis, too, began to climb the ladder of fame. He entered Worcester College, went into residence in 1824, and graduated with the B.A. degree in 1826. The quality of his work was reflected in the fact that he took a double first in Mathematics and the Classics. On taking his degree, the entire assembly arose as one man to honour him, a tribute

1 Ward, op. cit., p.60.
2 loc. cit.
3 Quoted by Ward, op. cit., p.63.
only once paid previously, and that to Sir Robert Peel on taking his double
first.

These years from 1822 to 1826 were extremely eventful in the
religious development of the Newman brothers. John Henry came face to face
with the power of liberal thought in the Common Room of Oriel. The Neotics,
as the liberal thinkers of this period were called, were closely connected
with Oriel College, and according to Dean Church, were primarily interested
in subjecting traditional dogma to the criticisms of reason and history.¹

John Henry was particularly impressed by the views of Edward Copleston and
Richard Whately. The former led him to a careful scrutiny of his views on
the church,² and the latter forced him to a more detailed examination of
dogma.³ However, he turned to Provost Hawkins as his chief guide in
intellectual/

1 R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement, p.17.

2 Edward Copleston taught that historically the Reformers never held
to the episcopacy as being essential to the constitution of the
church. He further held to the view that supernatural virtue or
efficacy was not necessarily guaranteed to the clergy. (Richard
Whately, The Remains of the Late Edward Copleston, Lectures X and XI.)

3 Richard Whately was mainly interested in an historical study of the
terminology in which traditional dogma was expressed. (cf. Richard
Whately, The Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in Matters of Religion.)
In one of his chief works he made an impressive analysis of a group
of Pauline expressions which he thought had become separated from the
meanings originally intended by Paul. (Richard Whately, Essays on
Some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul, Essay III.) He
came to the conclusion that the Church used the Bible as proofs and
not as sources of doctrine. (Ibid., p. 236.)
intellectual matters. Of Hawkins he wrote: "He taught me that mode of limiting and clearing my senses in discussion and in controversy, and of distinguishing between cognate ideas, and of obviating mistakes by anticipation." From Hawkins he learned to appreciate tradition. He adopted the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration through the influence of Summer's "Treatise on Apostolic Preaching", and was led by the Rev. William James to believe in apostolic succession.

Francis, however, was forced to find his way alone during these difficult years, for he found no teacher or friend in whom he could unreservedly place his confidence. In solitary study, in midnight walks, and sleepless nights he searched for answers to questions which could be answered only at the cost of his cherished Evangelical beliefs. By 1826 the very doctrine which John Henry had accepted with delight, Francis viewed as fraudulent. Here is revealed, perhaps, an explanation of this wide divergence in point of view which followed the brothers the rest of their lives. Though both seem to have been attracted by solitude, the future Cardinal was more easily influenced by external factors. He was the dreamer, the poet, and therefore more prone to transport minor incidents into a religious romance. This difference in temperament is emphasized by Benn:

(John Henry Newman's) ready sympathy with others and his insight into their needs marked him out as a born leader of men, but the leader impelled from behind and drawn toward ancient ideals rather than a directing and organizing head, not to say a truly creative genius. Francis, on the other hand, seems neither to have possessed any personal magnetism, nor to have been influenced or affected as his brother was by persons and things.

3 A.W. Benn, _The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century_, p. 18.
The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was regarded by Francis as a "Popish fancy", a perversion of common sense.\(^1\) Further, he could not adhere to the claims of the Episcopal theory, for he felt that church history refuted them. We note with astonishment the deep feeling he managed to insert in his writings on this subject, as though he were engaged in battle to the death with a personal enemy:

It was clear beyond all denial, that for a century after the death of Edward VI the Bishops were the tools of court-bigotry, and often owed their highest promotions to base subservience. After the Revolution, the Episcopal Order (on a rough and general view) might be described as a body of supine persons, known to the public only as a dead weight against all change that was distasteful to the Government. In the last century and a half, the nation was often inflicted with sensual royalty, bloody wars, venal statesmen, corrupt constituencies, bribery, and violence at elections, flagitious drunkenness pervading all the ranks, and insinuating itself into Colleges and Rectories. The prisons of the country had been in a most disgraceful state; the fairs and waists were scenes of rude debauchery, and the theatres were - still, in this nineteenth century - whispered to be the haunts of the most degrading immorality. I could not learn that any Bishop had ever taken the lead in denouncing these iniquities; nor that when any man or class of men rose to denounce them, the Episcopal Order failed to throw itself into the breach to defend corruption by at least passive resistance.\(...\) If such a thing as a moral argument for Christianity was admitted as valid, surely the above was a moral argument against English Prelacy.\(^2\)

In the light of the worldly and sinful acts (as he saw it) of many of the Bishops, he refused to accept the principle of Ordination. The idea that a wicked man should have divine authority to bestow on a candidate for priesthood the power to forgive sins was for him an example of pagan magic.\(^3\)

\(^{1}\) F.W. Newman, Phases of Faith, p.10.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., p.12.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., p.14.
In this manner was Newman driven to discard tradition as an element in his religion. Though, on the basis of his worth as a scholar he had been elected to a fellowship at Balliol College, Oxford, he could not bring himself to sign the Articles of Subscription because of his views. For this reason he was forced to resign his fellowship.

In 1828 Francis Newman went to Dublin as tutor of the children of an Irish peer. While engaged in this work he met John Darby, a non-conformist who founded the group first known as the "Darbyites" and later as the Plymouth Brethren. In fact, Newman was a charter member of the organization, the aim of which was "to commence a really catholic Christian Union.... Its only doctrine was: 'Receive ye one another, even as Christ hath received you'."¹ For eighteen months Francis, emotionally distraught and torn by doubts of his faith, lived under the influence of Darby. For the first time, he found himself under the domination of a superior mind:

Henceforth I began to ask: what will he say to this and that? In his reply I always expected to find a higher portion of God's Spirit than in any I could frame for myself. In order to learn divine truth, it became to me a surer process to consult him, than to search for myself and wait upon God and gradually..... my religious thought had merged into a mere process of developing fearlessly into results all of his principles, without any deeper examining of my foundations.²

The major "principle" of Darby's creed which Newman adopted was the belief/

---

1 F.W. Newman, Thoughts on a Free and Comprehensive Christianity, p.5-6.
2 Ibid., Phases of Faith, pp. 20-21.
belief that the end of the world was drawing near, and under the stimulus of this conviction, he decided to go with some of Darby's friends to Baghdad on a missionary venture to convert the heathen.

Many have speculated on Newman's actual reasons for this decision. Had he so chosen, a great career lay open before him at Oxford. It is indeed strange that so gifted a student would turn his back on the world of scholarship. Sieveking thought he had the correct answer: "It was about this time that he asked my aunt, Maria Rosina Giberne, to whom he was most passionately attached, to marry him, and was refused. I think it very probable that this might have been a strong reason why he wished to break up the old life and go for a change abroad." However, Sieveking has no other evidence to substantiate his claim. Newman's reason, as he stated it, was probably the true reason: "About this time I heard of another remarkable man - Mr. Groves - who had written a tract called 'Christian Devoteedness', on the duty of devoting all worldly property for the cause of Christ, and utterly renouncing the attempt to amass money. In pursuance of this he was going to Persia as a teacher of Christianity. I read his tract, and was inflamed with the greatest admiration: judging immediately that this was the man whom I should rejoice to aid or serve."2

Francis published a book in 1856, Personal Narrative, which gives an account of his experiences as a missionary. He notes that the following party left Dublin in 1830: Lord Congleton (who was then called Mr. Parnell); Dr. Cronin; his mother Mrs. Cronin; and her daughter Nancy Cronin (to whom Mr. Parnell was engaged); Mr. Hamilton, who returned to England before the journey.

1 G. Sieveking, Memoir and Letters of Francis W. Newman, p.27.
journey was completed; and Francis Newman. The group arrived at Aleppo on Jan. 14, 1831 after having suffered many hardships on the way. The first night out from Ladakia, on the way to Aleppo, the party slept on a lofty, bleak plain:

We heaped our rudest boxes to make a wall, and on the lee side prepared a sleeping place, stretching over it some oil skins..... We had a small supply of food in baskets..... All night the rain fell in torrents..... Our whole floor was wet. Clothes, bedding, bags, baskets were drenched, and we had to mount in the morning in the midst of rain... The roads were river beds..... After eleven hours without dismounting... We had fasted the whole day.

At Aleppo, Francis for the first time came to a full realization of the difficulties in converting the non-Christians. One day he attempted to convince a Mohammedan carpenter of the infallibility of the Scriptures:

He waited patiently until I had done, and then spoke to the following effect: 'I will tell you, sir, how the case stands. God has given to you English a great many good gifts. You make fine ships and sharp pen-knives, and good cloth and cottons; and you have rich nobles and brave soldiers; and you write and print many learned books; all this is of God. But there is one thing that God has withheld from you, and has revealed to us; and that is, the knowledge of the true religion, by which one might be saved.'

Another incident occurred which further increased Newman's disquietude:

An Englishman of rather low tastes who came to Aleppo at this time, called on us; and, as he was civilly received, repeated his visit more than once. Being unencumbered with fastidiousness, this person before long made various rude attacks on the truth and authority of the Christian religion, and drew me on to defend it...... He was a half-educated man, and I easily confuted him to my own entire satisfaction: but he was not either abashed or convinced; and at length withdrew as one victorious.

1 Quoted by Sieveking, Op. cit., p.34.
3 loc. cit.
These two events caused Francis Newman seriously to consider the historical side of his religion throughout the remainder of his missionary venture.¹

In July, 1831 word reached the party that the wife of Mr. Groves² had died of the plague in Baghdad. About this time Francis was stricken with a severe fever, and Dr. Cronin was convinced that he would die. As a treatment the good doctor leached his temples, bled his right arm, and dosed him heavily with calomel. However, in spite of this, Francis recovered, only to suffer a more severe attack five months later.

On April 25, 1832 the party left Aleppo, bound for Baghdad. At Aintab they were arrested for selling Turkish Testaments to natives, and were ordered by the Governor to leave immediately. As the group passed the city gate an angry mob attacked them with heavy stones, and Dr. Cronin was badly injured. Frequent mishaps followed them all the way to Baghdad, but the party arrived on June 27, 1832. A few days later Mrs. Cronin, overcome at last by the hardships of the difficult trip, became sick and died.

During this entire venture which lasted three years, Newman had been delving back into the old problems of doctrine. Having escaped the influence of Darby, he had decided to accept the teachings of Scripture, completely shorn of tradition, as his creed. After months of detailed study of the Bible and conversations with his companions, he came to many unorthodox conclusions, among/

1 Newman wrote: "Thus the historical side of my religion, though essential to it, and though resting on valid evidence (as I unhesitatingly believed) exposed me to attacks in which I might incur virtual defeat or disgrace, but in which, from the nature of the case, I could never win an available victory... I saw not my way out of the entanglement." (Ibid., p.24.)

2 Mr. Groves had gone to Baghdad in 1829 to prepare the way for the party.
among which was the Arian heresy:

Having gained boldness to gaze steadily on the topic, I at length saw that the compiler of the Athanasian Creed did not understand his own words... If anyone speaks of three men, all that he means is, 'three objects of thought, of whom each separately may be called man'. So also, all that could possibly be meant by three gods is, 'three objects of thought, of whom each separately may be called God'. To avow the last statement, as the Creed does, and yet repudiate Three Gods is to object to the phrase, yet confess to the only meaning which the phrase can convey. Thus, the Creed really teaches polytheism, but saves orthodoxy by forbidding anyone to call it by its true name... It teaches three Divine Persons, and denies three Gods; and leaves us to guess what else is a Divine Person but a God, or a God but a Divine Person."

We can sympathise with Newman, for to-day there is this same confusion evident on every hand with regard to the treatment of "Person" in the Creed. Yet, had the young Evangelical been less averse to scholarship and its contributions to the problem, he would have been aware of the true nature of that problem. The Noetics had already shown that behind the Creeds lay the Graeco-Oriental philosophy of "substance", while the nineteenth century had become committed to a philosophy of personality. Whately, in his work on the historical meanings of dogmatic terminology, had proved that "Person" in the sense in which it had been used in the Athanasian Creed, has nothing in common with personality, other than the principle of individuation. Self-consciousness, as a conscious attribute of the individual, cannot enter into any consideration of the Creeds. Thus Newman was altogether in error when he interpreted the Creed as stating that God is three Persons, as three men are three persons.

However, the Athanasian Creed need not detain us, for our present purpose/

purpose is to emphasize the way in which Newman's treatment of the Trinity brings into sharp focus the nature of the inward struggle with which he was troubled. His Evangelical distrust of reason was in conflict with his developing intellect, which gave rise to an uncertainty about the content of revelation and the nature of its authority, and about the meaning of faith, reason and knowledge. Ten years were to pass before Francis Newman achieved harmony of thought on such matters. In the next chapter we shall see how he allowed his faith to become subordinated to reason, and finally how he attempted to identify the two under one act of consciousness. However, he returned to London from his missionary journey with his old depreciation of reason and inadequate authoritarian idea of revelation colouring his views on the fundamental principles of his theology.
CHAPTER II.

The Life of Francis W. Newman - 1833-1897.

On returning from Baghdad in 1833, Francis Newman discovered that reports of his heretical thinking concerning the doctrine of the Trinity had preceded him. On every hand he was being denounced as one who was attempting to pervert the true faith. His best friends turned upon him with venomous attacks and the two men whom he loved most were the most bitter in their assaults: his brother and John Darby. John Henry, in whose home the family was then living, refused to allow Francis to visit his mother. John Darby wrote a scathing letter in which he charged Francis with "endeavouring to sound the divine nature by the miserable plummet of human philosophy." Caught in the powerful currents of the changing times, bewildered by conflicting ideas, he could only cry out:

My heart was ready to break..... Oh Dogma! Dogma! How dost thou trample under thy feet love, truth, conscience, Justice! ..... Burn me at the stake: then Christ will receive me, and saints beyond the grave will love me....

We admit to a deep sense of compassion for Newman in his hour of crisis; however, in all justice we must also admit that in many respects Darby's judgment was accurate. We have already noted that Francis Newman turned to the standard of common sense in his treatment of the Trinity. However, Darby's charge must be considered in the light of powerful influences at work in the first/
first half of the nineteenth century in order to see the nature of this "miserable plummet".

No distinction was made between natural philosophy and science before the nineteenth century because the function of science was to explain primary qualities. This system of thought received an added stimulus in England during the first quarter of the nineteenth century because of new discoveries which gave additional weight to a rigid anti-metaphysical view of the universe. In the light of facts which could not be refuted by reference to Scripture, how could one contend for the truth of miracle and at the same time admit that the uniformity of natural laws established the natural causes of all effects in nature? No room was left for supernaturalism.

In addition to the rise of the "scientific spirit", the liberal movement, with its insistence on the right of human reason to question that which the church held to be above reason, and the development of Biblical criticism created strong anti-orthodox influences which were included in the scope of the judgment Darby levelled at Francis Newman. Thus John Darby and John Henry Newman thought of Francis.

---

1 These influences also led to the Oxford Movement, of which John Henry Newman was a principle figure. The Tractarians felt that the very citadels of the faith were at stake, for the scientists were attempting to destroy beliefs which the church had cherished for centuries, the Biblical critics were attacking the principle of Scriptural infallibility, and the liberals were causing many to look on the church as a human instrument. Once again, we see a great divergence in the points of view between Francis and John Henry Newman as each attempted to meet the challenge of these powerful forces. John Henry responded by teaching the doctrine of the visible church divinely appointed, with Sacraments and rites as the only channels of grace. His emphasis was on external continuity through episcopal succession. (See especially tracts four and forty-seven). Francis, on the other hand, tried to reconcile these influences to his theology.
Francis Newman in the light of philosophical agnosticism. From their point of view his method of procedure would inevitably lead to infidelity.

However, Francis Newman had read the works of Kant at Oxford and had not only listened to but had learned from the scientists. While at Oxford he had come to believe that Kant had destroyed the "objectivity" of primary qualities, that both primary and secondary qualities were subjective, that we experience only phenomena, and that reality was beyond sense-perception. As early as 1827 Francis Newman believed the function of science to be a description of phenomena rather than an explanation of primary qualities. Thus, for him, science was another name for common sense. In the realm of phenomena he believed that theology must justify itself before the bar of science, and as we noted, he felt that the traditional doctrine of the Trinity violated this standard of secular truth. Yet Darby was wrong in that Francis still retained his belief in the external authority of the Scriptures as a standard for all metaphysical doctrine such as election, the fall of man and original sin, the atonement and eternal punishment.¹

The one bitter fact which cut at the very depths of Newman's soul was that those who loved him were using intellectual dogma as a test and standard for affection. He wrote:

At last my heart had died within me; the bitterness of death was past..... when I conceived the belief that if we may not make a heaven of earth for ourselves out of the love of others, it is in order that we may find a truer heaven in God's love.²

---

² Ibid., p.39.
From that moment the love and compassion of God for man became the most powerful certainty in his creed; it was a faith born in personal experience, burned pure in the crucible of agony of heart.

Then began a search for a body of Christians among whom he would be able to worship his God of love in peace, but all doors were closed against him in London. Finally he found a little group of Baptists at Bristol, who recognized in him a kindred soul, and they took him in. For a while he was happy. During a religious service in June, 1834, he met Maria Kennaway, a lovely girl wholly dedicated to helping the poor around her home. Francis and Maria were married in 1835 and lived happily together for over forty years.

When Francis Newman went to Manchester College, in Manchester, in 1840, he met James Martineau, who had been appointed that same year as professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy. Here began a long friendship. For fifty years Martineau was regarded as one of England's most profound thinkers then living. Under the careful tutorage of the wise Unitarian, Francis spent the next three years studying Biblical criticism. He was particularly interested in the works of De Wette and Thomas Arnold. De Wette had pointed out traces in the Pentateuch of/

1 Ibid., p.40. He was later thoroughly ashamed of the antics caused by excessive religious emotion into which they drew him, for he wrote of this experience: "I am, nevertheless, ashamed to tell anyone how I spoke and acted against my own common sense under this influence, and when I was thought a fool, prayed that I might think it an honour to become a fool for Christ's sake."


3 The year of his marriage Francis was given the position of classical tutor at Bristol College. He showed marked ability as a teacher; thus it came as no surprise to his friends when he was appointed as Professor of classical literature in Manchester College in 1840.
of the progressive development of ritual and modes of worship among the early Hebrews.¹ By his study of DeWette's comparison of the historical books of the Old Testament, Francis was introduced to a vast field of thought which gave rise in 1846 to one of his best known books, History of the Hebrew Monarchy.

Thomas Arnold was among the Biblical critics of the earlier years of the century, though his influence on others came after the Oxford Movement had begun. His cardinal aim was to show that Scripture should be interpreted both spiritually and historically, that eternal truths underlie the particular events in Scripture.² He presented certain guiding principles of Biblical interpretation, the most important for Francis Newman being his theory of accommodation. In this he asserted that divine inspiration is progressive in character, and in every case is fitted to the ability of the receiver to possess it.³ Francis saw that this mode of interpretation would enable him to escape the dilemma of dual authority. Since the Scriptures were clearly not infallible, he felt that he could no longer rely on them as an external authority. However, he was left without a guarantee of the truth of his metaphysical beliefs, and the nature of these beliefs made such a guarantee necessary. He regarded Christianity as a religion separate from and superior to all other religions because it rested on divine revelation. Since man was totally depraved after the fall the only way in which he could receive the true religion was through a divinely grounded revelation, and such a revelation, he had thought, was in the Bible.

Thus/

² Thomas Arnold, Two Sermons on the Interpretation of Philosophy, Preface.
Thus began a search for a new foundation to replace the old. His quest covered the years from 1843 to 1847 and involved such tedious and in many cases irrelevant wanderings in the fields of philosophy, Biblical criticism and progress of science that we need not follow him in detail. Suffice it to say that he found his new basis in what he conceived to be the "essence" of Christianity, rather than in its miraculous origin, namely the idea of the union of God and man which was the idea of moral perfection. In this perfection lay the absoluteness of Christianity. His theology became the task of extracting this "essence", expounding its intellectual content, and justifying his conclusions by the aid of the faculties of consciousness and religious experience. Thus his theology rested on moral values, and found support for them not only in the needs and yearning of the human soul, but in the theoretical reason as well. The Bible and history were regarded as secondary sources in providing intellectual content for faith. The moral and spiritual capacities of man made up the ground and only ground of religious action. All else is religion at second hand, or by hearsay. This was Francis Newman's "Intellectually" grounded metaphysics fashioned in the main from German philosophy. Miracles were no longer essential for the soul to perceive truth; nor were they necessary as a guarantee of revelation. "Miracles will never prove the goodness and veracity of God, if we do not already know these qualities in Him without the aid of miracles".1 An infallible Bible or an infallible voice of the church, if either existed, would be external miracles incapable of giving that deeper revelation of God speaking to the consciousness through reason, conscience, and the soul.

Francis/

---

1 F.W. Newman, Phases of Faith, p.96.
Francis Newman's old dual basis of authority was unified by ascribing to consciousness the authority to measure the truth of all judgments. This change from an external to an internal authority caused him to regard both faith and reason in a new light for if the grounds of all knowledge are in the consciousness, both faith and reason are subjective. Further, he saw that if unity of consciousness was to be preserved, faith must neither be placed in opposition to reason nor subordinated to it, nor supplemented by it. Faith must be co-ordinate with reason. As he came to believe that all knowledge was rooted in man's moral nature, in his interests and ideals, he viewed reason not as a faculty for logical demonstration, but as that function of consciousness which gave an intellectual content to volition. The basic assumption on which his system rested was: man possesses a mind which is capable of receiving and understanding truth. This premise could not be demonstrated, but rested on faith in reason, faith in the assumption that the mind was created by God for the sole purpose of knowing truth. Thus for Francis Newman without faith there could be no knowledge and without knowledge there would be no faith.

Working from this principle, Francis felt that his theology rested on a base as secure as the base of science. Though scientific faith differs from religious faith in that the ideal of the former is cognitive while that of the latter is ethical, yet he believed that from the logical point of view, faith in the ethical ideal was as valid as faith in the cognitive ideal. Thus a union between faith and reason became effected for Newman in his view that knowledge is a realm ruled over by a rational faith and a believing reason.

It is clear that the thought of Francis Newman was part of a great movement sweeping across the nineteenth century. Behind the movement was the motivating/
motivating power of German Idealism. Julius Charles Hare, as one of the representatives of this movement, fought Tractarianism with the keen insight of a critic possessing an infinite capacity for judging accurately and discriminantly. In opposition to the view which held to the divine virtue of the Sacraments, the doctrine of apostolic succession, and an appeal to a dead past as a panacea of relief for the troubled present, he taught that the human personality possessed the ability to apprehend the spiritual:

Every genuine act of Faith is the act of the whole man, not of his Understanding alone, not of his Affections alone, not of his Will alone, but of all three in their central aboriginal unity. It proceeds from the inmost depths of the Soul, from beyond that firmament of consciousness, whereby the waters under the firmament are divided from the waters above the firmament. It is the act of that living principle which constitutes each man's individual, continuous immortal personality.

Faith, for Hare, is that apprehensive region where the human and divine become one in love. Throughout his writings he pleads for a new formulation of Christian truth which will make room for all knowledge rather than be thwarted constantly by the attempt to cast progressive thought into the rigid doctrinal systems of an earlier age which had been designed around their earlier beliefs. For, says Hare, this abortive method leads men with high spiritual vision to so identify eternal truth with their own petty system of/

1 This facet of his nature is well brought out in his Miscellaneous Pamphlets on Some of the Leading Questions in the Church During the Past Ten Years.

2 Julius Hare, The Victory of Faith, pp. 37-38.
of dogma that they "have been ready to cry out Crucify him against everyone
who ventured to criticize that system". 1 We must, he teaches, learn that the
Bible is not a wicked instrument of inflexible creeds which bind men's intel-
lect to an arbitrary will, but is a presentation of eternal verities cast
in the personalities of holy men... 2

Francis Newman spoke with the same vision. In like manner we see
his thoughts repeated in the works of Frederick D. Maurice, the disciple of
Coleridge. Creeds, says Maurice, grew out of history, but more important
than the symbol of history is the eternal principle shining beyond, for all
but leads to the cardinal principle of life, both human and divine: the
nearness of God to man. Religious experience becomes the proof of historic
symbol, a human expression of a divinely revealed personality. 3

These new spokesmen for the century 4 were primarily interested, as
were Erskine and Campbell in Scotland, in freeing theology from its past,
involved as it was with sectarian differences. As with Carlyle and Charles
Kingsley, they were calling for a new obedience directed toward the reality
of the divine as reflected in the dignity of human life and the world in
which/

1 Ibid., p.312.


3 Frederick D. Maurice, What is Revelation? pp. 53-54.

4 No historian would include Francis Newman in such a grouping because
these men placed the Person of Christ at the forefront in their theology,
while Francis Newman excluded the Mediator from his system. However,
within the broad trends outlined above, Francis Newman was one with Hare,
Maurice, Kingsley, Erskine and Campbell. Since all of these men started
from the same base, it is our contention that Francis was the more logical
in his exclusion of Christ. They tried to make Christ absolute, yet at
the same time a relative link in the chain of history. If, as they all
contended, the story of religion is the evolution from the imperfect to
the perfect, if history is a series of causes and effects leading to
higher levels of truth, goodness and beauty, the historical Christ cannot
figure as an important event in theology.
which it was nurtured. Beneath petty sectarian differences they saw with a vision unequalled in their day the profounder unity of a deeper truth, namely, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. A new theology was being written, not on tablets of dogma, but on human consciousness, on the development of personality through appeal to the moral significance behind Christian dogma and the power of the inward expression of external Christian truths. Reaction was violent to such unorthodox trends but by the end of the century the broader view prevailed, since it was on the side of the spirit of the time.¹

In 1846 Francis Newman returned to London. Though driven away by bigotry, he returned triumphantly as professor of Latin in University College. He was recognized as one of the greatest classical scholars of his day and "when the authorities of the College secured him for their staff, they knew that they could have obtained no better man for their purpose".² He remained at University College until 1869, when he became Emeritus Professor. These years from 1847 to 1870 were his most productive, not only in the exposition of his views in the literary fields, but in the moral arena of self-sacrifice and service to others as well. His book, The Soul, published in 1849 was his greatest work. Shortly after its publication, Martineau wrote to his friend:

> Now I have read The Soul and shall bless you for it with thank-s I cannot speak, so long as I have a soul that lives. Nothing that I have ever read - unless it be some scattered thoughts of Pascal's has come so close to me, and so strength-ened a deep but too shrinking faith.³

---

² James Drummond, et.al., Life and Letters of James Martineau, II, p.28.
The book is best known for the distinction Francis makes between "once-born" and "twice-born" souls, which William James developed into his leading thesis in *Varieties of Religious Experience*. A year later *Phases of Faith* appeared, which was an autobiographical account of Francis Newman's religious development. The book was both widely acclaimed and sharply criticized, calling forth two articles of praise from Martineau, in "The Prospective Review", and two thoroughly shallow works which attacked Francis Newman: *Eclipse of Faith*, by Henry Rodgers, and *The Irrationality of Infidelity*, by John Darby. The chief value of *Phases of Faith* stems from the view it presents of Francis Newman as one of the most influential critics of traditional Christianity of his day.¹

However, Francis could never remain for long with his books. His theology was a principle of life rather than a system of abstract speculation, including a bitter distaste for the expedient, a determined dedication to duty, and a deep love and compassion for the down-trodden. Thus was he led to fight for a great cause - the betterment of mankind. It is a mistake to assume that Francis Newman's religious opinions placed him among the celebrated men of his times.

The real value of his life was shown in the splendid aspects of Social Reform which he showed to the world; the way of the new Citizenship, of the new Patriotism, which he was forever preaching and writing about. He was the Perseus of To-day whose whole-hearted efforts were spent in freeing the Andromedas from their antiquated bonds and fetters; whose good sword was ever pointed at the throats of the dragons which left their ugly heads against freedom.²

---

This intense personal interest in defeating all enemies of the realization of hopes and dreams in the hearts of all men led Francis Newman into the thick of controversies and caused the politically oppressed to flock to him from many parts of the world. When Kossuth, the Garibaldi of Hungary, came to England for help, he was constantly thwarted by indifference until he found Francis Newman.  

Francis flooded the press of England with Kossuth's tragic story, presenting the exiled Hungarian as an individual in search of justice in a land where justice supposedly existed in abundance, but was chained by the gross immoralities of wicked men: "Is right to be recognised in the affairs of nations as paramount and sacred," he demanded, "equally as in the affairs of individuals? The heart of the people everywhere says yes!" Then turning his attack toward the guilty nations, he cried:

Only the dynastical faction, both in England and on the continent - the secret diplomats and the organs of the Stock Exchange, unanimously reject the supremacy of Right... Expediency is their guide...... In this contest we see upon the Republicans the mark of martyrs and heroes. 'The Kossuths and Mazzinis' of whom the Czar Nicholas spoke to Sir Hamilton Seymour, mixing contempt with fear, may meet the lot common to the Apostles of a new creed; but they are preaching a nobler practice and a higher faith than our routine statesmen dream of. To such Apostles the future belongs. They may die before their cause triumphs, but triumph it will.

This was the true cause which had won Francis Newman's allegiance -

1 In March of 1848 the indomitable Kossuth, leading the Opposition in the Hungarian Diet, forced through a majority vote which established in Hungary a constitutional government. This courageous action so inflamed the Austrian government that an economic barricade was thrown around the tiny Republic and troops were sent across the border. Kossuth won fame throughout the freedom-loving nations with his heroic efforts against the enemy, but was finally forced into exile. He came to England for help, but the Ministry refused to extend aid to Hungary; for, with a keen eye on the expedient, England sided with Austria. For three years Kossuth laboured in vain for his oppressed country, and then he met Francis Newman.

2 F.W. Newman, Miscellanea, III, p.20.

the New World. It was this New World, which he believed would soon become a reality, for which he laboured. In every nation he could visualize a handful of men like Kossuth and Mazzini who, in their selfless fight for right and liberty, were outlining in dreams and action the contours of that New World; men "resolved to act on moral principles, and to sacrifice the convenient, the pleasant, the easy, and apparently or temporarily expedient to the sacred certainty of Right." ¹

During these years Francis Newman was waging his own "Oxford Movement". However, his opponents were the "barbarism" and vice of his native land. He had no pulpit; but, form lectures, pamphlets and magazine articles he fought to rid the country of the moral diseases which he felt were keeping his New World from becoming a reality in England. He was out of sympathy with socialism, for, he believed that men like Kingsley and Maurice were confusing civilization with progress. He saw that the sickness pervading every stratum of society must be conceived not as that which stands in the way of progress and true development, but as barbarisms of civilization; a nation, he preached, is not to measure attainment in terms of progress, standards of living, or eradication of poverty, but in the degree to which its natives have "become fit for citizenship". ² He never tired of urging his cure for the evils of the day, as over against the familiar cures offered by the socialists: "remove evil habits... and it will presently/

---

¹ Loc. cit. Such visions indicate a side of Newman's nature quite out of keeping with Newman the Scholar. Had his ability as a teacher been united with practical aims and a less visionary attitude towards life, he might have achieved greatness. As it is, we feel the need to apologize to the reader for the necessity of presenting the following material on the "barbarisms" of his day. However, no retrospect would be complete without it.

² F.W. Newman, Miscellanea, III, p.449.
presently appear that never was it easier for a people to feed and support itself.¹

One of the "barbarisms" which particularly offended Francis was the fact that Parliament had sanctioned the disposal of human refuse in the streams and rivers of the nation. In 1848 a law had been passed which made mandatory this procedure of sewage drainage as a public health measure. Francis was scandalized. Though we recognize the practice as a necessity in modern city life and town and rural life as well, Francis Newman revealed the weakness of his method of thought in his attack against the idea. This same refuse, he urged, should be placed on the fields to fertilize them and thus put back in the soil that which for centuries had been removed without adequate replacement.

Another even more odious barbarism, in his opinion, was the introduction of the practice of vaccination for smallpox. He wrote: "the analogy was so beautiful between defiling the natural streams with a view to public health and defiling the blood in the arteries with a view to the health of the individual, that those who had been bitten and infected with rabies for the one scheme took naturally and kindly to the other."²

However/
However, one of his most colourful wars against barbarisms was waged against vivisection. For years he travelled over the country organizing clubs, writing pamphlets and lecturing against this "crime". Once, in a heated debate, he asserted: "The whole matter is not barbarous, but ghastly; and we have a new portentous example of imbecile legislation."  

With even greater fervour, Francis Newman went about calling the attention of the public to vice in public and private life. In vivid terms he described the depths to which England had descended in the abyss of political trickery by securing revenue for the government at the expense of thousands of souls submerged beneath an abysmal ocean of alcoholic beverages. He spent ten years calling on people and begging them to remedy the evil practices carried on in prisons which had become sources of crime rather than preventives. His efforts were not unsuccessful, for cries were soon heard from many quarters which caused detailed studies of prison conditions to be carried out.

During this period Francis Newman was actively seeking the betterment of the legislative system of his country. There was perhaps no more firm believer in decentralization of government in all of England. However, he was no radical political reformer: "It should be said, that first, he threw light on old paths, and secondly, showed where modern obstructions lay which seemed to him to hinder true progress." 

In/  

2 Ibid., p.469.  
3 In an article, "Corporal Punishment and Penal Reformation", in Fraser's Magazine, Feb. 1865, Francis wrote: "In order to prevent crime, these institutions which generate crime must be remodelled".  
In 1375 he gave a lecture in the Athenaeum, in Manchester, on "Reorganization of English Institutions". His plan for decentralization, advocated in the lecture, called for a division of the country into local centres of government, responsible for sending its best men as ambassadors to Parliament, with instructions from the people, and with proper salary, to serve for a period of three years. The local government centre would have power to recall a delegate from Parliament at any time on a two-thirds vote of its membership; and, to provide another man to take his place at Parliament. Each delegate would be elected without the expense of an election campaign and without candidature. Francis felt this plan would greatly benefit the nation, and there were many who agreed.¹

Francis urged that out of decentralized government many benefits would emerge: (a) local legislation would be able to deal with the problems of local life without the necessity for disturbing Parliament, since laws not of a purely national character always overburdened a centralized government; (b) it would solve the church-state problem by giving each individual a chance to speak his views; (c) local pauperism would disappear, for this dread disease would be treated on the spot the moment it appeared; (d) national patriotism would increase since each individual would be taking an active part in government.²

Francis Newman was a devout disciple of Thomas Jefferson. America, in /

---

¹ Toulmin Smith, an authority on old parish records, county documents, etc., was a staunch follower of Francis in this scheme.

in his opinion, had advanced ahead of the rest of the world in solving local and national problems:

Where every industrious man is above the anxieties of want, where every intelligent man may become educated and refined, and every man of high powers may rise to high office; in such a community there will be prosperity and content, even if the form of government be Chinese; but where to the above is added the fullest democratic liberty - there personal self-reliance and a free man's pride are a crown on content and prosperity.

He believed the superiority of the American form of government over that of the British was evident for the following reasons: (a) in America there is a concept of liberty which is well defined and practised in terms of maximum freedom of the individual from interference on the part of the state; (b) Congress is organized on a more realistic basis. In England the Ministry and Parliament are so constituted that Parliament cannot control the Ministry without destroying it.

On the other hand it does not have the power to create a new Ministry. In America, Congress freely exercises a margin of control over the Cabinet, and the fact that the life of the Cabinet does not rest on a majority in Congress largely accounts for the efficiency of that government. Another check which Britain does not have is on the appointment of nominations to office by election in Congress, and the matter of foreign affairs. Since these two vital areas are controlled by

---

1 From "Westminster Review", April, 1855. Such a utopian conception of America during the nineteenth century is an indication of the extent to which Newman went in his role of "Don Quixote". However, the following chapters will show that, in other areas, Newman was capable of fine, original thought.
by Congress, that body is given an activity which is independent of the Cabinet, thus providing a real and constant check on the Cabinet. For these reasons, says Francis, the American Republican form of government should replace the British form.¹

Francis had a great deal to say on the subject of war. As a rule, he reminds us, this atrocious blight on civilization is considered from two points of view: the moral and the international. The former views war as either just or unjust, and judges the aggressor by this measurement; the latter views war as either legal or illegal and judges the instigator of hostilities accordingly. However, there is a third alternative which should be the paramount view, but which in fact is seldom considered, namely, the national view:

Inasmuch as the whole nation is implicated in a war, when once it is undertaken - inasmuch as we all have the same national disgrace if it is unjust, the same suffering if it is tedious, the same loss, if it is expensive - it is an obvious principle of justice... that every side of the nation should be heard to plead against it by its legitimate representatives.²

For this reason Francis Newman urged a revision of the situation in the British government whereby the arbitrary judgment of executive officials could plunge the nation into war through the secret advice of a Cabinet, all of one party and acting in the interests of that party. This task should be given over to Parliament with the absolute decree that no blow in war shall be struck until Parliament permits and commands it.³ He has several other remedies/

¹ Loc. cit.
² F.W. Newman, "Deliberations Before War", in London University Magazine, June, 1859.
³ Ibid., "Ethics of War", in Miscellanea, III, pp. 72-73.
remedies which should be connected with the above: (a) a full discussion of ways and means (of circumstances and necessities regarding probabilities of war) in Parliament by representatives of the people; (b) a determination that no secret decisions or settlements be made until all issues are made public; (c) in his book, Europe in the Near Future, he proposes armed arbitration as a further remedy, organized much on the plan of the League of Nations. Such a view was exceedingly "far-seeing" in 1879:

Apparently the only way in which European wars can be suppressed is by the successive agglomeration of free men, living under and retaining their separate institutions, into powers which have no interest in war, but much interest in peace; until unions reach such a magnitude as to be able to forbid wars of cupidity, and offer a high tribunal for the redress of international grievances....

However, Francis Newman's greatest and most effective war against oppression and injustice was his championing of women's rights. Had he accomplished nothing else in his long and rich career, his work for this cause would place him among the great figures of his century. In 1867 he startled the country by throwing light upon the true legal position held by women in England. He showed his fellow men that a woman had no legal protection with regard to property. Women in England, he pointed out, lose all rights to private property when they marry, and if they earn anything while married, their husbands are authorized to seize it by brute force and spend it as they wish. What a mockery is the marriage service, he cried, "which says 'with all my worldly goods I thee endow' while the law allows him to gamble away her whole fortune the day after the ceremony." The husband is allowed to live in riotous indulgence on her money and can so insult and torment her that life with him/

1 Ibid., "On the War Power", The Contemporary Review, November, 1877.
2 Ibid., Europe in the Near Future, p.19.
3 Ibid., "Women's Wrongs", in Miscellanies, III, p.189.
him becomes intolerable. She is forced out into the world penniless.

For a decade and longer Francis Newman forced the public to think about the horrors attested in newspapers, revealed the sordid happenings in divorce courts, and promoted many units of a nation-wide society for the promotion of women's power of self-protection through the privilege of the vote. For it was his opinion that the law was unjust to women because they had no voice in the making of it.

Few men of his day were so inspired to help women rise to their full stature. Perhaps he better understood the woman's point of view. He had witnessed dear friends, such as Anna Swanwick, struggling to break away from their prisons, possessing fine abilities and great visions, yet lacking the opportunities to express them. With the moral passion of a crusader, Francis entered the battle, fighting as he always did on the side of the weak and helpless. He did not cease in his efforts until old age forced him to resign from the conflict.

However, this was Francis Newman's last fight. "This scholar, translator, mathematician, historian, political economist, political philosopher, moralist, theologian, philanthropist, the most copious and various writer of his time," at last, at the age of ninety-two, found himself unable to take an active part in public affairs. For fifty years he had been a familiar figure wherever.

---

1 Sieveking, Op. cit., p.214. "Anna Swanwick... was well known for her philanthropic and educational work among the poorer classes, and also for her earnest endeavours for the larger development of women's work and education."

2 Ibid., p.337. "He does not disguise the shameful state of the law as it affects women today, and as it is carried out by Government - the law which makes wrong-doing so easy and unpunishable for men, and so hard and unjust for women. He was himself convinced of their plight; and once convinced he stood forward as a modern John the Baptist, spared no one, and passionately accused his countrymen of the injustice, immorality and cruelty of their making one law for men and another for women..."

wherever controversies raged or wrongs needed righting. One of his last acts for his fellow men occurred a few months before his death, and remains to-day a fitting commentary to any retrospect of a life so unselfishly lived for others, for the poor and lonely. A charwoman had died, poverty-stricken and alone. Francis Newman discovered that she had no loved ones to follow her body to the grave. Picking up his walking stick, he painfully limped behind the horse-drawn carriage to the cemetery as a mourner paying his last respects to an unknown friend who had died.

Throughout the most productive years of his life, Francis W. Newman remained unorthodox in his religious beliefs. As we survey in detail the principle features of his theology in the following chapters we shall be inclined to regard his creed as heretical. However, in his last illness, he put aside the cloud of intellectual error under which he had laboured for half a century and turned to Jesus for help. The Rev. J. Temperley Grey wrote the following words to a friend just two weeks before the death of Newman:

Of late his attitude towards Christ had undergone a great change. He confessed to me only very recently that for years he had held on to Christianity by the skirts of St. Paul; 'but now' he said, 'Paul is less and less and Christ is more and more'. He made this statement with an emphasis and an emotion which conveyed the impression that he wished it to be regarded as a final testimony.

1 Francis Newman died October 6, 1897.

2 Quoted by Sieveking, op.cit., p.344.
CHAPTER III.

A Theory of Knowledge.

Francis Newman always insisted that he was not a metaphysician, yet throughout his theological writings one observes his belief in a spiritual sphere of divine harmony, a world of eternal actuality not too far removed from this world of unrealized perfection in which we live. He was constantly reaching out for that divine existence wherein perfection rules, that world in which "the habit of right action is a law made for itself." Though in general he refrains from discussion on this subject, we catch occasional glimpses of it scattered throughout his works, such as his insistence that "faith in the harmony of earth and heaven... is the key to religion."2

However, his chief interest was centred in the epistemological problem. And we must remember throughout this chapter his basic presupposition, arrived at in the last chapter, which he brings to his study of the problem, namely, that faith and reason are identical acts in consciousness of the mature person. From 1848 until the last of his writings were published, his arguments developed from the following principles.

Man is an almost absolutely self-enclosed entity forced to observe and speculate about the universe, God and man from the privacy of his own mind. With Neo-Kantian certainty he saw a great barrier imposed between man as he thinks and God as He is, but differed from Kant on the question of the nature of this barrier and the necessity for its being, contending that our memories of the past, distorted by sin, our paralysed wills, and our inability to foresee the future prevent us/

2 Ibid., Theism, p.11.
us from apprehending absolute truth. With Augustine, he affirmed that our memories blind us to such an extent that we live in a shadow of truth; our sick wills render us so immature that we are incapable of making sound judgments on the basis of truth; and our finite nature incapacitates us in the light of objective truth. For a man who remains in this natural state, life in controlled by opinions, prejudices, bigotry and flights of fancy coloured by superstition. He remains a mere puppet, riveted to his narrow corner of the universe, with no sure anchors of certainty to sustain him in critical times.

However, the "great conversion" is the way of release, of achievement. The divinely ordained gift of grace lifts us above ourselves onto a higher plane, enabling us to overcome our infirmities and advance toward perfection of memory, will, and anticipation. It gives us a "soul-illumination" which evolves our blinded condition into clarity of insight, strengthening our wills and instilling a confidence in the future which dispels our fears.

Francis Newman has maintained the form of the Evangelical position, but in content he is diametrically opposed to it. His treatment of grace, which is the key to any system of religious epistemology, is original. Orthodoxy, in the history of thought, has always presented grace as a gift of additional strength, an infusion of supernatural power, or a formalised re-working of Aristotle's concept of form, which enables man to overcome his weakened natural condition. But Francis Newman regards grace as the action of God which directs the evolution of the faculties of consciousness from infancy to maturity, a divine guidance of what we consider to be a natural development.

This, in brief outline, is Francis Newman's theory of knowledge. However, we need to expand it in order to indicate more accurately the way in which/
which it appears in his doctrines of God, the Scriptures, Christology and the Church. To this task we now turn.

No theory of knowledge can be adequately presented until one discovers the doctrine of man which necessarily accompanies it; specifically, we must know the final cause before other related causes become intelligible. And so, we ask: what is the end for which man was created? Traditionally, the answer has been that man was created to glorify God and to rest in Him. For Francis Newman, man was created for truth and was given a mind to achieve it "as truly as limbs for useful labour".¹ Thus, within the mind alone are the only tests of truth possessed by man, as out of the harmonious co-operation of the faculties of consciousness come perceptions of cogency as acts of grace.

The faculties of the mind are not metaphysical entities inherent within the mechanisms of thought. Francis Newman came to this conclusion prior to 1849, which shows that he was able to lift himself above the current thought patterns of his day. He insisted that the vain supposition that the faculties are things, destroys the unity of consciousness. The faculties are functional abilities created by: (a) our own personal experience and our freely willed response to it; and, (b) the operation of grace on our native capacities and sentiments, or in other words, the hand of God shaping our native endowments. As these two factors act on and influence the slowly developing personality, either in harmony or in discord with each other, the three faculties evolve: the logical, the moral and the spiritual.² Newman calls the moral faculty the "conscience".

¹ Ibid., p.1.
² Ibid., The Soul, p.41.
"conscience", the logical faculty "reason", and the spiritual faculty "soul". Scientific truth which, as we have seen, is truth in the phenomenal realm for Francis Newm, is developed through a combination of experience with the logical faculty. Moral truth is discovered by experience and reason cooperating with the developing conscience.\(^1\) However, spiritual truth is discerned in God alone through the action of the soul; there is no other way to know God, either through logical reasoning or through moral truth, for the pure act of grace, as distinguished from natural grace, establishes direct contact between the soul and God. The conscience discerns moral principles through the medium of having been lifted by experience and reason to the position where vision was possible, but in spiritual intuitions the worshipper sees by virtue of a light within - not by a "natural light", but by the light of the soul which has been touched by God.\(^2\) Thus, the spiritual man, alone of all men, knows truth with certainty because God has given him "an eye for seeing the truth."\(^3\)

Thus there is a real world of perfect will, perfect knowledge logically ordered, and perfect spirit who is God. This Perfect Will, or the morally eternal in our immoral world, is envisioned with a high degree of probability in the conscience if it be directed by duty; Perfect Knowledge who is God is logically perceived with a lesser degree of probability in the world of sense perceptions, if verified by reason; and the Spirit or being of God is beheld with absolute certainty by the soul, if it be directed by love.

Before/

---

1 Ibid., p.44.
2 Ibid., p.37.
3 Ibid., p.38.
Before discussing each faculty in detail, it seems necessary to develop further Francis Newman’s unique idea of the operation of grace, or the evolution of the faculties. It will be noted from the above that Francis Newman gives the soul an empirical basis: it is not a thing. The true soul begins as a function in man in his childhood, with an experience universal with all children, namely, awe experienced in the presence of an infinite sense of vastness in the gloom of night. All of us, says Newman, have experienced the fear which arises in such a situation; not fear of anything human, but rather "it is the negation, the unknown, the unlimited". 1 In the early days of history this phenomenon is observed among the primitive Hebrews as they worshipped in the darkness of groves, inspired no doubt by awe in the presence of the Unknown.

Awe, if it is to lead to higher levels of development, must assume a moral form, that is the soul and the conscience must grow together. Failure at this point explains the rise of the absurd practice of fetishism among the ancient pagans, as well as the equally primitive idea that men can influence the dead in some fashion.

The logical faculty, too, is beginning to develop in the child simultaneously with the soul. This development as reflected in the history of civilization, lifted fetishism in the belief in magic in which the gods become personal, some good, some bad. Thus this view was scientific rather than religious for it was dependent on the development of common sense rather than on the soul.

Tints of fetishism yet cling to beliefs through the powerful influence of tradition which hinders the development of common sense. We see this primitive level of development in many of our so-called "religious" forms such as fear of clear thinking in religious doctrines; a belief in charms such as a wafer blessed or

1 Ibid., pp.55-56.
or water sprinkled by a priest: the magical power invested in the ordination of priests, supposedly endowing the recipient with divine attributes. All of this is simply a higher form of fetishism, a magical investment, and such childish absurdities stunt and warp the religious growth of the soul, frustrating the work of grace.¹

However, if such fantasies are avoided in the evolution of the childish mind, the development of reason leads to a consideration of objects in nature such as the brilliance of the starry heavens; and the sentiment of awe, which has left the child lost in a sea of immensity and enveloped in mystery, softens into a sense of wonder which is "the sentiment of the sublime and wonderful."² If progress has been unhampered by false training or by the licentiousness of an unbridled imagination, the child becomes normally curious, yet at the same time sobered; inquiry should be encouraged in an earnest and grave spirit for there is now at work a divine action which Francis Newman sums up as "the humility of conscious ignorance and littleness, and astonishment at powers to which no limit is seen".³ A child without the sentiments of awe and wonder "would be as great a monster as a person without love or the power of laughter".⁴

As awe is softened into wonder when the logical faculty has carried us beyond fear of the unknown, so wonder develops into admiration when we are able to perceive beauty in the universe, which helps to prepare the soul for love.

However, /

---

1 Ibid., pp.61-62.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., p.63.
4 Loc. cit.
However, if this natural development is thwarted, the contemplation of beauty may lead to that abnormality called idolatry, which, of all curses, is most arresting to the evolution of the soul. The glance of a child, lighting on a living face beaming with an outward expression of inner moral worth, may lead to fine and holy emotions. In like manner, pictures and statues which are skilfully painted and carved to represent the highest ethical ideals often become moral and spiritual powers. On the contrary, the "stupid and debasing idolatry which deforms, is found in connection with some staring doll, tricked out in tawdry finery and called a virgin." Human art should never be allowed to become an object of adoration for only that beauty created by a divine hand can lift the soul to a sound and secure level of admiration.

The present stage of development has carried the individual consciousness far on the road to growth, but not yet into the spiritual realm. In like manner, the primitive religions based on the development of the human race to this stage are not religions in the true sense of the word. They rather indicate the scientific progress of man for, contrary to modern belief, man possessed a common store of empirical knowledge before he owned a religion, and he was moral before he was religious. The acquisition of a sense of the sublime and the beautiful supplies a very important part of genuine morality, but in no sense can it be called religion.

Morality, says Francis Newman, must include both the self and that which is antagonistic to the self; and it recognises both interest and duty as leading ends of action. When these two ends are in harmony the virtue which pursues interest/

1 Ibid., p.72.
2 Ibid., p.76.
interest is called prudence; but when the ends clash, "then to pursue interest in the face of sanctions of duty against it, is stigmatized as selfishness". The problem of the moralist is: how can man's impulsive nature be so controlled as to enable him to sacrifice interest at the shrine of duty. Morality can never make a man more moral except in a prudential sense, for true morality demands a constant war on the self; thus self-improvement is contrary to the moral purpose. Not self-betterment, but self-annihilation is the goal of morality. Fortunately for the moralist, there is within man an ability which, when developed properly, is nobly antagonistic to the self. This ability is called "enthusiasm", which is the capacity for love for a great idea. One of the most important achievements of the developing moral faculty is the further development of our capacity for enthusiasm, for the ability to swallow up self in the passion of a great vision around which we purposively build our lives. However, it is reserved for religion and not morality to complete the development of this powerful ability to such an extent that self goes down in defeat before the holy altar of devotion to God. The moralist "may, as it were, build an elegant engine, but he has to look elsewhere for Heat and Moving Power. Enthusiasm is the life of morality, and to excite a pure and reasonable enthusiasm is... the great moral end of Religion."

Awe, wonder and admiration, then are the primitive beginnings of the soul. As each affection is acquired it is blended into experience of human tendencies /

1 Ibid., p.77.
2 Ibid., pp.78-79.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Loc. cit.
tendencies through association in such a manner that the moral faculty, or conscience is expanded. If normal development is not retarded or distorted by fanciful influences, the conscience grows until moral truths can be intuited by direct vision. Such a truth is the vision of self swallowed up in the vastness of the infinite, and a direct vision of the necessity for self-annihilation.

Though the moral faculty is first acted on, the logical and spiritual faculties develop with it side by side, giving rise to an individual sensation of unity in consciousness. The stars which instil a sense of wonder and beauty in a child impress the more mature observer even more powerfully with a dual feeling of order and unchangeableness, and hence of eternity. The emergence of the faculty of reason becomes the turning point in history as well, acting as the dividing line between primitive and civilized religions. The perception of universal order abolishes polytheism, for one god must be supreme - the God of all nations. The perception of His eternal nature leads the observer to endow Him with the moral attribute of constancy. As the imagination becomes moulded by coherent forms of thought, theology is born, along with new powers of understanding which will either dissolve all good in the rest if guided by selfishness, or will give to religion "definiteness of form, consistency, and notions which can abide the criticisms of acute incredulity".1

In this, as in all processes of development, we see the intimate way in which all faculties of the mind develop in unison into oneness in consciousness. The perceptions of order, design in the world, and in the goodness and wisdom of God properly belong to the expressions of an evolving logical faculty. The concept, then, of a personal God first strikes the consciousness as an intellectual judgment rather than as a spiritual experience, yet this is but the ground of preparation/

1 Ibid., p.81.
preparation for true religion, for the activity of the soul in the life of man.

After this ground has been laid, a new sentiment of the spiritual faculty is added to those of awe, wonder, and admiration, namely the affection of reverence. The soul, at this point not only becomes affected, but for the first time its development becomes active, taking its first step into self-conscious awareness of its own being, nature and destiny. For this reason, Francis Newman says that the acquisition of reverence is "the beginning of true religion".¹ All creeds inferred by the intellect before the germination of reverence in the soul are not religious at all. In fact, failure to interpret properly the wisdom, goodness and providence of God in logical forms has led to fallacious doctrines. In all probability error entered because the mind without reverence attempted to speak on religious matters. Such doctrines, in Francis Newman's opinion, as the divine efficacy of the Sacraments, Purgatory, and eternal punishment are based on illogical premises. No man who truly reverences the goodness of God can believe in eternal punishment for it contradicts the nature of God revealed to the developing consciousness in the reason, conscience and soul.

True religion, for Newman, stems from the principle actions of the religious soul in reverence: in love, trust, hope and belief, as the soul communes with God, for the affection of reverence is essential to the generation of true spirituality. Reverence appears in the soul as a special act of grace, acquired at that precise moment when God acts in such a mysterious manner that religion and morality coalesce in consciousness. This development is of such immense importance in Francis Newman's thought that the following chapter will be devoted to an analysis of it. We shall see that when the conscience has been united to the soul, man has been united to God in spirit, and the greatest event in the life of man has been consummated.

1 Ibid., p.106.
It now remains for us to examine the faculties in greater detail. The moral faculty is based on the principle of freedom of the will, for as Francis Newman points out: "religion is an absurdity if Duty be a fiction; and Duty is a fiction, if man has no choice, if he is but a machine, a helpless slave of fate".¹

Though the impugners of free will claim that human action is predetermined by states of mind, habit, motives, and circumstances, Newman artfully shows how experience is a denial of their argument. The force of his statement is more compelling in his own words:

When temptation assaults the heart in which virtue is weak, it may be that the tempted yields at once to the seduction. But often the soul hovers awhile in perplexed hesitation, fearing to sin, yet drawn by desire, distracted doubtfully. While this distraction abides, neither side of motives is stronger: neither that which seduces, nor that which urges rightfully. If one side were stronger already, action would ensue at once, as the needle must swerve at once to the strongest magnet: but which set of motives shall be stronger, the mind is deciding... settled by his own free choice: through which he becomes worse or better.²

Then, too, when a man sins, conscience attacks him with gentle reproach or bitter remorse, depending on the gravity of the offence. Wisdom at once demands contrition in the offender, and experience tells us that mercy pities the contrite, and the offence is forgiven. But if we have no freedom of choice, it is absurd to think of contrition in this sense; a sinner could not help sinning, having been driven to it by powers felt to be beyond his control; yet, like a madman, he insanely blames himself.³

The conscience is a strange monitor, but is not more strange than nature; for there is in the very structure of the universe an energy which objectively/

---

¹ Ibid., Thesii, p.6.
² Ibid., pp. 8-9.
³ Loc. cit.
objectively sustains all things - the principle of life. We observe it in plants, animals, and men, and recognise it as the same energetic principle of subsistence. Within our consciousness we know this "life" is ours; it is a part of us, an individual possession. In some vague sense it is "us". It is the datum of self, yet we have no subjective control over it. Francis Newman holds that this principle is divine, just as a law of nature is divine. Yet, over and above this life principle in consciousness is another force which introspection reveals, a "voice" which demands that we refrain when we are tempted to sin. When we refuse to heed the voice, it continues to forbid; it acts without volition on our part; we cannot control it; many times it goes against our own will. It is our conscience, within us yet not controlled by us; an intelligent moral force superior to our sinful will. "The life which is in all nature is the life within all consciences, intelligent, moral, mighty, and our natural Lord".  

There were many of his contemporaries who did not hold to the above view of conscience, but Newman has an inspired argument in its defence. No man, he says, can fail to observe the geometry which constructs the cell in the honeycomb, enabling the bee to conserve the wax with scientific thrift; yet none would imagine that the bee was a student of Geometry or a scientist. In this, and in other instincts of animals and insects, man discerns the guiding influence of a Mind which orders, plans and decrees a beautiful and practical world; a Mind as directly visible as each man's mind is to his fellow-men, yet not restricted to the limits of any known body or dependent on any visible organism. We see the same mind at work in the instinctive behaviour of man; each man is aware of his inability to control the reflex action arising from instinctive behaviour.  

1 Ibid., p.14.
In fact, we are aware of a common power at work in both beast and man and would think it strange if this ruling power confined its commands to the lower forms of life. We know that the same Mind which inspires maternal cares in the hen inspires maternal love in the woman: it follows with equal persuasiveness that, even before approaching the question of conscience, we would expect that the power which over-rules the lower instincts must exert some influence over the higher ones, and act on conscience if it acts on maternal love. Thus, concludes Newman, beforehand the understanding expects divine power in conscience, and afterwards, when the experiments have been made, our observations verify the assumption. Conscience is shown to be a voice of God within the mind.\(^1\) If additional proof is needed, Francis Newman directs our attention to the fact that conscience grows more morally powerful in the individual who adores God, and reacts more favourably under the teaching of the deeply spiritual man who believes in God.\(^2\)

On the other hand reason, in Newman's opinion, is an unstable faculty driving the mind in all directions in search of truth - which is its only function. A glance into the history of thought gives him his verification for this assumption. Socrates, he notes, who was the world's first moral philosopher, abandoned the study of physics because scholars taught contrary ideas as truths. Some said the universe was a plurality while others asserted its unity; some conceived everything to be in motion, and others that motion was impossible; some thought birth and death to be all of life and others taught reincarnation. Socrates therefore decided that it was impossible to/

---


to attain truth in physics and turned instead to morality: to what the gods have approved and purposed. On this he judged that the wise student should devote his time. However, many in the nineteenth century were reversing the doctrine of Socrates, says Newman. They have abandoned the study of religion because many contradictory doctrines are taught as truths. Some teach that the church is single, others that it is many; some believe the Pope to be infallible, while others hold that nothing is infallible; some believe that miracles have happened in every age, others that they never occur. Many therefore assume that truth cannot be discovered in religion, and turn instead to physics: to tangible, measurable things.1

However, Newman decided that the energy which moves planets is as divine as the force which motivates conscience, and with Aristotelian fervour insisted that a study of these things was a study in theology. Galileo and Kepler had supreme faith in the proposition that man's mind was created in order to know truth and that the universe was made in such a manner that it was fitly propounded to man's scrutiny. If we approach religion with this same faith, we shall also arrive at astounding truths, for "faith in the harmony of earth and heaven has opened nature; faith in the same harmony is the key to religion".2 It is all too true, Francis Newman admitted, that as far as the logical faculty is concerned, all knowledge is partial and only ignorance is infinite, yet if the mind of men cannot sound the depths of the mysteries of God, neither can it know itself wholly. All we can hope for is knowledge sufficient/

---

1 Ibid., p. 10.

2 Loc. cit.
sufficient for life and righteousness. The moral law itself is but a revelation of subjective inward sentiment, yet we can see God's moral laws both in the heart and in the world, and when one knows another's sentiments, and powers and ways, he knows enough about that person for confidence and love. To this end the faculty of reason operates.1

The precise operations of the logical faculty are easily discerned, for they are to the soul as science is to religion. Reason gives the mind an abiding confidence in the certainty of truth in the same degree that science gives to religion a spiritual vigour by offering it faith in absolute law. The logical faculty proclaims not only the certainty, but the virtue of truth as well, just as science teaches real religion to accept truth as the best and to discard old superstitions, opinions, idols and prejudices. The logical faculty gives the soul a chance to enjoy not only the fellowship of God, but his grandeur and majesty as well, in the same manner that science lifts the imagination of religion to see how measureless is God's world and its vast duration in the past. The contributions of reason, then, are the contributions of science. Thus science and religion should be as co-operative in the world, as reason and the soul are in consciousness. Science gives to religion its "bony fabric and solidity, its simple, consistent strength, its harmony and purity, its grandeur, its dignity, its Universality".2 However, there is a definite limit beyond which the logical faculty cannot penetrate: it cannot furnish us with knowledge of the soul; it cannot acquaint the soul with God; it cannot furnish the consciousness with right loves and right hatreds; it cannot cover the skeleton with flesh and breathe into it the breath of life.3 Each faculty is a peculiar ability with a unique/

1 Ibid., p. 11.
2 Ibid., p. 21.
3 Loc. cit.
unique function and none can supersede the others.

Since every theory of knowledge comes equipped with a criterion of truth, we need to find Newman’s instrument for testing the veracity of judgments. As Francis Newman tends to place differing emphases on spiritual, moral and physical knowledge, we would expect the task of discovering his standard of truth to be difficult, and such is the case. Francis Newman is aware of his problem. He notes that science assumes the accuracy of its informants, such as the five senses. It trusts the mind as it dictates first principles and judges evidence. It has faith in its instruments, the telescope, the barometer, the thermometer, etc. But science does not assume the proper functioning of its aids until each has been thoroughly tested empirically. However, the mind alone is able to direct the verifications and make the assumptions of trust: worthiness, and the mind itself is fallible: it needs to be verified. Failure to realize this important point has caused untold error, confusion and suffering; we see much of it in the long history of travail through which science has passed. As Francis Newman says:

Yes, if religion has miscarried and brought forth folly, no less have other sciences teemed with monstrosities, ’til manifold experiences and the joint work of many nations, many ages, many geniuses, have slowly unfolded truth.1

The logical faculty as it deals with the natural world operates on principles easily grasped. It obtains its first principles, or theories, by intuition, by gazing directly on truth. To verify the flash of intuition which gave rise to the theory to be tested, the investigator applies the experimental method. Then the theory, together with all its relationships, is put to the test of congruity, for if it be truth the mind realizes it must be in harmony with/

1 Ibid., p. 21-22.
with the rest of the world. However, mere coherence cannot guarantee truth, for within limits falsehood may be consistent; therefore, the degree of cogency is determined by the practical fruitfulness of results. This is the first harmony.

A second and more powerful harmony is sometimes secured when many minds are in agreement, and when all students envision the same intuitions, acquiesce in the same reasoning in testing, and arrive at the same results. This type of knowledge has a very high degree of probability.

A third harmony is achieved when the truth intuited becomes a new power for investigation, such as a telescope. This type of knowledge can be verified in many different ways. These are the three verifications of science, according to Francis Newman; and in the phenomenal realm they cast aside most of the impurities of falsehood, allowing truth to emerge. This same method can be applied to the fields of religion and morality.¹

As we noted earlier, initial notions and sentiments are conveyed to the consciousness by intuition, presenting a crude and rudimentary awareness of God, which grows purer and sounder with the uninhibited development of the understanding and conscience. All men receive these primitive visions, use similar processes of reasoning and arrive at similar and equally practical results. For across the world and through history we can see a harmony in humanity with regard to fundamental principles of morality. People have always believed in free will, or, which is more important, have always acted as if they did; humanity has always given its approval to the generous, the brave, the truthful, the merciful, the temperate. All nations have these words in their languages designed to express approval./

¹ Ibid., p. 23.
approval. So too have many embraced the belief in one spiritual Energy pervading the universe.¹

A second verification in moral and religious matters is derived from the power of happiness which the cherishing of righteousness sheds in the heart; for happiness unaimed at once with inward harmony. This verification becomes powerful and convincing when one reflects on the observation that the pursuit of happiness would ruin virtue; for this reason the arrival of happiness, wholly unsought, makes its testimony weighty.

A third verification gives religion the epistemological certainty accessible to science:

If morals be true, spiritual worship cannot be in vain; for nothing so enables a man to withstand temptation, to endure calamity or to persevere in courageous virtue, as the belief in a personal God, listening to our voice, whose eye watches our conduct, and approves our rectitude. This faith may at first be wavering and feeble as is the learner in a scientific process, but as the learner wins his confidence in his theorems and his formulas, yes, and in his own powers of reasoning, by frequent trial; so he who strives after virtue and learns by experience what is religion's power, gains confirmation to his faith; and the intuitions which before were trusted anxiously, by trial are proved trustworthy, and themselves grow also clearer. And experience strengthens faith, until faith grows confident.²

In this manner is the true convert able to judge and discern God's goodness, wisdom and presence with absolute certainty; for faith possesses the quality of becoming ever more strong in the atmosphere of gratitude, love and joy which ever increases as one longer communes with God. Thus we know by intuition that God is the power which animates the universe, that He approves our right/

¹ Ibid., p. 24.
² Loc. cit.
right doing and disapproves our wrong, and that adoration of Him is suited to man's nature.\footnote{1} But, for human and practical religion we need to know that God will give spiritual power to all who pray to Him, and intuition will not affirm this truth, nor will it present the vision. Rather, "instinct prompts the act, and experience affirms the truth".\footnote{2} It is God acting in the soul which initiates prayer; it is man reaping his blessed reward who is convinced. With Maurice and Hare he urges those who doubt to try it, and they, too, will be convinced.

In Newman's theory of knowledge, then, we discover the foundation points on which he rests his teaching about Sin, Christ, God and the Church. His basic point of departure, as was noted, is the idea that faith and reason, when in conflict, reflect a disordered, immature mind. Faith and reason are identical acts within the consciousness which has developed normally.

Newman's teaching about sin, which we will study in the next chapter, rests on the presupposition that the barrier between man and God exists in the mind as a result of the unnatural development of Conscience, or the moral faculty. Thus, Newman's theory of man is psychological in that his presupposition with which he approaches the subject rules out all metaphysical and purely theological inquiry.

In like manner, Newman's theory of history with which he supports his conclusions reached about Christ and God rests on the presupposition that every effect in nature has a natural cause, that the supernatural is non-existent. This, he feels, is a logical inference drawn from an empirical fact which he thinks/
thinks he has established, namely, that the normal development of consciousness from the initial experience of awe to the direct visions of moral truths is a perfectly natural development. Thus history has no more room for the absolute and the supernatural than has the human mind, since history is merely the natural development of mankind.

With this "natural" framework of presuppositions in mind, we turn now to Newman's views on sin, feeling, perhaps, in advance, that Newman gave too creative a function to the human consciousness which would lead him to base his teaching on the subjective conditions of the sinner rather than on the objective Source of his salvation.
CHAPTER IV.

NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT SIN.

Sin becomes an active problem in the soul, in Newman's opinion, when one arrives in his conscious development at that point where he conceives that the holy God whom he sees in nature is the immanent God of the conscience, making his moral demands in the life of man by frowning on all wrong doing. Offences committed against our fellowmen, which we once regarded as crimes only, now become sins because they offend God. The true germ of spirituality is planted in the soul when this idea opens out into the realisation in consciousness that God hates and punishes even the hidden desire within the soul of that which is offensive to Him. For at the moment when God becomes Lord of the conscience, and the All-Seeing Eye that pierces every barrier erected around the heart, special grace has made itself known. God has spoken and until He speaks, man's state of consciousness rises no higher than the purely moral.

However, we must note the meaning Francis Newman attaches to this "inner witnessing of the Holy Spirit". Special grace for him has no supernatural connotation:

In present theology the present world is opposed to the future and is represented as something intrinsically bad... Such a conception we now see to be the sombre view of men who were unhappy enough to live under the Roman Caesars. We respect it, as we respect and pity misfortune; but we cannot share it... God is not the Antagonist of matter, nor of nature, but of everything unnatural; and of all things Sin is the most unnatural. Opposition to nature is perhaps the definition of sin; as rightly to develop nature is the definition of virtue or holiness.2

Because/

2 Ibid., Catholic Union: Essays Towards a Church of the Future, p. 81.
Because of the tenderness of conscience in the developing mind, and the chaotic state of the untrained emotions, sin produces deep inward distress from the moment of emergence over the threshold of consciousness. To the sensitive moral faculty God is a vengeful Being who abhors sin, and to the unregulated passions He is One who punishes sin without mercy. Thus for the first time in their development, all faculties are in unnatural, violent conflict, with sin as the cause.

At this point Francis Newman gives us an illustration of the way in which he frequently attempts to deal with theological and metaphysical principles from the point of view of psychology. Obviously to approach the doctrine of the depravity of human nature by way of psychology is to emerge with a hopeless confusion of concepts:

Nowhere is truth and error, right and wrong, and morbid feeling so miserably entangled; nowhere is it harder to vindicate the sensibilities of sensible and reasonable devotion without seeming to lay a foundation for despicable superstition.¹

Brunner, in lifting the matter to a higher level of interpretation, shows us how to avoid such an illegitimate mixture of concepts:

Two men board a train. One of them perhaps does something sensible, the other something stupid, upon their entering the coach. But as they look out, both notice that they have taken the wrong train and are going in the wrong direction. That one man was reasonable and the other stupid is a difference between these two men; it is a difference however, which has no significance in relation to the fact that both, whatever their individual differences, are going in the wrong direction. This is what the Bible means by the word sin, the total perverse direction of our life, the tendency away from God.²

However,

¹ Ibid., The Soul, p. 126.
² Emil Brunner, Our Faith, p. 42.
However, Francis Newman achieves a fine insight into the nature of sin when he goes on to assert that there is but one connection in which one can speak of any "soul-condition" approaching total depravity in human experience; when the soul is ruled by victorious selfishness which is both the fiendish antagonist of the soul and the arch enemy of the conscience.

The thoroughly selfish know not what sin is, nor what God means, nor that they have a soul; if once they break the bonds of habit so as to fall into crime, mere teaching without training is utterly useless. Like fierce beasts, they need a cage and club, not a religious instructor.  

Yet no soul, Newman insists, which experiences an acute sense of sin can be hopelessly hardened or depraved, no matter what character the guilt assumes.

In his treatment of the intimate relation between sin and despair, Newman reminds us of S. Kierkegaard. Both taught that remorse draws the soul to seek relief from the misery of sin; not a remorse which is mere sorrow for wrong doing which some erroneously call repentance, but that "soul-agony" of self-condemnation which follows the unshakeable conviction that the evil deed committed is irreparable. Though Kierkegaard, with deeper spiritual cognition, relates that remorse which leads to despair to the Christ of Christianity, Newman chooses to be true to his theory of knowledge in holding that remorse has a natural relation to the soul.

We have already deduced the reason for Francis Newman's hatred for sin; it is a barrier to the improvement of character. It retards the process of purification of the conscience, and it deadens the more noble sentiments in the soul.  

---

2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., Theism, p. 38.
The sinner, who is seeking for virtue as the end of all striving, fails in his quest and in this failure recognizes the nature of sin in the light of the sacred moral ideal unattained. Thus fault is an impurity and an offence to the inward feelings, the presence of which is esteemed sin and defilement on the part of the sinner, only when fault is committed wilfully.

However, Newman's major interest was always centred on what might be called the pathological aspects of sin, or the spiritual depravation it causes in the soul. Sin makes its entrance into the consciousness on the moral level. The sinner makes resolutions to do better and when these resolutions are broken, remorse, which leads to the spiritual level, begins its work. With active good will the sinner attempts to mend the faults, that is to repress the evil desires and to cultivate meekness and love. Under the ruthless goading of repeated failures conscience becomes increasingly more sensitive and condemning, pressing upon the consciousness of the sufferer a thousand sins before disregarded. The sinner desperately seeks to lessen the burden of guilt by the expedient of purifying the affections by an exertion of the will; but all to no avail, for the will cannot respond beyond a further quickening of the conscience, which becomes more sensitive and thus damns more stridently. The soul itself must be strengthened if inner harmony among the faculties is to be reinstated, yet every panacea employed is ineffectual. The trapped soul turns to one agency after another, perpetually undertaking pledges which are beyond his strength to fulfill, making bricks without straw; knowing that he ought to love God and his neighbour with all/

1 Loc. cit.
2 Ibid., p. 39.
all the passion of his being, yet only too painfully aware of his infinite deficiency. Remorse consumes, inner conflicts intensify, until the soul, caught like a man on a mountain precipice, ever and again presses closer to the abyss of morbidity. This is the real challenge, says Newman, which must be answered by theology: "What is the spiritual cure".1

Francis Newman believed that both the Tractarians and the Evangelicals were incapable of providing such a cure. The Tractarians, he taught, offered the sacramental system and rites of the church as the channels through which the healing power of grace operates. This position he repudiated as being a higher form of pagan fetishism. The Evangelicals offered the traditional doctrine of the Atonement and taught, in Newman's opinion, that faith in the proposition that Jesus died for our sins would bring peace. However, Francis Newman's own experience had discredited this position. He had discovered that faith is not the cure if faith means assent to a proposition, for the sinner already has faith in the proposition that "faith works by love and exhibits itself in spiritual action".2 Yet that is precisely the condition for which he is yearning; to love faithfully and to act spiritually. He cannot know that Jesus died for him merely on the word of another man or on the authority of a book. No intellectual doctrine, however true, can mend the broken heart.

There is but one action which can bring peace, namely, "an unreserved exposure of the heart to the Eye of God."3 This is the final, natural act to which the sinner's previous misery has led him, for it has caused him to rush head-long/

1 Ibid., TheSoul, p. 131.

2 Ibid., p. 132.

3 Loc. cit.
head-long into the presence of God. Faith, then, is not assent, but is the
desperate act of abandonment of self to the mercy of God in trustful belief
that God who searches the heart will mend his:

He faces that bright and pure Sun, which seems to scorch
his eyes, and says: Slay me, O God, if Thou wilt; I
deserve it, I am miserable; but leave me not sinful thus.
Put me to shame; I am shameful. Behold! I hide nothing.
Thou art light; expose my darkness. I will not palliate.
I am worse than I know. Show me all that I am. I cannot
heal myself. If I must die, I will die in Thy light.

O wonderful simplicity of Faith! He is faithful and knows it
not. He has trusted himself to the Judge of all the earth;
he has abandoned all self-justification; his heart is
broken, and is ready to welcome mercy undeserved: he has
believed in God's goodwill, and in His eternal purpose to
destroy sin... He has followed conscience through cloud
and storm unto the fiery presence of the Eternal, till fear
has dropped off in His nearness. The harmony of Heaven and
Earth is begun within the man's soul, because his will is
subdued to God's will; and thus Self-despair, joined to
faith, has led to peace with God.¹

Faith, for Newman, is neither intellectual assent nor blind
acceptance in spite of the facts. Faith must pervade all faculties of the
mind. On the other hand, he differs in point of view from Hare and Maurice in
that faith must not only be logical, moral and spiritual, it must also be fitted
within the natural development of the consciousness. It is related to our
action as trust and to our understanding as belief, cogent with all other beliefs.²
As Francis Newman expresses it:

.... at first glance this faith is only a trust sufficing for
action (which must come first) and from action arises experi-
ence, and from experience conviction until sure belief is
superadded to the primitive trust, and the faith becomes
complete, and unhesitating and tranquil.³

Thus/

¹ Ibid., pp. 133-134.
² Ibid., Theism, p. 65.
³ Loc. cit.
Thus religious faith has the same basis as scientific faith, for in like manner faith in the uniformity of law was at first a presumption or a trust, and has since become a firm belief, verified by empirical evidence. The fundamental error made by both the Tractarians and the Evangelicals, in Newman's opinion, was the inductive basis on which they placed faith. The true basis, he taught, must be a direct insight, intuition, or special act of grace given by God through natural events.¹

There is freshness and some originality of insight in much of Francis Newman's writings, but nowhere are they more marked than in his dual treatment of the development of the soul in the light of the barriers of sin. Irrespective of the genetic traits of sex, he contends that there are two general types of souls representing temperaments of character: the masculine and feminine. Broadly speaking, these two labels characterize the two powerful forces which were contributing to the roughness of the passage Francis Newman experienced between his return from Bagdad and his acceptance of pure theism, namely, the moral power behind the Oxford Movement, and the emotionalism in the religion of the Baptists at Bristol. Of the masculine and feminine souls he wrote: "the former is impelled to action before the affections are fully ready for it; the latter is little moved by a sense of duty, and is satisfied not to act until impelled by the affections".² In a more narrow sense the former represents John Henry Newman,³ while the latter represents Francis Newman prior to his rejection/

¹ Ibid., p. 67.
² Ibid., The Soul, p. 136.
rejection of the Evangelical creeds.\footnote{1}

The trapped soul, struggling for freedom from remorse, is a typical characteristic of the masculine type of soul. Often in such natures the force of ambition, and especially the strong effects of other passions, make of the inner man a raging battlefield of powers in discord. Harmony and inner peace are sought by an unconditional surrender of the rebel forces to the will; but final peace comes not until love comes in to reconcile the warring members. These souls reveal the ugliness of sin.

On the other hand, the more feminine character seldom experiences this inner turmoil of the passions, not because of the prior presence of love in the soul, though such is the case, but because of the non-moral nature of the conscience which, in these cases, is yet in its infancy.\footnote{2} Francis Newman's artful description of the feminine temperament is worthy of quotation:

There are those of amiable natures and soft affections perhaps also very susceptible to natural beauty, who appear to approach religion altogether on its sunny side. They see God, not as a strict judge, not as a glorious Potentate; but as the animating spirit of a beautiful, harmonious world, beneficent and kind, merciful as well as pure. The same characters generally have no metaphysical tendencies: they do not look back into themselves. Hence they are not distressed by their own imperfections. Yet it would be absurd to call them self-righteous; for they hardly think of themselves at all. The child-like character of their nature makes the opening of religion very happy to them; for they no more shrink from God than a child before an emperor before whom the parent trembles.\footnote{3}

\footnote{1} Francis Newman believed that in accepting the principles of his new position, "Hebrew Theism", he had combined the best of both types of souls.

\footnote{2} \textit{Ibid., The Soul}, p. 187.

\footnote{3} \textit{Loc. cit.}
In actual fact, Newman insists that the feminine soul has grasped the true nature of God, as we shall note in the following chapter. Faulty interpretations of external phenomena and bad training lead many falsely to conceive of God as a stern taskmaster and an avenging spirit. However, the simple minded have no reason to be afraid of God, for the experience of grace, as it opens the soul and equips it for the duty of spiritual discernment, gives abundant testimony of His infinite love.

A survey of the status of men and women in nineteenth century England gave Francis Newman another clue to the distinction between the two temperaments. Men, he observed, are accustomed to a business world controlled by established rules of procedure imposed from without and demanding strict observance. In order to succeed in business a man had to know the rules and obey them. Business was conducted between equals who looked with mutual respect to the principle of justice, for equals have certain rights which must be observed. Thus among men the demands of conscience assumed an important role. However, a woman was forced to live by details rather than by rules. Hence, reasoned Newman, she thought of God, not as a being who might sacrifice his deepest desires and affections for the sake of a principle, but as One who judges each case for itself in the light of His love. Each day of her life reminded her of the superiority of her husband over her own authority and wants, while she was forced to view her children as being subservient to her and dependent on her for their daily needs. Thus she dealt not with equals but with inequalities. As she looked to her husband with eyes of affectionate obedience and to her children with deepest sentiments of mercy, so, too, did she look to God as One in whom mercy reigns supreme.
supreme and to herself as one in whom obedience is a blessing.¹

We have seen how the masculine soul is driven to conversion by the brutal thrusts of remorse. The experience of conversion for feminine souls contains no such crisis, for duty has not become a demanding power in them. Rather they suffer because they can detect no relation between them and God. He is like a poem, beautiful and moving, but indifferent to their aspirations. Out of this circumstance arises a sense of vacuity, for the realization of God's majesty and holiness creates a longing to partake of that nature. But He is transcendental, "high and lifted up", and, with Isaiah, the feminine soul can only say, "woe is me". A restless, yet divinely implanted instinct agitates the soul,"guiding it dimly to feel that it was made for some definite but unknown relation towards God".² This natural agitation deepens into positive uneasiness which continued experience generates into a powerful inward yearning for the Strong, the Eternal, the Perfect. Such profound and fervent desire soon ripens into/

---

¹ Ibid., p. 190. Francis Newman places these simple observations into a fine passage: "That none can enter the Kingdom of God without becoming a little child - guileless and simple-minded - is a sentiment long well known. But behind and after this there is a mystery revealed to but few, which thou, Oh Reader, must take to heart; namely if thy soul is to go on into higher spiritual blessedness, it must become a woman; yes, however manly thou be among men. It must learn to love being dependent; and must lean on God, not solely from distress or alarm, but because it does not like independence and loneliness. It must not have recourse to Him merely as a friend in need,....., but it must press towards Him when there is no need".

² Ibid., p. 193.
into love through the very nature of the affections, and at last the conscience
becomes conscious of the love of the affections for God. In principle, the
masculine soul, judged by the indwelling God of the conscience, searches for
and finds the transcendental God of mercy, while the feminine soul, longing for
the God whom she sees in nature, suddenly possesses the inward God of the con-
science.

Newman believed that as the fallacious doctrine of the depravity of
human nature is based, in his opinion, on an inadequate treatment of the religious
experience of the masculine soul, the equally faulty doctrine of prevenient grace
stems from an attempt logically to formulate the psychological conversion of the
feminine soul. Here again, he rests his case on his belief in the identity of
the natural and the divine. For him, just as natural law is a divine manifest-
ation of the power of God, so is the natural operation of grace in the soul a
divine manifestation of the love of God. Law is both natural and divine. Thus
to declare the existence of a supernatural germ in the soul is pagan. The only
meaning we can attach to the doctrine of prevenient grace is that God loved us
before we loved Him:

And as a mother who contemplates her infant in the cradle,
contemplates not only what it is, but what it is to be,
filling her heart with fond anticipations, with joyful hopes;
and reckons that hereafter the child shall become wise and
good, and shall know its mother, and shall respond to her love,
and shall become an accomplished man or woman, noble and
worthy of love; even so, as in dim out-shadowing, may we
judge of the divine Heart, and rightly believe that He loves
us for our promise not for our desert.1

Here we have not only Newman's view of prevenient grace, but a new

insight/
insight into one aspect of the indwelling God which needs to be developed in this connection rather than in the context of his teaching about God. This divine "potentiality" resident in every child is the immanent God and until we become conscious of Him we can never recognize the divine life within us. Thus the divinely appointed pathways which lead to justification are ways designed for the purpose of enabling us to see ourselves, not only as we are, but as we can be and are about to become. In this we perceive the connection Newman makes between natural grace in consciousness, as the faculties develop, and the special act of grace which gives the soul direct communion with God, enabling the conscience to sacrifice self to duty. In Francis Newman's opinion, such a treatment removes the antithesis between the natural and the divine, and thus removes the logical ground for the doctrine of election, etc.

Newman's position here is, again, very close to that of Maurice, who taught that God has always been present in all men. Though, according to Tulloch, Maurice was in danger of seeing everything in terms of his own ideas, 1 yet he was farther from the danger of being charged with illusionism than was Newman; for he insisted that historical revelation was a fact. His insistence that God was one with humanity led him in no way to minimize Jesus in history. In fact, he accepted most of the implications of the Christology of the early creeds. However, the central thought in his theology seems to be that the Logos is eternally present in all men. That is, he goes beyond the temporal to the eternal. The historical incarnation is not as important in his thought as is the timeless relation which exists between God and men; "the truth is that every/

1 John Tulloch, Movements of Religious Thought in Britain During the Nineteenth Century, p. 276.
every man is in Christ; the condemnation of every man is, that he will not own to the truth; he will not act as if this were true, he will not believe that which is the truth, that, except he were joined to Christ, he could not think, breathe, live a single hour. ¹

Thus in his doctrine of Redemption, Maurice taught that man was not, in fact, redeemed when Jesus died on the cross, for all men were already redeemed. The atonement of Jesus was consummated in order that man might become aware of his redeemed condition. ² Newman would be perfectly willing to agree to this view, provided the argument proceed directly from religious experience, to the total exclusion of the historical argument. Newman cares not what the indwelling God be called. ³

Both types of souls, then, come to the realization that they love and are loved by God. This is the new birth, a family reunion with God, yet intensely individualistic. The corporate idea of the family relationship comes as the converted soul perceives that all men are loved in the same infinite measure as he, and on the basis of this perception Newman builds the ethical arena for activity with our fellow men. However, the inward movements of the soul proceed as if it stood alone in the universe with God.

Though fully aware of the fixed, unalterable laws of the physical universe, the converted soul sees God's redeeming grace at work in temporal events. ⁴ Whatever happens, the convert interprets the event in the light of God's/

¹ F. Maurice, Life of F.D. Maurice, I, p. 155.
⁴ Ibid., p. 195.
God's mercy and kindness, as His visitation or chastisement, as expressions of His love. Francis Newman advises against freezing such ideas into formal creeds for they are not logical, and may not even be true; yet to deny them or to ignore them would do such violence to the instincts of the soul which experiences them that far more would be lost than gained. To introduce such experiences into the doctrine of predestination is to distort the mystical and mysterious utterances of the soul which is struggling to find expression. Newman is aware of the nearness of this position to the precipice of illusionism:

Is all this to the philosopher a vain dream? Can he explain it all? Does he scorn it all? Whatever theory he may form concerning it, it is not the less a fact of human nature: one of some age too: for David thirsted after God and exceedingly rejoiced in Him, and so did Paul; and the feelings which they describe are reproduced in the present day. To despise widespread enduring facts is not philosophic; and when they conduce to power of goodness and inward happiness, it might be wise to learn the phenomena by personal experience, before theorizing about them. It was not a proud thing for Paul to say, but a simple truth, that the spiritual cannot be judged by the unspiritual.

Though Francis Newman can hardly be called a humanist, in denying the objective validity of a supernatural worldview, and in refusing to allow religion to transcend the limits of humanity on other than such inadequate arguments as the above, he does expose himself to the charge of subjectivism, and of false mysticism. We cannot rest content on a piety of such nature. We believe rather that in the person of Jesus Christ we have an objective fact far richer in content that any mystical feelings which may arise within us. The Person of Christ "makes us so certain of God that our conviction of being in communion with him is able to justify itself before the bar of reason and of conscience."
It will be instructive at this point to refer to William James' treatment of the religious experience of the masculine and feminine souls.\(^1\) James insisted that the feminine soul did not pass through a conversion experience;\(^2\) he gave the feminine soul the name "healthy-mindedness."\(^3\) On the other hand, he called the masculine soul "morbid-mindedness," and held that it was more compatible with Christianity.\(^4\) Yet in reducing these types to the realm of psychology, and in approaching them objectively as though he regarded himself as neither healthy-minded nor twice born, he gave a false and unrealistic tone to the original conception which Newman had presented. For Francis Newman, the experience of conversion was necessary for admittance consciously into the presence of God regardless of soul type; for the distinction between the justified and the unredeemed lay in the distance one stood from God spiritually. James missed the spirit of this careful distinction:

In the religion of the once-born the world is a sort of rectilinear or one-storied affair, whose accounts are kept in one denomination, whose parts have just the values which naturally they appear to have, and of which a simple algebraic sum of pluses and minuses will give the total worth. Happiness and religious peace consist in living on the plus side of the account. In the religion of the twice-born, on the other hand, the world is a double-storied mystery. Peace cannot be reached by the simple addition of pluses and elimination of minuses from life.... There are two lives, the natural and the spiritual, and we must lose the one before we can participate in the other.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., pp. 82-84; see also pp. 187-188.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 87.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., pp. 162-165.
\(^{5}\) Ibid., p. 166.
In contrast to this account Newman's discussion rings with a sincerity and depth of feeling lacking in James' approach:

"God has two families of children on this earth; the once born and the twice born; both obedient, both reverential, both imperfect, each essential to the other. Let neither despise the other, but let each learn his own weakness, and the other's strength. To those who were religious but not spiritual, we have applied the words: "We have a little sister and she has no breasts"; but behold the little sister is grown up, and she still has no breasts, for she is a Man! And this opens to us the relation of the two classes, in their present development. We see in them the Man-soul and the Woman-soul, that which thinks and that which feels, the negative and the positive; the formal and the instinctive, the critical and the creative, the principle of conservatism and the principle of progress; in the one the Conscience, in the other the Affection, takes the lead; yet one without the other could never be made perfect."

For Newman, the more formal mind of the man-soul is mellowed by the affectionate nature of the woman-soul. On the other hand, the constant possibility of the woman-soul becoming diverted into fanaticism is thwarted by the sober regulative effect of the man of conscience. By mutual co-operation and generous sharing of the best in each nature, true religion emerges. Newman thought of the woman-soul as being more compatible with Christianity, being related to the twice-born as law to Gospel, or as priest to prophet; the one religious, the other spiritual. Yet they are rather to be conceived as two parallel streams, neither of which can completely blend with the other until "they become one in the bosom of God; who is neither male nor female, but feminine in soul and masculine in action."

From this background Newman presents his treatment of the human will.

Once/}

---

2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., p. 205.
Once the sinner has been converted, one might suppose that at last the road was open to permanent peace of mind, with no obstacles to overcome, and with moral perfection easily accessible. Yet shortly after the journey is begun, one makes the discovery that the converted will does not have sovereign power over the affections. While in the grip of remorse, the sufferer had believed his entire nature to be at fault; the whole man stood condemned. Yet unknown to him, his will actually was half for God and half for independence from God, and while in this state the sinner was "incapable of any inner distinctions". After conversion, however, he soon discovers that his will has been freed from evil, but his impulsive emotions refuse to be guided by it. Paul says he served God with his will, but served sin with his affections. Newman contends that Paul did not consider himself responsible for these sins, or for the natural bond unifying his affections with sin; he refuses to admit a causal relationship between this predisposition for evil and his new nature.2

Human error, says Newman, enters the doctrine of the will when experience with God is not given its rightful place. Though the affections are depraved in every man, there is no valid reason why the belief in human depravity should include the will. Further actions resulting solely from disobedient affections should not be stigmatized as sin:

It/

1 Ibid., p. 142.

2 "If then I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me". However many contend that Paul was referring to his state before conversion. (cf. J. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 99).
It is calamitous that so grave an error as the confounding of unwilling imperfections with sin should have been built up out of the passionate phrases of St. Paul when the context shows clearly that what he calls sin was not counted by him as his own deed, nor therefore needed to be repented of.\(^1\)

Thus for Newman only those acts stemming from the will, which are at variance with the highest standards of morality, are to be called sins. Acts which result from the imperfect state of our affections solely are not to be so regarded. We see in this treatment of sin the way in which he allowed his anthropocentric method to dictate his conclusions. A full view of sin must include far more than a mere grounding of it in the human will. Paul taught that the ability to sin, which is independent of the will in the sense that it imputes no feelings of guilt, is a vital factor in our concept of sin,\(^2\) and must be reckoned with in our doctrine of redemption. As Robinson states it, sin has to do with "the cosmic background of man's history, destiny and worth to God".\(^3\) Though we recognize sin in the subjective experience of standing consciously in the presence of God, we must admit to the universality of sin in which, as Tulloch says, "man not only sins, but he is a sinner naturally. It is his nature and disposition to sin.... It is not merely an act, but a state which clings to the race".\(^4\) Newman, in reasoning from his own premises, was faced with a real antinomy between the universality of sin and the fact of guilt. He sought to solve the problem by positing free choice as the ground of/

1. Ibid., *The Soul*, p. 145.
2. Romans 7:8; 5:13.
of sin, thus removing the necessity of holding to the universality of sin. In this way, moral perfection becomes a matter of absolute conformity to one's own standard of right. Sin is wilful deflection from this standard.

Thus, in keeping with his theory of knowledge, Newman regards sin primarily as a barrier to the improvement of character, or that which hinders the normal development of the Conscience. As we pass now to his views on Christ and the Scriptures, we enter a realm of inferences Newman drew from his theory of the human consciousness. The most basic of these preconceptions is that the Jesus of History as revealed in the Gospels must be a myth. For since no explanation of Him can be found in the human mind, which reveals an identity between the human and the divine, but leaves no room for the supernatural, then no place can be found for Him in history. In history, as in the human mind, no natural effect can be traced to a supernatural cause. Thus, in advance, we would expect Newman to refute the claim that Jesus was in any manner both man and God.
CHAPTER V.

NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT CHRIST

During the most important years, in his development of "Hebrew Theism", \(^1\) Newman refused to give Jesus a place in his religion. An example of his treatment of Jesus during this period is given in "The Religious Mischiefs of Credulity", first published in 1879:

If Jesus, after leaving his own trade in order to roam as a religious mendicant, enticed other men to abandon duty to their parents and wander at his side, in order that he might always have an audience on which he could count; if he made light of filial duty in comparison with the duty of following and glorifying him; if he denied the duty of industry and forethought, and pronounced the rich to be accursed, the poor to be blessed; - if while proclaiming his precepts to be superior to any earlier teacher and blessing those who had the privilege of listening to him, he yet taught dictatorially much that is erroneous; - if he declared that in the course of that generation he would return in the clouds of heaven and in the sight of all men, to take possession of the throne of the world; - if he asserted that all power on earth and in heaven was given to him; - if he identified submission to himself with obedience to God; - if he declared the reception and non-reception of his ill-taught messengers to be a test of pietist or impiety; - if he denounced on his simple countrymen a doom at the great day of judgment worse than that of Sodom, merely because they did not listen to his teaching; - if he emphatically taught the eternity of torture in the flames of hell; - if he was gratified by seeing men fall prostrate before him; - if he declared the sins of a woman to be remitted because she kissed his feet and loved him much; - if he identified credulity with faith... it is certain that such a teacher, had he appeared in our days, in whatever part of Christendom, would find no acceptance among moralists or statesmen.\(^2\)

However,

---

\(^1\) 1840-1880.

However, Newman's negative approach to the Christ of History need not detain us for his arguments are not new. Of far more interest is his positive approach, developed after his thoughts had become logically arranged in his particular interpretation of Theism. Much that is original appears in his treatment, though his indebtedness to Strauss and Bauer is obvious.

We had thought that before he had become an atoning sacrifice, Christ could not preach the full gospel, and that until Paul came forward, the full gospel was never heard. I am now satisfied that Jesus took a humble place as a man and a Hebrew prophet, preaching the pure Theism of the Prophets, and that Paul would not retain him in that position; but raised him, as it were, from the Temple Court to a throne in heaven, where humility was out of place.

Though this thesis has been advanced many times in the history of criticism, Newman finds his main support from two unusual sources. The first of these is a reconstruction of the death of Stephen:

The moral and spiritual superiority of Israel to all known empires... depended on the strict upholding of the divine unity.... Toward anyone who teaches a second God, no pity is allowed: the rulers and the populace are commanded to stone him... Unquestionably in Acts 7 the penalty of Stephen's offence is stoning. Evidently the high priest and his successors and Paul himself believed that in their action they were simply obeying the law..... In their interpretation he was teaching the people to honour another god whom their fathers had not known.

---

1 Ibid., Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 3.

2 Ibid., p. 21. In actual fact, the text states that Stephen was accused of (1) Abusing the Temple, and saying Jesus would destroy it; and (2) Abusing the Law, and saying Jesus would destroy the Mosaic customs; However, he was stoned after he had said: "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God". (Acts 7:56). This fact, in addition to the method of punishment administered to Stephen, lends credence to Newman's contention.
Newman notes that there arose a great persecution against the church in Jerusalem, immediately after Stephen's death, with this important exception; the Apostles were not molested. Since they apparently were in no complicity with Stephen, Newman assumes that Stephen must have started "some new doctrine of his own". In teaching that Jesus was a new God, Stephen taught a doctrine of which the Apostles disapproved:

For Pilate and Herod, if Luke may be quoted, had joined counsel on the condemnation of Jesus, and would have been keen to check any conduct on the part of the apostles liable to lead to any disturbance, and the Sanhedrin would have been on the alert; but we infer from Paul that long after Stephen's death the apostles and their converts were at peace in Jerusalem.

Thus, says Newman, the only conclusion possible is that, since no action was taken at this time against the Apostles, they "passed as orthodox Hebrews".

The second support for his view of Jesus, Newman found in the Book of James. He taught that James, who was the first "bishop" of the first Christian

1 Acts 8:1. "And there arose on that day a great persecution against the church which was in Jerusalem; and they were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles."


3 Ibid., p. 24. Newman also refers to Paul's statement that he had been commissioned to persecute the sect of Stephen as additional support for his view. Though Newman's view here is interesting, the evidence he produces to support it, namely one isolated verse of Scripture, seems insufficient.
Christian Church, was one of Jesus' Apostles. Thus it follows that "the doctrine taught or assumed in the Epistle of James is the doctrine which was held as true and cardinal in the earliest Christian Church." Newman considers it as a treatise "elaborately composed - a comprehensive summary of practical Christianity."

Newman then gives us what he considers to be the major emphases and inferences to be drawn from the Epistle: (1) The Law in James' treatment we see the view held by Jesus. The Law is exalted and honoured, whereas Paul "reasons the law down". (2) "... No allusion is made by James to anything personal in Jesus - his relation to us, his benefactions to us, his atonement and blood, his strengthening grace, or any consequences to us from his resurrection." James, says Newman, regards the Law just as Paul regards Christ, placing the major emphasis on the inward law of liberty, "written on

---

1 Ibid., James and Paul, p. 5. "That James was first president (bishop) of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, and had been one of the twelve apostles selected by Jesus, is universally agreed." Actually Carr states that traditionally St. James, the Lord's brother, has been regarded as the author. "The grounds on which the authorship has been ascribed to James, the son of Zebedee, hardly deserve serious consideration." (The General Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 3.)

2 Ibid., p. 6.

3 Most of the critics of the nineteenth century, as well as those of the present day regard the Epistle, not as a summary of practical Christianity, but as "an authoritative reply to questions which had arisen, a bishop's ruling on incidents and questions of Church life and discipline which had been reported to him." Carr, op. cit., p. 24.

4 Ibid., p. 11.

5 Ibid., p. 12.
Concerning a special coming of a Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, which had ushered in a new dispensation, the Kingdom of Heaven, as opposed to the Law, James may seem to have heard no more than had certain disciples at Ephesus, before Paul instructed them. God, he teaches, is the Father of Lights, who bestows wisdom on us, and gives grace to the humble; but he does not call this God-given wisdom and grace the 'Holy Spirit'. Much less has he anything about 'spiritual gifts' in individuals, or the 'pouring out' of the spirit, such as abounds in the book of Acts.2

Regeneration and Salvation: though James often calls on man to exert his own will toward his regeneration, his central doctrine seems to ascribe "the initiative of the spiritual life to the will of God".3 Newman regarded this as the beginning of the doctrine of election which Paul later taught. "God's will is the origin; the 'word of truth' is the instrument; and the 'word'... is a precept of practical goodness: 'be ye doors of the word'."4

As for salvation, James held to the necessity of escaping "from the wrath to come".5 However, Newman insists that he held no concept of hell.

He does not appeal to man's lower nature, fear; but to his higher, Conscience..... The salvation to which he points is wrought by the 'engrafted word', i.e. holy precepts firmly lodged in the heart..... Christian faith is the means only (of righteousness) and vehement anxiety is shown, not to make it of equal value with the end.6

(5) Righteousness/

1 Loc. cit.
2 Ibid., p. 13.
3 Loc. cit.
5 Loc. cit.
(5) Righteousness: this is the end which we seek, that to which we are saved. It is the same as 'works', "which explains his desire to let faith be the means and works the end". The righteous person is known by his actions alone. Thus, "morality is the true end of all religion".2 (6) Temptation and other views: though James alludes to the devil as tempter, his cardinal development is: "man is tempted by his own lusts, not by God... nor by any supernatural power".3 Further, Jesus does not appear as Saviour or Mediator. Nowhere in the Epistle do we have any hints that James held to internal devotion towards Jesus as a part of religion. "It is impossible to account for omissions so extensive and important, if James not only believed those doctrines, but held them to be fundamental".4

The practical fact is that the Gospel of Jesus and James has been totally lost and the supplemental Gospel of Paul has taken its place, with the ascetic precepts of Jesus by its side. That sharply marked divisions of doctrine existed, Paul avows, which were denoted as the sect of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, and of Christ. The last name is highly suggestive. It proves that there was a class of Christians who refused to move onward into new developments, but/

1 Ibid., p. 16.
2 Ibid., pp. 16-17.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 18. It may be impossible provided we hold to Newman's view of the purpose for which the Epistle was written. Newman's failure to support this view negates his point.
but held fast to that which traditionally came from Jesus. This was the doctrine of James.

Newman's object is to show that Paul "so changed the religion taught by Jesus as practically to found a new one, though bearing the Christian name." Newman contends that two facts are beyond dispute: (i) Paul established most of the Gentile churches, directly or indirectly, and the doctrine of these churches became the standards of Christian teaching; (ii) He died around 66 A.D., under Nero, "and up to that time no document had been received as of authority throughout the Christian churches... The four Gospels and Acts were none of them written, or at least known in their present form. These Gospels, as we know them, were not compiled until after Jerusalem was destroyed, and the original Jewish Church of the Apostles had lost its influence. All took their present shape under more or less Pauline influences, and those Pauline biographers inevitably perverted the position of Jesus, and so garbled his utterances, that to elicit the truth is an arduous task." After the Roman war had reduced the followers of Jesus to a virtual/

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31. "It is further observable that 'Cephas' (Peter) is a sect in advance of Christ (James). This agrees with Paul's notice to the Galatians, that Peter acted with him until certain news came from James, in deference to whom Peter revised his conduct... The First Epistle of Peter is strongly doubtful, but if it be genuine, its date must be much later, when Peter had passed far beyond the Gospel of James, and went all lengths with Paul". (*Ibid.*, p. 31).


3 *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5. Though such views were more or less common during the nineteenth century period of historical criticism among the more liberal element, the picture has altered radically to-day. The general feeling is more in the line with the position held by E.F. Scott: "One fact has emerged clearly from the modern investigation. It has been established that the Gospels assumed their present form gradually, as enlargements or revisions of previous works which had served the same purpose in a less adequate manner. When Mark wrote his Gospel he would not think of himself as doing something which was entirely new. He was merely continuing, with a little more skill and knowledge, the work of teachers before him... Thus there was a direct continuity between the later tradition and the earlier". (*Validity of the Gospel Record*, pp. 3-4). B.H. Branscomb in *Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*, pp. xxii f., gives considerable evidence in support of the view presented by Scott.
virtual state of helplessness, Paul's Gentile churches prevailed over the Jewish churches, "and called them heretical, and instead of a single Hebrew God, left to us all a Father and Son in Greek fashion".\(^1\) Thus Paul was a convert not of the Apostolic faith, but of the heretical sect of Stephen.

At this point it will be instructive to present Newman's interpretation of the message of Paul, who did not obtain his gospel from the Apostles, but through the revelation of Jesus Christ.\(^2\) Further, says Newman, Paul shows us the way in which he received this revelation, namely, "by means of visions and dreams".\(^3\) This method was in keeping with the Greek sect instigated by Stephen, and out of it grew the following "Gospel of Paul".

In common with the leaders of the Jerusalem church, Paul taught the one cardinal doctrine which "enabled James, Cephas, and John to give him the 'right hand of Christian fellowship', in spite of the many differences between them",\(^4\) namely the doctrine that taught the early return of Jesus the Messiah to establish a righteous rule over all the earth, and that all who had repented of their sins and believed in Him as Messiah would become members of the new kingdom.\(^5\) However, time proved both wrong in the only doctrine in which they agreed.

Paul/

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 7.

\(^2\) Gal., 1:12, 15-17; 2:6.

\(^3\) Ibid., Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 25. This is Newman's interpretation of 2 Cor. 12: 1-4. "How came he so vehemently to oppose and so heartily to despise the tenets of the original disciples who had known Jesus in the flesh? Simply, in plain English, he placed more confidence in the ghostly communica
tions which he had received". (Ibid., p. 27.)

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 28.
Paul taught that faith in Christ was the root and principle of the Christian life, and that works of righteousness were the consequences. James and Paul differ at this point:

James, in his eagerness for active, practical religion paradoxically compares works to the spirit of life - faith to the body, which is dead without the spirit... James counts on the power of the will in sinners, and tries to rouse them by vehement appeals to exert themselves.... Paul on the contrary, has a painfully intense sense of the weakness of the sinner's will - that is of the human will generally - but he preaches a doctrine calculated to work on the affections, especially on gratitude; 'What the law could not do... God did for us by his free love'. Not that Paul less esteemed pure morals and useful works; but because he had received the free salvation therefore he was bound in gratitude and affection to serve 'Christ' in all practical goodness. To give efficacy to such a doctrine, Jesus must be held up to the imagination, and painted out in a style widely different from that of James. His super-human person and super-human works must be developed, defined, and magnified. 'To preach Christ' was the phrase characterizing Paul's Gospel - not to preach works or holiness and piety to God... An hourly consciousness of a present and inward Christ must be sustained. Inward devotion to the risen Saviour must be kindled, as a thing in itself excellent - nay, better than even its rightful and necessary fruit. Thus all these factors which we call the evangelical doctrine belong not to Jesus, but to Paul.

Further, Paul held that God the Father was the source, and Jesus was the agent, that Jesus was 'first born of all creation'. Athanasius, states Newman, cannot go...

1 Ibid., James and Paul, pp. 21-23. Scholars have long held that Paul's conception of the death of Christ as a manifestation of the divine love did not hold central place in his doctrine of the Atonement. Rather Paul taught, in the main, that the death of Christ was a propitiatory offering, a form of substitutionary expiation. (Cf. James Denney, The Death of Christ, pp. 174-204.) Though Newman recognizes this as Paul's teaching about the Atonement, he fails to note the contradictory tone between this and the above statement.
go to Paul for support of his creed. In fact Athanasius deviated from Paul in the same manner that Paul deviated from the Apostles, for in "practically every Epistle, Paul represents Jesus as a second God. He maintained that Jesus had lived in the form of a god before his human birth; and to the Colossians he wrote that Jesus was the earliest born of divine creation, and acted for God as his substitute in creating". This idea, in Newman's opinion, was "probably new to every other Apostle and to nearly every Jew who had not, like Apollos, imbibed Pauline or Egyptian teaching".

Newman held that this feature of Paul's teaching was not the most important. The doctrine of the atonement holds that distinction. This doctrine was a new teaching also, for nowhere in the Old Testament is there the slightest idea of sacrifice being an atonement for sin. "No doubt, whatever happened was readily interpreted as entailing some 'gift to the altar', which was generally a gift to the priest's table. Thus the birth of a child in a Hebrew family required the offering of a lamb, or at least two young pigeons; not as atoning for any moral sins, but according to the notion of the early Hebrews as removing ceremonial uncleanness."

Newman applies the same treatment to the other Hebrew sacrifices which are called expiatory. "They never are supposed to remove moral sin, crime or its punishment. A thief was ordered to restore the double; but his offences have/ 

1 Ibid., Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 29.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., Ancient Sacrifice, pp. 6-7.
have nothing of ceremonial pollution, no ceremonial expiation was imagined.\textsuperscript{1} So, too, with the sacrifices accompanying the making of a covenant. "In the Hebrew Pentateuch, Moses is represented as sprinkling the people 'with the blood of the covenant'. But... neither here nor the sprinkling of the door-posts with the blood of the Paschal Lamb, does the remotest idea show itself of atonement for sin."\textsuperscript{3} Thus, concludes Newman, it is the more astounding that any of the New Testament writers, versed in Hebrew Law, should have attempted to find in the Old Testament "a weight of analogy for the wild idea, that the violent death of a righteous being by the hands of wicked men can be construed as a sacrifice pleasing to God, which purifies the conscience of believers."\textsuperscript{4}

Newman called Paul's ideas listed here as "pagan and noxious. They deny the doctrine of all the noblest Jews and that of all Christians."\textsuperscript{5} We recognize/

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., \textit{Ancient Sacrifice}, pp. 6-7.
\item \textit{Loc. cit.}
\item Ibid., p. 8.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 9. Elsewhere Newman imagines a conversation between Balaam, the Midianite Prophet, and Paul: "I understand, Paul, that with me, you condemn parents who sacrifice the fruit of their body for the sins of the soul? I cannot understand how you manage to believe in the possibility of the transference of guilt from a guilty to an innocent person. The innocent person, in your case is, you say, 'Jesus Christ'; and his blood satisfies the creator's justice; but do you mean the blood of the man Jesus? and that the few drops shed by one man in crucifixion are an 'offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour'? Is the blood of any man, however good, more acceptable to God as a sacrifice than the blood of an ox?" Paul might reply: "No, but this is the blood of the Son of God." Balaam would answer: "You say dreadful things, Paul. I forbid parents to kill their own children, and you think that God would kill His own Son, and thus set an abominable example to us feeble men. None of your own prophets ever set forth such monstrous doctrines." (\textit{Ibid.}, \textit{Hebrew Jesus}, p. 33.)
\item Ibid., \textit{Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed}, p. 31.
\end{enumerate}
recognize, of course, that Newman is ignoring a body of teaching in the Old Testament. In the matter of Atonement, as Knudson puts it: "Paul was the first significant thinker to attempt what may be called a theological explanation of Jesus's death and of its reconciling or saving value. In doing so he availed himself of the current Jewish teaching concerning retributive justice and the vicarious suffering of the righteous. According to this teaching, sin must be punished. God would not be true to his ethical nature if he were to forgive sin without manifesting his wrath against it. But his wrath need not necessarily manifest itself in the punishment of the sinner. It may manifest itself in the suffering of the righteous. It was so in the case of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. God laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, and the chastisement of our peace was upon him. This was also true of other martyrs, according to Jewish teaching. And what was true of them, Paul held to be true in a pre-eminent degree of Christ."\(^1\) Newman, on the other hand, believed that no atoning sacrifice is ever necessary to have our sins forgiven, and that nothing stands between a contrite heart and the forgiveness of God.\(^2\)

Thus we see that Newman believed that the schism which he perceived between Paul and James "really turned upon two vitally different systems of religion: that of James representative of Jesus and that of Paul representative of the sect of Stephen and of the Rabbinical culture run wild.\(^3\) However, there/


2 F.W. Newman, *A Reply to the Question. "What Have We Got to Rely on if We Cannot Rely on the Bible?"*, p. 10.

3 Ibid., *James and Paul*, p. 32.
there is another aspect of Paul that needs to be presented:

Paul represents, not ultra-Rabbinical logic only but also religious passion, morally refined, though intellectually unbridled. Among the philosophers the soundest intellect will win the day; but among the less educated, the most powerful heart. Thus the Christian church steadily gravitated towards Pauline doctrine in spite of resistance from the representatives of James. If Peter came over first, John followed ere long; and, in time, a Peter and a John, real or spurious, reinforced or surpassed Paul. Those who painfully discern the inability of a corrupt multitude to be converted by the preaching of pure morality, or by the doctrine of an infinite, omnipresent, perfect, but ever silent God, are apt to rejoice that a Gospel of love, remorse, gratitude and passion, like that of Paul, should rescue an elect remnant into a high-strung moral and mystical religion; and if Paul's doctrine, or John's doctrine be TRUE, joy at its propagation is most just. But truth, when violated, surely revenges itself upon us. When error is consecrated, truth becomes heresy. I

Turning now to Newman's ideas of the message Jesus actually taught, we find a strange but expected exposition. However, it is important to note again that Newman's views here presented represent the study of a lifetime, and are taken from works published in the main after 1880. Prior to this date, and following his acceptance of pure Theism, his views were quite different. In 1850 he devoted considerable space in his writings to an attempt to prove that/

---

1 Ibid., p. 33. "James fought an honest battle for his Master's old creed, with no ambition of raising novelties or claiming for Jesus any loftier place than he himself had claimed. But to Paul, and we may believe, to Pauline converts, especially to Gentiles, the Creed of James may have seemed not honourific enough for a Messiah who was to come back from death and become the divine judge of Jew and Gentiles. Hence, when the Church of Jerusalem disappeared with the city, and both Paul and James were slain, the creed of Paul superseded the creed of Jerusalem, until Athanasius displaced Paul." (Ibid., Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 36.)
that in goodness, Jesus fell below the standard even of his own disciples.\(^1\)

In 1854 he wrote:

We must either submit frankly to his claims and acknowledge ourselves as little children - abhor the idea of criticizing him or his precepts, and, in short become morally annihilated in his presence - or, on the opposite, we cannot help seeing him to have fallen into something worse than ignominy... Nothing can be less suited to minister to the Spirit, and train the powers of the human soul, than to be subject to a superhuman dictation of truth; and nothing could be more unlike a divine law of the letter, than the incoherent, hyperbolic, enigmatic, inconsistent fragments of discourses given to us unauthoritatively as teachings of Jesus. We cannot believe that Jesus was the Messiah, for he just does not act like one.\(^2\)

At a later date, in commenting on the story of the Temptations, Newman wrote:

"The true temptation of Jesus was the whisper made to him, 'are you not possibly the Messiah?' and by it the legendary devil overcame him."\(^3\)

Though Newman all but despairs over gleaning an accurate picture of Jesus from the Gospels, he manages, by using the Epistle of James as a guide, to develop the following ideas: Jesus was a prophet who came teaching the Mosaic law and the faith of the Old Testament prophets. It was a message exclusively intended for Jews, and not for Gentiles. For proof of this statement Newman reminds us of Peter's experience with Cornelius:

When Cornelius and his party are baptized in Acts 10, the church at Jerusalem is offended with Peter for admitting Gentiles; and Peter, when thus called to account, does not defend himself by the obvious reply: 'This is the very thing that the Lord... commanded us to do, although ten other apostles were at hand to corroborate him; but instead, he behaves as if he had quite forgotten it, and defends himself by a new vision or dream.'\(^4\)

Thus/

---

1 F.W. Newman, Phases of Faith, pp. 139-164.
3 Ibid., The True Temptation of Jesus, pp. 21-22.
Thus Jesus did not teach the doctrine of eternal hell. From the modern Jews I learn that Hell was never a part of their national creed, and could not have been believed by Jesus. Newman held the doctrine to be pagan in origin, and was probably introduced into the New Testament in the form in which it is found there through the influence of the sect of Stephen.

Jesus performed no miracles, as we understand miracles. Newman holds that there simply is no sure evidence. "If those recorded in our Gospels took place, Peter had plenty to tell; but Paul, who was eager in any Hebrew Book for miracles, and who abode for fifteen days with Peter, learned nothing from him worth hearing. Paul's ignorance, and the late date of the Gospels, disprove the miracles alleged to Jesus." In fact Jesus never claimed to be God in any sense. He did not regard himself as sinless. He taught free forgiveness without the need for an atonement.

He placed all moral duties... above all ceremonial rites, as more than all burnt offerings or sacrifices; he insisted on the purifying of the heart as the source from whence spring evil thoughts, words and deeds; he appealed to the private judgment of his hearers... he propagated pure inward spirit; his religion, communion with God the Father in love and trust; he abhorred all shams and hypocrisy, and showed endless pity for the sinful and despised... In fact, his religion is best summed up in the Lord's Prayer. This is his religious creed.

Having/

1 Ibid., p. 54.

2 Ibid., Divergence of Calvinism from Pauline Doctrine, p. 10. "The doctrine of Hell has no pretense to Jewish inspiration and revelation any more than Christian. Whether true or false, it is pagan in origin; and now has become the weight which will totally sink Christianity, if it cannot be cut away."

3 Ibid., Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 54.

4 Ibid., p. 56. Weinel claims that Newman taught that Jesus died for claiming "to be a royal prince". (Weinel, op. cit., p. 189.) However, Newman was careful in his more mature thought to point out that the Gospel story had been so badly distorted that "we do not know rightly the causes or the excuses of the movement which led to his arrest, apparently with two insurgents who had taken up arms in his name." (Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 10.)
Having disposed of the Jesus of the Gospels, Newman sought to discredit the Scriptures. Here again, we are confronted by a change of view through the years. However, we will present the ideas Newman reached during his latter years.¹

Hereby am I strengthened in the determination, in which for many long years I have acted, never to read out any portion of the Christian narratives in a devout tone, for any imaginary value in the particular passage. I do not know of a single moral lesson of the slightest importance for which we are obliged to have recourse to these gospels; moreover, most of their precepts are overstrained and thereby impractical, ill-fitted for real life. On the other hand, every line is saturated with the assumption of the superhuman wisdom and mystical greatness of Jesus, or with ascription of malice and stupidity to the mass of men around him; every page subtly infuses into the inexperienced mind the poison of credulity. To make the reading safe for young people, and to those who are unused to active criticism, a perpetually hostile comment; any is all but necessary; and this, of course, is inconsistent with any use of the book for edification. Until an idolatry has lost its foothold in the hearts of not a few individuals only, but in the heart of the age, it is wise rather to shatter the idol itself to pieces than to leave it in mystical honour erected on its pedestal.²

This statement represents years of struggle against the idea of Biblical infallibility. Newman's position on Christology and his attacks against the Bible as the final authority in Christianity, were responsible for the name he won as the most influential critic of traditional theology during the nineteenth century. Here again, his hatred for the Bible grew out of his theory of knowledge: "spirit, not form in religion; the free movement of personal intuition, unfettered by creed or definition - for these he pleads throughout".³ There can/

---

1 After he had become thoroughly conversant with the field of Biblical criticism.

2 Ibid., "The Religious Mischief of Credulity", in Miscellanea, II, p.360.

3 Storr, op.cit., p.375.
can be no possibility of an external, authoritative revelation of moral and spiritual truth, according to his system:

No heaven-sent Bible can guarantee the veracity of God to a man who doubts that veracity. Unless we have independent means of knowing that God knows the truth and is disposed to tell it to us, his word... might as well not have been spoken... What God reveals to us, He reveals within, through the medium of our moral and spiritual senses.  

Newman's greatest omission, with regard to his views on Christ and the Scriptures, was his failure to deal adequately with revelation. Nowhere does he attempt to answer the question: is God revealed in Christ?  

As we turn to Newman's teaching about God in the next chapter, we shall ask the question: what kind of God has Newman found in nature and in the human heart?

---

1 Even were this true, Newman has not the right to make the further step and assert that "if we know this beforehand, we don't need the Bible as our religious foundation...... We need no other revelation of God than that found and experienced in the heart and in nature... The Bible... can lay no foundations." (Ibid., A Reply to the Question, "What Have We Got to Rely on, If We Cannot Rely On the Bible?, pp. 5-7.

2 McGiffert shows the way in which erroneous preconceptions can distort our view of Christ: "The interpretation of the work and person of Christ will depend on many things. It will depend on our idea of man; whether he be helpless, depraved, and naturally vicious, or whether he be simply blind and in need of light, or strong and in need of incentive. The interpretation will depend on our idea of sin; whether it be a substantial corruption, or a depraved will, or on the other hand mere imperfection, a lack of the highest ideals and the like. The interpretation will depend on our idea of God; whether He be a Christ-like God or the Avenger of the Old Testament... Finally the interpretation will depend on our philosophy..." (A.G. McGiffert, Christianity as History and Faith, p. 109.)
CHAPTER VI.

NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT GOD

From Francis Newman's theory of knowledge emerged his ideas about God. We know about God because He has and does reveal Himself to us. However, Newman cautions us against the use of history and the Bible in forming our views of the Almighty, for God reveals Himself "solely in the laws of the universe, and in our inner consciousness". Our logical faculty reveals to us the object of religious worship: "a spiritual agency in the Universe of Matter, and hereby a living and ruling God, eternal and supreme". Our moral faculty shows us that this Universal Mind possesses the moral attribute of righteousness; and our spiritual faculty points out to us that "our kindness, our benevolence, is nothing but a little flame proceeding from Him as from an infinite fire, whence the sacred utterance that 'God is Love'."

Newman is careful to point out that the logical faculty does not attempt to prove the existence of Mind in the universe. "No syllogism is pretended, that proves a lung to have been made to breathe, but we see it by what some call Common-sense, and some Intuition." Inasmuch as the whole world abounds/

---

2 Ibid., "The Religious Mischiefs of Credulity", in Miscellanea, p. 353.
3 Loc. cit. However, we must remember that in Newman's system the faculties are not metaphysical entities, isolated in operation; rather they are special abilities situated as clusters around the fact of consciousness. Thus, each faculty, in some measure, is dependent on the others, i.e., the logical faculty could not declare that God is except in co-operation with the moral faculty which perceives that God is good.
4 Ibid., *The Soul*, p. 86.
abounds with what appears to be similar instances of design, the properly
developed logical faculty is led to the conviction that the lungs were meant
to breathe, the eyes to see, and the mind to discern truth. Though no long
series of logical steps are needed to lead to the conviction, yet such a con-

Thus logically we would expect to find Mind in the universe, and the fitnesses
which meet our view in the human world render our conviction of the presence
of a Designing Mind to be most reasonable. The logical faculty, then, gives
evidence in support of our belief that "there is a Boundless, Eternal, Un-
changeable, Designing Mind, not without whom this system of things coheres:
and this Mind we call God."3

However, "in speculating on the qualities of the Divine Mind, we
reason primarily from the qualities of our own minds, not from external
nature."4 We turn to the testimony of the soul and conscience for knowledge
about God. Since these statements have been amply supported in Chapters III
and IV, we will consider, in the present chapter, the attributes of God as
Newman/

1 _Loc. cit._ "Not to see a Universal Mind in nature appears to indicate so
hopeless a deficiency in the Religious Faculty, as to preclude farther
discussion. Just as, if anyone had no sense of Beauty in anything, we
should not imagine that we could impart it by argument, so neither here."

2 _Ibid._, p. 88.

3 _Loc. cit._


Francis Newman emphasized, above all else, the self-sacrificing love of God. He is a forgiving God, but more than that, He is so perfect in Love that He seeks out the sinner. We recognize this fact, says Newman, not from some external authority, but by an instinct of the soul.

Since the preceding statement forms the basic premise of the line of reasoning to follow, we need to consider carefully Newman's position at this point. In the first place, Francis Newman is presenting an essential part of the Christian conception of God. As Professor D.M. Baillie says, God is "the one who at the same time makes absolute demands upon us and offers freely to give us all that He demands. It means the One who required of us unlimited obedience and then supplies the Obedience Himself." Newman attempts to resolve this paradox by bringing forth the instincts of the soul as the source and ground of the knowledge of both terms of the paradox, and then fuses the terms.

1 Ibid., The Soul, p. 231. "It is one of the first elements spiritually discerned, that the impediments to acceptance with Him lie solely in us, and that there is no time or state conceivable, in which a man shall turn to Him, and He refuse to hear. We cannot expect too much readiness in Him to save, too much tender compassion, for the plain reason that these qualities in Him are infinite... our great danger, folly, and even sin, lies in Unbelief of His inexhaustible long-suffering."

2 Ibid., pp. 244–245. Newman equates this instinct with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and says: "by what else but this instinct was Divine existence ever discovered at all? What but the Soul, groping after Him, taught all nations of men to be familiar with these high ideas?"

3 D.M. Baillie, God Was in Christ, p. 121.
terms by identifying the instinct of the Soul with the Spirit of God. That
this is an exaggerated statement of the capabilities of instinctive behaviour,
Newman himself admits in another place.¹ It is clear that Francis Newman
found his central idea of God’s nature in tradition as represented in the doc:
trine of the Trinity, and in the Scriptures as included in the Biblical doctrine
of the incarnation, for the idea that God demands and forgives in one act of
love is to be traced to Christ, not to instinct.²

After having presented the God revealed to Consciousness as a righteous
and loving God, Newman breaks these two characteristics of the Divine Nature into
various moral aspects of His Personality. Before proceeding to a discussion of
the righteousness and love of God, we need to consider briefly these different
phases of divine Perfection.

Under that phase of the divine Character which has to do with the moral
law and the moral ideal, and which Newman designates as the righteousness of God,
are the following aspects:

(1) The Truth of God. There are some, says Newman, who assert that
our only ground for believing that God speaks the truth, is that "God himself told
us so in a Book".³ However, the truthfulness of God "reaches beyond letters and
words, pervading all nature and the mind of man".⁴ We know God is true because
He/

¹ F.W. Newman, Theism, pp. 2-5. "Man’s highest instinct leads to lofty
aspirations, to generous sentiment and to boundless desires, till he
seeks and finds the Author of his soul. In seeking for Him, he perfects
his virtue, by finding Him to be made strong within." However, "instinct
is but a dumb pointer... It cannot guide reasonings, nor frame sentences,
nor interpret its own movements, nor verify its own suggestions."


³ F.W. Newman, Theism, p. 32.

⁴ Loc. cit.
He adapted our minds for truth:

... not indeed seeing everything, nor omnipotent of the smallest things, nor incapable of error, nor independent of culture.

Fallacies stand around us, as dangers in all life, to be avoided and guarded against by rightful industry. But our minds and instructive judgments cannot be essentially delusive.1

Therefore, we infer that God is truthful and "loves our truthfulness eternally".2

(2) The Holiness of God. The basic idea behind the term "Holy God", for Newman, is "the glorious fulness of his moral excellence".3 He is the perfect realization of the moral ideal. We learn this from the conscience, and "on this side we have positive and well-defined knowledge, that the Author of man's heart commands and approves Virtue".4 Since we learn from conscience that virtue is the highest good, the Holy God is the God of perfect virtue.5

(3)

1 Ibid., p. 33.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., On The Relations of Free Knowledge to Moral Sentiment, p. 8.
4 Ibid., Theism, p. 66.
5 Ibid., pp. 42-45. In this section Newman gives us an idea of the meaning he has in mind of the relation between divine Holiness and human virtue: "All true virtues spring out of one root, the love of Goodness... Moreover, when all virtue is pursued - and is pursued because it is virtue - then conscience assumes supremacy, and unveils her righteous power, and the heart honours the idea of the all-righteous, the all-holy, and the vision becomes all-lovely and is impersonate as God the Good, until the Soul worships with love and joy, and finds her inspirer. Then at length virtue puts on her true form..." The moral man "Thinks not to make virtue itself the chief object of pursuit, nor study to press forward to virtue more complete. (But for the spiritual man) the desire for virtue is a passion... and his chase is perpetual, for the quarry cannot be caught.... Thus to the mere moral man virtue is Finite, and to the spiritual man virtue is an Infinitude, and the moral man often rests on the arms of earth and time, but the spiritual ever tends toward the Infinite God. For the passion which gnaws his bosom at his failures, shows him, as a God within, the Rebuker of his wanderings, and reminds him of that divine Eye which judges righteously... Unclouded and serene will the sight of God's countenance be, when we hunger and thirst after virtue with our heart and soul, and with mind unsupstitious, as we shall spontaneously. Holiness approves our poor efforts and teaching us his replies." (pp. 42-44).
(3) The Blessedness of God. All men, Newman believes, who see in God the powers we possess in part, such as force, intellect, desire, judgment and will, "inevitably judge that in Him they are all perfect, absolute in completeness and also complete in harmony; hence, Peace and Blessedness are ascribed universally to God, not by Induction nor by Experience, which here apply not, but by intuition, and by Deduction from prior truths". Activity brings pleasure to the strong, healthy body or mind; infinite burdens are not heavy to those who possess infinite power:

And as every faculty, rightly exerted, brings its own delight, and the nobler the faculty, the purer the breath of joy; and as man knows man by sympathy only, by presumptive likenesses, attributing inward sameness where outward sameness appears; so, concerning the Unseen and Eternal Heart, we judge fitly that it rejoices as we rejoice, only with joy far more glorious, in exerting energies like to ours, but more glorious than ours by far, grander, mightier, completer, harmonious, eternal. Therefore has man's universal voice pronounced God blessed; and to believe His perfections is to ratify the verdict.

The righteous God, who is a real expression of the moral ideal, also "wishes the welfare of his creatures". The latter aspect of the divine Nature Newman calls the love of God, and is divided into several slightly differing qualities of the divine Personality:

(1) The mercy of God. We must regard God as inflexible in severity, whose moral laws are unchangeable, for He is a God of righteousness. Nevertheless:

As/

1 Ibid., p. 32.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., The Soul, p. 97.
As poisons have their antidote, and as diseased flesh may be burned out and a limb be made healthy; so is the disease of sin burnt out of the soul by repentance, though the outward results of sin may remain to plague us. Nor is any sin so pleasant, but repentance is vastly more painful, a divine retribution most just and adequate.¹

Thus, for Newman, mercy has reference to the misery of sin.

We know God is merciful for men at their moral best are merciful. When the one who has offended is deeply penitent, the good man knows that he has received his full punishment, and, instead of desiring further infliction, he forgives the offender, "receiving him back into kindness, and this we call mercy". In like manner is God merciful. However, Newman reminds us that "the outward effects of sin take their course against us, except so far as our repentance may naturally change them. But where the poison of sin so longer disorders the soul, He re-admits us to His presence, and forgives the past".²

(2) The grace of God. Newman makes a careful distinction between the mercy of God and His grace. He is merciful to man because man is suffering unbearable, but he gives grace to man because man is weak.³ However, in order to square this attribute of God with his theory of Knowledge, Newman must make a distinction between nature and grace while at the same time retaining his idea of the naturalness of special grace. Newman was quite adept at this sort of thing: "When it is said that 'Nature' without Grace will not enable us to serve God/

¹ Ibid., Theism, p. 52.
² Ibid., p. 53.
³ Ibid., The Soul, p. 217.
God acceptably, what is meant is that the strength which the soul regards as its own, and natural to it, because always at its command, is not found to suffice for the exigencies of the spiritual life. It needs over and above, a strength out of itself.... and this strength is called Grace. This special Grace is natural to the soul, but not at the express command of the soul.¹

(3) The faithfulness of God. Here again we are dealing with a term that is practically identical with mercy and grace. However, the major difference is that mercy and grace are concerned with the sinner, while the faithfulness of God is a manifestation of divine love directed toward the human soul who has already bowed in submission before the divine Will.² It has to do with the conception of a divine covenant between God and the soul.³

Thus Newman's view of God is that of a divine Person, as revealed through the logical faculty; a righteous God, truthful, holy, and blessed, a personalization of the moral ideal, as revealed in the human conscience; and, a God of love, merciful, gracious and faithful, as revealed in the soul. As a righteous God he makes his moral demands on His creatures, but as a loving God, He provides the means whereby the moral demands may be met.

In/

1 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., The Soul, pp. 215-217. Newman again indicates the weakness of his base: "It is difficult, or perhaps impossible, to silence the objections of philosophers to the idea, that the Most High has entered into a private stipulation with this or that soul; and we may admit, that such a statement does but crudely express the real truth at which it hints, and which the intellect imperfectly embraces. Yet nothing will convince the soul which has passed through such processes, that it does not discern a spiritual reality, when it dwells on the Faithfulness of God."
In the course of the historical development of Christian thought the conviction arose that God's righteousness and His love were in opposition. The most common solution to the "division" in the divine Nature has been a theory of the Atonement. Newman, however, has a quite different approach to the problem. In opposition to the Evangelicals, who preached that the purpose of God in the lives of individual men was to save the soul from the miseries of this world of time for the blessedness of the world of eternity, he taught "practical righteousness as the end for which God has ordained us". This is the principle around which Newman constructed his theology. "When a man not only acts justly and mercifully, but delights in justice and mercy, and is attracted to love just and merciful men for their very virtue, and hates injustice and cruelty for their own sake; his love, his joy, his hatred are spiritual even though his theories may be, or seem to us, atheistic... Herein lies the true glory and strength of Christianity, the strength which has upheld it in spite of the countless fables and mischievous falsehoods encumbering it and marring it. Apostle differs from apostle in diverse points, and nearly all add something to Jesus: but all agree in earnest exhortation to practical virtue and inward holiness as the end of faith, even when they couple it with a creed of doubtful disputation". Not eternal life, but the unshakable desire to be and to do good is the highest des: tiny God has prepared for the individual.

Thus/

1 Ibid., "Sin Against God", Miscellanea, p. 300.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., The Service of God, p. 13.
Thus we look, not to the soul, but to the conscience for a reconciliation between the justice and love of God, for it is our conscience that informs us of the value of seeking "first after virtue, and secondarily only to follow happiness":¹ and that virtue is the highest good. However, since the usual way of attaining virtue is by allowing sympathy rather than introspection to guide our conduct toward others, a sense of duty toward others crowds out the higher ideal of personal virtue:

Now, if one man excelled all others as a parent excels a child, one might choose virtue for others rather than happiness; for this is the higher law whenever practicable. But seldom can one choose for another, or dream to guide him; hence, in practice, we solely choose the happiness of others, and the illusion creeps in, that happiness is the chief good.²

Thus the goal of the Christian is, not to be happy in another life as the Evangelicals taught, but to be virtuous in this life: not to be virtuous in this life in order to be happy in another, but because virtue is the highest good.

Since each good man, in the main, seeks to make his fellowmen happy,³ the further illusion has arisen that God's chief pursuit is to plan for our happiness. Obviously if God is mainly concerned for our happiness, there is discord in the divine nature; for His righteousness and His love are directed toward different ends: He demands righteousness of us that we may be good, and He forgives us when we sin that we may be happy. From this arises, in Newman's opinion,

---

¹ Ibid., Theism, p. 60.
² Ibid., p. 61.
³ Since, "to seek for their Virtue is too high an aim". (loc. cit.)
opinion, the further error of thinking that God will suppress violences.

And by rewards and punishments keep things smooth... And when by painful facts, this is signally disproved, divine Rule is disbelieved, and all faith shaken. Faith revives when we discern that Virtue is the chief good, and is, in fact, promoted by the Divine Ordinances... Therefore we cling to the conviction that he orders and disorders, and that evil is permitted only for the sake of the higher good.

The view that virtue is the highest good resolves the conflict between the ideas of righteousness and love in the Nature of God; for, if the moral perfection of man is the aim God is striving for, His righteousness and His love will have the same ends: "We love Him for His Goodness, He loves us that we may be good". Thus, for Newman, God's righteousness is God's love. The two are not in opposition but are to be equated with each other. To believe in God the Righteous is the same as to believe that he loves mankind.

Under the stimulus of this view of the Goodness of God, Newman was led to revise his old Evangelical ideas pertaining to man in the service of God, or religion in general.

The/
The short of it is, that religion is in the heart, not in the dry mind. Intellectual belief may be barren, but moral faith is the parent of true virtue, and a natural companion of those noble virtues, Reverence and Love. Yet, in this short statement we do not embrace the whole. A man may be admired for the power of accuracy of his intellect, but he is not therefore esteemed or loved; on the other hand, whatever the deficiencies of his intellect, he deserves esteem if he be good. If we love God Himself, it is for His Goodness, not for His power or high intelligence; and the same law of love must be applied to men. Thus, there are two sorts of atheists, and two sorts of theists. One who is intellectually a theist may either be reverential, or destitute of reverence; and so may an atheist. But reverence is the vital element of moral and spiritual character.\(^1\)

However, we must be clear at this point, says Newman, in our views of the part we must assign to the understanding and to the affections. "We must not mistake religious emotion for religion".\(^2\) Every emotion is transitory, but the religious state must be more or less permanent, "which shows itself whenever the thought of the most High recurs to the mind".\(^3\) The religious affections are most proper because they benefit us, and thus are necessary to religion, but they must not lead us to believe that God, like a weak man, "resents coldness or exacts gratitude".\(^4\) On the other hand, though we must not allow the intellect to define the moral attributes of God, we must nurture the conviction deep in our understanding "that God deserves to be loved".\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) Ibid., The Causes of Atheism, p. 6.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., The Service of God, p. 8.
\(^{3}\) Loc. cit.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p. 9.
\(^{5}\) Loc. cit.
In like manner, we need to draw near unto God and worship Him inwardly; but "to make the service of God consist in this is, at bottom, the same error as to identify the useless and selfish life of a hermit with religious life".\(^1\) Further, theology is involved in no way with the ends of religion, but must serve as a means; "our social perfection is the end which theology ought to subserve. To attain such perfection as men and women can attain in their mutual relations is the highest service of God".\(^2\)

However, the question arises: if moral perfection is the goal toward which we all ought to strive, and theology is to be a means of helping us to achieve that goal, of what is our theology to consist with regard to a main, guiding principle? Newman answers: to obey God. There is no other way to honour Him.\(^3\) The Laws of God which we are to obey are not found in the Bible, but/

1 Ibid., p. 10.

2 Loc. cit. Thus, "this world is not to be abandoned to men, selfish and greedy and ambitious, but is to be defended and rescued from them by the concordant efforts of God's own true servants. Unjust and corrupting institutions, evil laws, reckless governments, are not to be left unmolested. Since bad law is of all bad things most widely and deeply efficacious for evil, while good law of all good influences the noblest and most effective for good; therefore to purify laws and institutions is a primary mode of establishing the Kingdom of God on earth. In no other way can the roots of moral evil be torn up". (Ibid., p. 13). "It is never the material but the moral that unites men, though the moral can only act through the form of the material. Even with the same nation, same language, same laws, same religion... primitive social inequalities, unduly sundering ranks, put enmity between High and Low and cause implacable strife... Men are men and not brutes, - not because of one Adam, but because of one God who dwells in all consciences. In the Childhood of Paganism, in the manhood of Monotheism, one Parent watches over their childhood or supports their manhood, and commands their Virtue and rears them to sympathy... as brethren of one family, citizens of one country". (Ibid., Theism, p. 91.)

but rather "are to be discovered by a study of our own nature and of the world that surrounds us. To one who looks on the Universe as the work of God, nature is one side of God manifest. To live according to nature is the most obvious way of trying to live according to the law of God".1 Newman was insistent on this point. In another place he wrote: "The laws of nature are strictly inseparable from the divine Existence... What we call nature is forever interwoven with God".2 This is decidedly a drift in the direction of pantheism; however, "conscious of the independence of the human will, we cannot believe that we are absorbed into God, or are mere machines moved by Him; but we are, in the true and noble sense, children of God".3

On the other hand, man is a social creature, "born into a family and soon ushered into a community".4 He cannot live apart from the mutual aid and co-operation given to him by others; hence, social life is a natural part of man's being, "nor can he live according to the laws of nature and of God, except by a scrupulous performance of social duty".5 Thus right, moral conduct is the heart of religion and a study of ethics is the primary duty of theology. Further, true religion can never lead us into the immoralities of fanaticism for the reason that religion does not prescribe our moral laws; rather, morality dominates religion/

1 Loc. cit.
2 Ibid., On the Relation of Theism to Pantheism, p. 11.
3 Ibid., p. 13.
5 Loc. cit.
114.

religion since morality rests on the universal reason of mankind: "No inward impressions imagined to be divine must be adduced as dictating to us right and wrong. Only when we know our inward suggestions to be intrinsically good, can we presume to attribute them to the Father of Lights". Thus we infer that Newman believes a sense of the presence of God should in no way alter our estimate of right and wrong in human action; that the indwelling God leaves our code of morals undisturbed.

In the final analysis, to love God, in Newman's opinion, "is little else than to love the ideal personate righteousness". Love for God means the possession of a standard of conduct which is higher than our own personal attainments. It is clear that, essentially, Newman saw in the attributes of God what Christians have always seen in Him. However, the Christian affirmation is: "if we would know Him we must study, not nature, not history, not our own hearts, but Jesus Christ. No doctrine of God that does not pre-suppose the revelation of God by Jesus, is Christian." The most probable explanation is that Newman founded/

---

2 Ibid., *Hunger and Thirst after Righteousness*, Miscellanea, II, p. 307. "Hence, (the lover) has a constant self-dissatisfaction even when in perfect peace of conscience. Thus to love God is the same as to hunger and thirst after righteousness".
3 Ibid., *Hunger and Thirst after Righteousness*, Miscellanea, II, p. 307. "Hence, (the lover) has a constant self-dissatisfaction even when in perfect peace of conscience. Thus to love God is the same as to hunger and thirst after righteousness".
4 McCafferty, *op.cit.*, pp. 115-116. Bishop Gore, in his book, *Belief in God*, shows that the self-revelation of God in the prophetic tradition and in Jesus Christ are indispensable if we are to see God as He really is... After having presented his evidence, he sums up: "We satisfied ourselves that reason has no right to decide a priori that the old idea of a divine revelation is rationally untenable, and very carefully we sought to examine the grounds of this belief. Critically scrutinized, we found them in a high degree convincing. We found that it is very hard to resist the conviction that the prophets and Jesus Christ... were in touch — as other men were not — with Reality, with the real God; and that in a long and continuous process, more or less gradual, He could communicate to them the truths by which men could live, both about the divine nature and purpose and about human nature". (p. 284). Here in this revelation Bishop Gore found the attributes of God, — attributes which could be found nowhere else: "The Personality of God, His Absoluteness, His transcendence as the creator of all that is, prior to the world and independent of it, and His essential Goodness and Love". (p. 285).
founded his teaching about God on Christ's revelation of Him, but failed to recognize his source. We have already seen that in the last year of his life, Newman returned to the Christ he had known in his youth. Thus we conclude that Francis W. Newman spent the most productive years of his life in a state of intellectual confusion.

We see this same confusion of mind in Newman's views on immortality. When he adopted his version of Theism, he incorporated into his system the usual arguments for the existence of the soul after death. If the moral is a part of God's nature, he taught, the possessor of true virtue can never perish, for that which has God's nature even in part is as immortal as God. Again, those whom God loves are deathless; otherwise, God's "Blessedness" would be imperfect. "In short, close friendship between the Eternal and the Perishing appears unseemly to the nature of the Eternal." Another argument should be mentioned, though Newman himself saw that it contained the logical fallacy of the "undistributed middle". What is true is always best, therefore what is best is always true. Though we have no way of knowing directly the truth or falsity of the idea of immortality, life after death appears to be better than its alternative. Thus we presume that, since the best is true, man is immortal. However, Newman takes exception to the argument that there must be a future life in order to set right the wrongs of this life. Man, it was said, is the consummate failure of creation if there be no future life. "I must regard it as mischievous, delusive, and/

2 Ibid., pp. 63-64.
3 Ibid., p. 79.
and morbid, to pretend that life is a mournful dream, an empty bubble, unless it is to be followed by an immortality. If seventeen years of life are worthless, so are seven million".1

However, by 1836 he had rejected all of them. In that year he published his book, Life After Death? Palinodia, in which he states: "In my book entitled Theism I have long seen that I was one-sided. I there wrote, less as an inquirer, than as an advocate... Only because logically it seemed an important complement to a Theistic creed, I tried to persuade myself to its truth".2 It appears to us that Newman was "persuaded" by the weaker argument:

This world (I argued) was designed by its Author to be a School of Virtue to men, his highest creation in it. But if virtue, by divine decree, perish with each virtuous man, then the divine aim is thwarted by its own enactment... I now argue against myself as follows: If the divine aim be the moral advance of the race collectively, it is not necessarily made void when good souls cease to live: for the nobler souls do not live in vain, if their work survive.3

Newman wrote in Theism that God would not permit a virtue to be lost at death which was earned by vast effort. Again the argument he accepts is weaker than the one displaced:

Nearly all of our separate virtues, especially those that are gained or sustained by earnest effort and grave sacrifice, are virtually lost in the Christian heaven; while it is hard to imagine any heaven in which they will grow and thrive, unless its climate approximate to that in which they were native. A further inquiry arises, whether pious Christians would think it a boon from God to live a second life in a world sufficiently like to ours to need and maintain our virtues.4

---

1 Ibid., On This and the Other World, p. 9.
3 Ibid., p. 38.
4 Ibid., p. 39.
Newman arrived finally at the point where he could hardly tolerate the thought of the soul living through vast ages, for, in the light of eternity, he could see concrete events in human life fading away in importance and the consciousness of personal identity disappearing. "There is a terrible disproportion between the narrow limits of human life and the endless years that are to follow. The more the mind dwells on this contrast, the more does the sober truth of the Greek Axiom impress me: 'Whoever has a beginning of life also has an end!'" More and more Newman came to believe that only God could inherit an eternal life, for He alone is like the universe He created: unlimited in space and time. For us, "it remains to be grateful that he has given us that very noble gift, Human Life, and absolutely to trust Him with child-like confidence when He recalls it."^1

Thus following the year 1866, Newman was willing to make a positive statement on only one point:

Belief in a Future Life becomes pernicious, first if the argument requires us to disparage the present life, which is certainly God's work directly known to us. To speak with contempt and despair of this world cannot glorify its Author. Again the belief is mischievous, if, as always hitherto, it divert good people from striving to tear up the roots of evil. From the true Church are due to the world, not a mere salving of wounds... but sounder bases of Society, to prevent in justice, etc.^2

Thus Newman's only positive statement on the belief in immortality is an insight into his teaching about the Church, which, as we shall note in the next chapter, is wholly unconcerned with belief in immortality.

---

1 Ibid., p. 47.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Loc. cit.
CHAPTER VII.

NEWMAN'S TEACHING ABOUT THE CHURCH

Newman sought to identify the church with the Kingdom of God, and to define the Kingdom of God in terms of the social ideal of moral perfection achieved through individual acts of justice. Thus both the church and the Kingdom of God are viewed exclusively from the ethical point of view. Both are subservient to the end of virtue in individual life.

"Why", asks Newman, "after 1300 years is God's kingdom so slow in coming?"¹ Clearly this question must be answered if the social ideal is to be realised in time, in order that the weaknesses in the present state of the church may be remedied. Newman presents several reasons for what he calls the "historical depravation of the church:"

1. One of the chief reasons why the "Kingdom" is not already established is that "the Gentile churches founded by Paul lost themselves in theological controversies and bondage to human authority and books, in Polytheism and Sacerdotalism supposed divine".² Had the church from earliest times ignored Pauline paganism and accepted the religion taught by the prophets and Jesus, the Kingdom of God would have been farther advanced to-day, for "nearly all that is best in Christ: ianity on its strictly religious side came from Jewish Psalmists and Prophets, and Jewish schools of thought. The unity, spirituality, and holiness of God, his free forgiveness to the penitent, the superior value of morality - of Justice a

---

1 F.W. Newman, Hebrew Jesus: His True Creed, p. 60.
2 Loc. cit.
and Mercy from man to man... we owe to the Hebrews".  

For, as we noted in his views on the Historical Christ, Newman finally became convinced that Jesus was a Jew who emphasized and popularized the great religious ideas taught by the prophets. His first disciples repeated his doctrines. Now Newman gives us his own interpretation of church history; with the destruction of Jerusalem and the practical extinction of the teachings of primitive Christianity by Pauline circles, a new paganism came into being. First a primary and secondary god, Father and Son; then came the Athanasian Trinity. To this was added, in the course of four or five centuries, a new hierarchy of tertiary gods, saints and angels. And now, he says, we have a new earthly hierarchy, claiming to be the sole dispensers of God's Grace and Truth. The first deviation from the simple doctrines of Jesus proceeded from Paul's fanatical belief in dreams and visions. In later generations further deviations occurred in the propagation of idle tales, false miracles and unfair arguments. A law of bondage to a sacred canon and to the decisions of ecclesiastical synods, and finally to the Pope, supplanted the law of liberty and the principle of brotherhood which the primitive Christians taught. "God's favour was made to depend on the acceptance of a theological creed, disbelief in which endangered the soul eternally; good sense was frowned on, and free inquiry condemned as impiety... thus making for centuries a hell on earth for our noble, older brethren, the Jews, who alone preserved the lamp burning of pure Monotheism".  

Since/  

1 Ibid., pp. 60-61.  
2 Loc. cit.
Since the church chose to follow Paul rather than Jesus, it has naturally fostered the spirit of credulity as a religious duty. Since the church chose to follow Paul rather than Jesus, it has naturally fostered the spirit of credulity as a religious duty. In this way, the spirit of credulity has been cultivated as a religious duty.

The noble moralists of the New Testament will stand out more admirable and more valuable, when surrounding error is purged away: but until this work of criticism is performed, and the dogmatic principle is disowned, the spiritual and the moral will continue to be drowned in the ecclesiastical, and deprivation, schism, anathema and recrimination must be expected in the future as in the past. The noble moralists of the New Testament will stand out more admirable and more valuable, when surrounding error is purged away: but until this work of criticism is performed, and the dogmatic principle is disowned, the spiritual and the moral will continue to be drowned in the ecclesiastical, and deprivation, schism, anathema and recrimination must be expected in the future as in the past.

(2) The Reformation interfered with the realization of the "Kingdom" in two important areas:

A. The Reformers, in their zeal to remedy the errors and pretensions of the old church, "set up for the Bible claims wholly unapostolic, assuming it to be that infallible Arbiter of Truth which the Pope and councils pretended to be". This act "makes freedom of private judgment impossible," and invalidates the principle of the priesthood of all believers.

B. /

1 Ibid., On The Historical Depravity of Christianity, p. 8.
2 Ibid., p. 12. Newman was quite disturbed over the relation of the dogmatic principle to academic freedom: "It is then nothing short of tyranny to found institutions for ecclesiastical study and then punish the students as criminals, ejecting them from their positions, their connections and their honourably earned emoluments, if their conclusions militate against the prejudices of the legislature". ("Dr. Lushington's Judgment and Feasible Church Reform", Miscellanea, II, p. 103.)
3 Ibid., "From Luther to Colenso", Miscellanea II, p. 118. In actual fact Luther based religion, not on the Bible, but on the Gospel in the Bible. In his preface to the Epistle of St. James he wrote: "The right testing-stone by which to judge all books is this: to see whether they ply Christ or not... What does not teach Christ, that is not apostolic, even though St. Peter or St. Paul taught it". (Quoted by Cave, op. cit., p. 42.)
B. Further, says Newman, the Reformers imposed on all believers as authoritative certain doctrinal articles which made the Protestant Church occupy an absurd position; that of opposing Popish usurpation while at the same time setting up the imposer of the doctrine as a Pope in all but name. Since the articles could not be questioned or criticized a perfectly normal development followed: "on the one side, schisms and secessions, in spite of persecution; on the other stagnation and conciliation in the residual Church, which submitted tamely on the imposition". Such a development "renders freedom of private action absurd", and negates the central principle of the "kingdom". The church of the future must not "tamper with the primary morality stamped by God in the human heart... It must not be afraid of freedom".

(3) Newman believed that the most serious weakness of the church was: "Its avowed foundation is the miraculous and the exceptional. It commands us, not to look within our hearts, or into human history for the divine, but into one miraculous book and one miraculous history... It represents that God is surely present wherever there is miracle, but that where miracle is not, no one can be sure of the presence of God". Thus, the educated mind has great difficulty in/

1 Newman here admits that this was not the intent of the first Reformers.
2 Ibid., p. 119.
3 Ibid., p. 127.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Ibid., The Religious Weakness of Protestantism, p. 39.
in accepting the faith; however a true religion should become stronger in the
cultivation of mind and increase of wisdom. "The world has yet to wait for
a religion which shall grow stronger and stronger with every development of
sound scientific acquirement."

The only solution is to reject the miraculous as a guide and replace it with right as the law of action in the world.

Out of these weaknesses have developed scandals which continue to
darken the name of Christianity. Newman says that the Thirty Years War
stemmed directly from the sectarian strife between the Lutherans and Calvinists
and that Great Britain was endangered, her very existence imperilled, "by the
attempt to enforce Episcopalianism on Scotland and suppress Puritanism in
England".

However, since the development of a partial spirit of toleration,
many attempts have been made to "establish churches truly catholic". Every
attempt has failed, in Newman's opinion, because of the desire in each case to
found the church catholic on theological "truth"; and at the same time, "the
very point on which good men are at variance is, what is theological truth?
Yet, in spite of vast divergence on matters of doctrine, many are coming to
see that no church can claim a divine right to dictate theological principles
to others".

On the other hand, Newman could visualize thousands of right
thinking men who had learned that "as a matter of convenience separate churches
or sects must exist, yet each sect ought to be in friendly relations with every
other,/

1 Ibid., p. 44.
2 Ibid., Catholic Union; Essays Toward a Church of the Future, p. 1.
3 Ibid., p. 71.)
other, and moreover ought to desire that every other may perfect its best fruits, so that each may learn whatever the other has to teach. This was to be Newman's new foundation for church union:

A moral union in spite of ecclesiastical separations... In spite of re-action towards forms and creeds, the unifying principle of the age seems to be this: the moral is higher than the ecclesiastical. We are learning that right creeds are but means of becoming better men; and that goodness (in the truest sense) is the end proposed; and we have daily proof that persons who agree with us more minutely in their logical creed are by no means always so trustworthy in various virtues as others who differ from us.

Newman was seeking a union of all men who were willing to dedicate themselves to the cultivation of personal virtue. There would be absolutely no religious creeds in this church: "It would embrace Jews, Turks, Arabs, Hindoos, Chinese, - Christians, Theists, Pantheists, and Atheists, whenever they were personally sincere and virtuous." Each group would be at liberty to retain its religious distinctions if it wished, for, in the long run, "in the contact of friendliness, the stronger elements would attract and gradually overpower the weaker, exactly as we see in scientific truth."

Newman/

---

1 F.W. Newman, op. cit., p. 3.
2 Ibid., p. 4.
3 Ibid., p. 5. This leads us to note Newman's peculiar teaching on the doctrine of the Invisible Church: "It is a fact that out of a thousand persons taken at random are more than a few in whom kindness habitually overcomes selfishness; and of these there are some who have consciously and deliberately devoted themselves to the pursuit of all goodness and all virtue, as their reasonable service to God..... Those who in this sense seek to be servants of God..... are (not unjustly) entitled 'the peculiar' people of God and his 'invisible Church'". ("The New Crusades of the Church for the World", Miscellanies, II.
4 Loc. cit.
Newman was convinced that the nineteenth century was the ideal time for the organization of just such a church of human brotherhood. Was not communism itself a cry for a union of this type?

What else are all the Philanthropic movements of this half century... but plain confessions that there is a vast class of duties and doctrines which the state cannot take in hand until public opinion has gone first, and in which the church ought to form and gather public opinion if she could; but she cannot, because she is theological and ecclesiastical, not purely moral. Few Christians are bigoted as to refuse to co-operate with Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics to abate cholera and plague; many have learned to unite against slavery and intemperance. All these are but gropings and first steps in the quest of human brotherhood.\footnote{Ibid., p. 6.}

Thus the emancipation of nationality from the creeds of religious organizations was, in the opinion of Newman, merely a matter of time. The principle could be detected in the rising social consciousness of his age.

Would not every true Christian approve of uniting with those of other faiths in attacking such social evils as slavery? As far as Newman was concerned, this type of union, or church, would be able to care for humanity’s deepest needs. "If it is right voluntarily to associate for the extinction of intemperance, for the introduction of orphans into families, for the shortening of hours of labour... it cannot be wrong in principle... to join in a general society ready to do any or all of these things as the occasion admits."\footnote{Ibid., p. 8.}

However, Newman saw that a serious difficulty stood in the way of accomplishing such a mission. It was generally held that human nature was innately corrupt and that divine intervention was necessary to remove the corruption.\footnote{Some of the views of the natural depravity of man were metaphysically grounded: man has the "substance of sin" within him. Others were psychologically logical. However, the above statement is intended to include both groupings.} He believed this view to be fallacious, and that the re-action of the nation/
nation to slavery as reflected in the anti-slavery movement proved that an
innate sympathy with suffering humanity was an integral factor in human nature;
it needed but "the gathering of many hearts together to wake it into a steady
flame, - the altar-flame for the church of the future".\(^1\) Thus Newman felt
that in starting from the principle of the innate goodness of human nature,
his church would "aid to develop it into what it may be; not accepting political
enactments nor conventional practices nor theological tenants as a final test
of right, but always reaching out towards fuller justice, and through justice to
a more abiding universal and active Good Will".\(^2\)

The Church, Newman says, must be regarded as a human institution.
It is merely a vehicle which carries an ideal. The mistake Christianity has
made in the past has been to lose sight of the ideal by venerating the vehicle.
This ideal, the spirit of social co-operation, must be re-kindled in the affections,
conscience and imagination of men. The forming of the ideal in the imagination
is probably the basic need; for on this the emotions adhere.

Moreover out of reverence for this ideal grows the sense of
duty, and especially the duty of self-sacrifice. To have
an ideal for which we live and die, is the first pre-requisite
for a life which deserves to be called human. If we had none
we should be mere creatures of desire, carried away by it, as
inanimate bodies by attraction or beasts by their momentary
inclinations: the powers of the will would be unexercised,
and there would be no moral persistency. According as the
ideal is worthy or unworthy, the life is beneficial or
pernicious; but in either case it is human, and it is unselfish. Our highest ideal is... a god to us; and if we
devote/

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 8-9.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 9.
devote ourselves to it, we are practical Theists, whatever our creed. He who worships no ideal at all... is the real Atheist.¹

In fact, he insists that the sects provide the best examples of the force of an ideal "which gathers into its focus the energy of many minds".² The sect, though small in numbers, is powerful because of the very intensity of its actions, and its willingness to sacrifice everything to the ideal which drives it.

To make it possible for such a church as he has in mind to come into being, Newman says there "must be principles loved in common, and loved so dearly, as to overcome the repulsion existing between natures and classes of men otherwise different".³ One such principle is that of "unity in Freedom".⁴

It/

---

¹ Ibid., p. 22. Newman believed that such material would replace the material preached by traditional churchmen! The fact is, faith in the social ideal is not necessarily religious faith at all. As Professor Knudson expresses it: "It becomes religious only when human progress is viewed as grounded in man's co-operation with a divine agent. But even when so viewed its importance is easily exaggerated. No doubt the prospective improvement of the external conditions of life is an inspiration to moral activity. It is a stimulus and a guide to Christian love. Love would not be love if it did not seek and rejoice in the opportunity, to better man's lot both in the present and in the future. But religiously it is not man's earthly lot that is the question of ultimate and decisive importance; it is his relation to God now and eternally... Man's eternal hope comes first". (The Doctrine of Redemption, pp. 469-470). Man's social ideal can be properly understood only when it is subordinated to man's hope for eternity.


³ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

⁴ Ibid., p. 27.
It is the peculiarity of man to limit the love of his own liberty to that which is just, to discern that it is just, to desire the same just thing for others, and to love and rejoice in liberty, whenever and wherever it is established because it is just... Hence, this is precisely the virtue, which of all others, is best adapted to make any special organization work smoothly, and save all loss of power by inward discord.  

Union under such a principle may have very little theology in common; however, the moral enthusiasm inspired by love of liberty "is quite an adequate cement of union, if the love be sincere and intelligent and dominant..."  

"Out of such a suggested union Newman was convinced that there would emerge, first, a mutual respect and confidence, community wide; and second, a trust and confidence in the efficacy of the moral principle which unites its members. Once this belief emerges there will follow an effort on the part of the members to co-operate for the good of their fellow-men. This sort of action will inevitably produce "an esteem for the social ideal"."  

Newman had a great deal to say about the relation of such a church to the state. His general position was that the two should be kept independent for the sake of both. The old argument which urged that, since the same individual is/  

---

1 Loc. cit.

2 Ibid., p. 28. Brunner has a different idea: "Any church which, misconstruing what Christian faith and discipleship to Jesus really mean, should decide to bind itself to this Utopian programme, would in two generations or perhaps sooner be reduced to a protesting rump of visionary fanatics." (Quoted by Knudson, Op. cit., p. 468.)

3 Ibid., p. 29.
is a member of both organizations, the two are one essentially, he regarded as
in error. Nothing is more common than for the same men to hold a membership in
several societies which are different in principle. Further, "it is useless to
urge that ministers of state and high councillors ought to be religious men, and
well taught in religion. True, but not better taught than other men. They
were not appointed to their post for the sake of their religious opinions or
character". ¹

The healthy church, as Newman taught, was a valuable supplement to the
state, for it could attend to moral interests and call attention to moral evils
which the state collectively seldom sees. However, the church was not healthy,
and experience had taught the statesmen of England to beware of an ambitious church
whose organization was commensurate with that of the state. For all political
problems have a moral aspect, and thus the state church "is able to thwart the
public authorities very disagreeably". ² Newman had in mind the Anglican Church
and its interference with the statesmen:

If the Statesmen chose to destroy this power, which is certainly
not being used to foster wisdom and truth, they could do so by
giving every faculty to free discussion of tenets and claims in
the Convocation and elsewhere. Its tendency to obstruct and
clog depends on its system of routine and its pre-enacted creed,
which/

¹ Ibid., p. 32.
² Ibid., p. 35.
which at once makes it unable to guide the State into purer Truth and larger Justice, and also dooms it to sink below our statesmen on these very points... No such evils would follow from a truly free church.¹

For in free discussions, minds which are free, and brought together for that common purpose, would search for and find truth and right.

However, as Newman saw the situation in Europe and wherever Protestantism and Catholicism existed, the ideal of freedom was non-existent in the churches. He divided them into two general types: (1) the Hereditary Church, into which members are born. "Obedience, not conviction, is demanded of them".² (2) The Voluntary Church, into which men come by conviction, "or adhere to it feebly from custom. Such churches are founded on a creed which all members profess intelligently to believe".³

THE/

---

¹ Ibid., pp. 36-37. Newman had an unusual basis for his arguments: "Morality is that system of lower truths and sentiments which has already attained the suffrage of mankind at large. Religion (as distinguished from it) is that which, as yet, only higher minds have reached. In strictness, no sentiment or truth can be enforced, since its nature is inward; but even the outward actions connected with religion are unsuited for state compulsion, because the truth has not yet the confirmation of the whole human race. Thus the state rightfully punishes men for frauds, violence and for trading in vice; - things which the conscience of men everywhere condemns; but the state cannot wisely or justly compel citizens to listen to religious teaching with which they disapprove, or forbid their listening to that which they covet. For it cannot be pretended that there is as yet any practical agreement of human nature on what is especially called religious". ("Religious Freedom", Miscellanies, II, p. 59.)

² Ibid., p. 37.

³ Loc. cit.
The former type of church, says Newman, held to a higher type of morality, so long as the state was barbarous. But as the level of civilised statehood arose, the church descended, until "the Church lost all superiority, and fell into ambitious hypocrisy". The latter type of church held creeds "which have never been purely moral or spiritual, and therefore never have been such as all good men could accept."

Thus both types are pernicious in proportion to the intelligence of the Age.

While they did but reflect its general ignorance, blended with their own faith, they were agents of good, with little evil; but when the Age has cast off ignorances which they perpetually stereotype and enforce as divine truth, they become so hurtful that one who sees their error cannot easily be justified in adhering to them.

These churches, Newman felt, were the greatest impediment to the realization of the Kingdom of God.

Thus Newman was convinced that the old churches were "worn out".

Though/

1 Ibid., p. 38.
2 Ibid., p. 39. Newman gives this as his reason for his insistence on radical changes in the church. He believed the time was ripe for what he called a "humanist" church to be organized which would speed up the realization of the "Kingdom" in time. It would remove state-church friction, and also would unite nations together through its cultivation of the principle of universal brotherhood, "and by the very purity of its aim, will gather up into itself the enthusiastic philanthropy of the nations morally most advanced (and) .... realize that good-will among men, for which the heart of the nation aches". (Ibid., p. 57.)

3 Ibid., p. 57.
Though he felt that this fact was widely recognized in his day, he believed that he knew the reason why all attempts to remedy the situation had failed: each had sought to retain some of the old errors which were the original causes for failure. The first of these errors is that of confusing religious dogma with morals. Newman was fond of stating that the man most virtuous was not always that man who had the truest theory of virtue; "hence, however proper it may be for a church to propound, from time to time, its convictions on doctrinal points, it cannot, without becoming sectarian and unjust, impose these as tests of character on its members... To avoid this is to win half the battle."¹

Another grievous error has been the unwarranted distinctions made by every proselytizing religion between members and non-members. "No brotherhood toward those who join your union, more intimate than that which exists toward those who do not join it, must be recognized, or it becomes something... less large than the brotherhood of humanity."²

Finally, the greatest stumbling block in Protestantism has been the errors involved in church organization. Newman devoted a great deal of time in drawing up, in detail, his plan for organizing the "church of the future" in such a manner that it would "attract to our society the purest and freest minds of the Age".³ He insisted that every local division of the Society within any given community be entirely free and self-governed. This was his basic principle: "a central committee may advise and suggest regulations to the local societies, but the latter must judge for themselves... What arrangements would be needed concerning committees, office bearers, and the right of speaking, would remain for leisurely deliberation in forming Bye-laws".⁴ The following seems a fair summary:

---

1 Ibid., p. 57.
2 Ibid., p. 58.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 62.
summary of his plan of organization: (1) Solemnity of spirit must be achieved in every meeting. Thus nothing "pretentious", such as public prayers, would be tolerated. (2) Every meeting must be presided over by a chairman whose chief duty will be to repress "every word of rancour or uncontrolled spirit".  

He shall receive no salary. (3) While questions of convenience may be settled by vote, questions of principle must never be determined in this manner. (4) The rights and forms of address must be properly maintained. In the present system either a few speak to the passive masses, or everyone speaks. The "New Church" will be organized, broadly speaking, as is Parliament, with these restrictions:

A. All which may irritate in debate is forbidden.
B. No sweeping, hostile attacks can be made against anyone. The church must persuade, never seek to destroy.
C. One must not speak on his personal grievances. "In such a union each must leave others to take up his own grievances".
D. Personal controversy is forbidden.
E. No one has an exclusive right to speak, except on points of order or form.

(5) A committee must be elected periodically and freely, whose duty will be to harmonize the forms of address, give those who desire to speak the permission to do so, and control not only those who speak but what is spoken, in accordance with the above restrictions. This committee should "energetically put down those errors and weaknesses which otherwise will make the meetings of the Society unprofitable". (6) Men below the age of 25 and extremely old men should be excluded from participation.

As/

1 Ibid., p. 64.
2 Ibid., p. 67.
3 Ibid., pp. 69-70.
As for doctrine, no creed will be advanced as a test of admittance, for this would merely reproduce "the old phenomena of religious controversy". Since Newman held that every man, consciously or unconsciously, was in direct relationship with God, he believed that "the Church of the Future, if it begin with an earnest morality and devoid of all dogmatism, will inevitably become truly religious in the deepest and truest sense".

However, Newman did not want a moral test creed. He urged that there could be but one fundamental ground of union, one declaration to be required for membership: "that the candidate desires to join our union, not from selfish or ambitious motives, but in the belief that Moral Excellence is the highest Good of Man, and desiring to promote such good, in himself and in others, through Justice and Love". However, this is to be regarded, not as the expression of a doctrine, but as an intention.

Newman recognized the necessity for doctrines in any social union. However, he contended that these doctrines should arise, not from imposition from without, but from clear thinking and free searching for the truth. He believed the following doctrines would grow out of his "Church of the Future".

(1) All churches have held to a distinction between inward goodness and ceremonialism. The Church of the Future will hold to the former and reject the latter.

(2) Many churches hold to the doctrine of the natural depravity of man. On this doctrine are erected those of Infant Baptism and the Atonement. The Church of the Future will reject such doctrines in favour of the belief in the inherent natural goodness of man.

(3)/

1 Ibid., p. 73.
2 Ibid., p. 75.
3 Ibid., p. 76.
(3) The old distinctions between the sacred and the secular, the human and the divine, the natural and the supernatural, etc., will be discarded in favour of the view that they are not in opposition, but are one.

(4) Christian evidences, which made religion depend on historical events, must not be recognized; for once we break loose from traditional creeds grounded in history, we will see that religion has to do solely with the abiding "relations between God and man".¹

Thus, the "New" religion will teach a venerable earth, an improvable world, "a present and unchangingly benevolent God, inward reconciliation of the human heart to Him, a present sphere of affection and exertion, and the evidence of personal insight".²

¹ Ibid., p. 84.
² Loc. cit.
CONCLUSION

In the final analysis we observe in the thought of Francis W. Newman an attempt to formulate into fundamental problems that which traditional religious faith accepts as ultimate convictions. Newman's difficulties at this point grew out of his basal idea of the union of faith and reason in consciousness. However, he saw that from a logical point of view his primal point of departure in seeking truth should be the detailed experience of consciousness if faith and reason have their source in the developing content of mind.

We have seen this idea reflected in Newman's theory of knowledge. At this point we feel compelled to give Newman the place in the history of thought which this research has indicated he should occupy. For there is a direct line of continuity from the thought of Francis W. Newman to the American Pragmatic Movement which originated with C.S. Peirce in 1873. A comparison of Newman's system of thought with that of William James indicates a parallelism so exact that one hesitates to attribute it to historical coincidence, particularly in the light of the fact that James indicates his dependence on Newman in his views on religious experience.¹

For both Newman and James the mind's ideas are not of its own making; but rather they are of its own choosing. At every stage of its development, as shown in the chapter on Newman's teaching about Epistemology, the mind is primarily a selective agent; or, as James expresses it, "a theatre of simultaneous possibilities".² Our sense organs choose to respond to certain stimuli; attention/

¹ See Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 30.
attention causes us to select certain sensations and ignore others; morality basically is the pursuit of one group of interests to the exclusion of others; and, above all, thought is selective. The process of reasoning for Newman is not the determined mechanism of association, but is the way in which ideas are selected by virtue of their pertinent associate value and are discarded by virtue of their pointlessness.  

Newman and James agree that the consciousness does not exist as a substance or entity. It is purely functional. Further, the faculties, or elements, which become the content of the mind are regarded by both men as the same elements, in differing relationships, which comprise physical nature. James and Newman alike make this view one of the important bases for their respective systems.

Newman taught that an idea arises first in consciousness as a method of conceiving the thing thought about for some practical use to which the object is being or is to be put. The truth of the idea is determined, (in the "first Harmony", as Newman phrases it) by the degree to which the thinker is enabled to control the object so as to reach the desired end. This method of approach is typically pragmatic, and is precisely what James refers to as defining truth in terms of fruitfulness and satisfaction, conditioned by the environment and by the interests which initiated the idea.

For both Newman and James those religious ideas are true which satisfy the demands which gave them birth. Thus, we found Newman regarding sin as a barrier to the improvement of character, or that which interferes with the natural development of consciousness. Religion, like Knowledge, has to do with the reaction.

1 See William James, Ibid., Vol. I., pp. 286-290 for a restatement of this view.
2 William James, Essays in Radical Empiricism, I. p. 140.
3 See William James, Pluralistic Universe, pp. 322-323.
4 William James, The Meaning of Truth, pp. 192, F.F.
reaction of man to his environment, and since Newman further held that the divine
and the natural are identical in consciousness, the idea of the supernatural is
unnecessary and false. Thus the traditional idea of sin has no true meaning
for Newman.

Since religious beliefs rest on the satisfaction of demands, Newman
and James regard the acceptance of such beliefs as acts of faith. Faith for
them means belief in something which could be false inasmuch as the evidence is
not conclusive. Yet the believer is willing to act as if no further proof is
necessary. As James states it: "faith is the readiness to act in a cause the
prosperous issue of which is not certified to us in advance".¹

Though Newman appears to be very close in thought to William James
we cannot take the further step and assert that James was directly influenced by
Newman. All we can say at this point with any assurance is that Newman influenced
James in his views on religious experience. However, we can safely assert that
in the history of Thought, Newman rightfully belongs among the thinkers who paved
the way for the Pragmatic Movement in America.

It is to be regretted that the pictorial and dramatic characteristics
of Newman's style have found small space in this work, for his style gave his
thinking a far more adequate expression than we have been able to accomplish here.
However, we believe that the basic fundamentals of the thought of Francis W. Newman
have been presented. In retrospect we have seen Newman in his own peculiar field
of study, namely, the lot of mankind. On his one hand stands the world, completely
indifferent to human volition, making room only for what conforms to it. On his
other/

¹ William James, The Will to Believe, p. 90.
other hand stands man who, once he has learned to adapt himself to his environment, finds it to be an inexhaustible field of possibilities. Man overcomes the world by knowing it and acting in accordance with this knowledge. In this manner he moulds the world to his purposes. But these seemingly dual operations are but the inseparable parts of one activity through which a moralized world is derived from primitive chaos. In this way man works out his salvation.

Francis W. Newman had a courageous desire to banish illusions from the minds of his contemporaries. This was perhaps the chief interest of his life. In addition, he had a positive feeling for humanly important problems. He ever sought answers to questions occasioned by the exigencies of life. And where certainty was impossible he offered the way of faith.

His originality lay in the freshness of his perceptions and in an imagination freed from convention and tradition. Thus was he enabled to concentrate on the actual world spread out before him. It is impossible to separate his intellectual powers from his character as we study his life and teachings. He was endowed with shrewdness and a child-like directness which led him straight to the heart of a problem. He had no purposes which he sought to keep hidden, no prerogatives of which he was jealous. For this reason he was able to counsel with his students and meet his friends with a natural simplicity which inspired confidence and trust. In retrospect we can but repeat the words of the Reverend J. Temperley Grey: "Piety was woven into every fibre of his being".¹

¹ From the Rev. Mr. Grey's address at the funeral of Francis Newman.
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