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"Heu prisca fides!"—VIRGIL.

CARDINAL NEWMAN! The combination sounds inharmonious to an Anglican ear. Dr. J. H. Newman, the classical scholar, the eloquent and elegant writer, the hermit of the Oratory, is promoted to the princely degree of Cardinal of the Roman Church. In secular matters promotion usually goes by seniority, or is conferred for some exceptional services performed. But in the Roman Church such considerations, it seems, are not taken into account. Wordly policy guides her choice. There are many Roman priests in England, Scotland, and Ireland who have superior claims to promotion. What has Dr. Newman performed to merit the high distinction conferred on him? We fail to discover. No individual has written more pertinently, more forcibly, more bitterly, at the same time more truthfully, against the errors of Romanism, and against the system as a dangerous and deceitful Polity, than did Dr. Newman. On his transferring his allegiance to the Roman Church he had to repudiate all he had publicly taught, and to vindicate his change of religion he published his book on the "Doctrine of Development." Under cover of this theory alone could he, as a scholar, well read in ecclesiastical literature, have repudiated all that he had advanced in condemnation of Rome and her theological system. In no other way could he justify his defection from his mother Church. He had to unsay and repudiate his emphatic declaration, publicly made:—

"No man can justly blame me for honouring my spiritual mother, the Church of England, in whose womb I was conceived, at whose breast I was nourished, and in whose bosom

He paid the following just tribute to the divines of the Church of England:—"The most vigorous, the clearest, the most fertile minds, have, through God's mercy, been employed in the service of our Church; minds, too, as reverential and holy, and as fully imbued with ancient Truth, and as well versed in the writings of the Fathers, as they were intellectually gifted. This is God's great mercy indeed, for which we must ever be thankful."—Ibid., p. 30.

He was fully convinced that "Anglican doctrine was the strongest, nay, the only possible antagonist to the Roman system, and if Rome is to be withstood it could be done in no other way." He tells us also that "viewed politically, Protestantism is at this day the rallying point of all that is loyal and high-minded in the nation."—P. v.

It is, however, important to note that this book on the "Development of Christian Doctrine"—the greased plank which, as he informs us, irresistibly landed him into Romanism—cuts away the very foundation on which the whole Trent decrees and canons were based in support of Rome's doctrines. The theory of Development is in direct contradiction of the reiterated assertions of the assembled divines, whose repeated declaration was that each separate dogma, defined and enforced as an article of faith, by anathemas, was proved by Scripture, and held and taught from the beginning by the Apostles. Whereas Dr. Newman, while admitting that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity existed equally in the Anglican as in the Roman Church, now asserts under this new theory that the several distinctive doctrines of the Roman Church were natural developments of anterior dogmas which are alleged to have foreshadowed as it were the perfection of Christianity, as subsequently embodied in the present code, summarised in the Pian Creed of the sixteenth century. The same developing theory is still at work, and has produced the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Personal Infallibility of the Pope.

This theory of Development was gladly received by those whose previous studies had pointed out the absolute fact that Rome had built up her theological system from time to time by engrafting novelties on the old stem. This was really the
only solution of the difficulty. On the other hand, the old Conservative element in other quarters broke forth in undisguised indignation at this absolute surrender to the clamour of Reformers, whose goal was “THE OLD PATH.” By this section of the Roman communion Dr. Newman was proclaimed a heretic acting the part of a Jesuit!—Tablet, September 11, 1852.

The work on Development, when completed, Dr. Newman offered for the approval or otherwise of his newly-adopted Church. She wisely refused to take the responsibility of acknowledging it. It is not, however, officially censured. Dr. Newman was a great prize, and was to be accepted at any price, notwithstanding his heretical opinions. His alleged Jesuitry might be deemed a recommendation. The book itself, nevertheless, was a huge mistake; and if report be true, the writer was not allowed to ventilate his theological aberrations, lest he should again break out with some startling and awkward admissions. He had no other course to adopt than to shut himself up in his Oratory, where, so far as the public have been benefited, he has led a useless and unprofitable life. In turn, Dr. Newman had to repudiate his cherished theory of Development. His theological career has, in fact, been a series of repudiations. It is not at all improbable, under the circumstances, that this promotion is but a drugged sop thrown out to quiet a restless spirit.

But listen to Dr. Newman’s excuse for this repudiation. “That work,” he now tells us (“Apologia,” p. 161), “I believe I have not read since I published it, and I doubt not at all that I have made many mistakes in it, partly from my ignorance of the details of doctrine, as the Church of Rome holds them.” Not that he was ignorant of Romish doctrines in themselves, but how they are held or accepted by the Roman Church. Dr. Newman, in his “Lectures,” from which I have so largely quoted below, displayed a most intimate and thorough knowledge of all the phases of the controversy between us and Rome. To assert, therefore, that he was ignorant of the details of doctrine as held by the Church of Rome, as an excuse or apology for his present repudiation of a work which he informed us at the time of its publication was the irresistible cause of his change, is most disingenuous, if not based on
actual falsehood, and will not pass current as a valid reason for the repudiation.

His Eminence's promotion has excited almost as much interest as did his change of Creed. And here again we may profitably quote another of his memorable sayings, which we find in his "Apologia," pp. 367-8.

"Persons and things look great at a distance, which are not so when seen close,"

And applying this to himself, he adds:—

"Did we know him we could see that he was one about whom there has been far more talk for good or bad than he deserves, and about whose movements far more expectation has been raised than the event will justify."

Our estimate of Dr. Newman's conduct and startling repudiations of his solemnly declared opinions will fully establish his own estimate of his own character. Nor indeed is he now a free agent in action or thought. He has bound himself hand and foot, soul and body, to the Roman Jugger- naut, for he has told us (see Tablet, Sept. 1'i, 1852):—

"This I trust I may say, that if there be a man in the whole Church who from faith, obedience, and love towards her would rejoice and exult in sacrificing any opinion of his own at the bidding of his Ecclesiastical Superiors (if I dare speak of myself), I am the man."

This charming humility may be very captivating—to weak minds—but it lacks "the bold spirit in a loyal breast." Any one who could make such a degrading confession must be devoid of all self-respect, with an entire renunciation of his manhood.

Was it, then, at the bidding of his superior that Dr. Newman has, as we shall presently see, been acting a double part, deceiving his hearers, when he stood forth as a champion of the Anglican Church against the attacks of Rome, exposing the "vicious" and "soul-destroying" system of Romanism? Is it possible that Dr. Newman could stoop so low as deliberately, at the dictation of his Superior, to act a double part, and then as deliberately put the admission in print? That he practised a mental reservation when he attacked "the common adversary," Rome, he himself acknowledges, as we shall pre-
sently see. If an inference is to be drawn against him, he has invited it.

To trace back Dr. Newman's public career to his association with the "Tracts for the Times." Of the Church of Rome in Tract XV. he wrote:—

"True, Rome is heretical now—nay, grant she has thereby forfeited her Orders; yet at least she was not heretical in the primitive ages. If she has apostatised, it was at the time of the Council of Trent. Then, indeed, it is to be feared, the whole Roman Communion bound itself, by a perpetual bond and covenant, to the cause of Antichrist."

In Tract XX. he wrote:—"The Roman commune is infected with heresy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in place of God's truth, and by their claim to immutability in Doctrine cannot undo the sin they have committed."

In Tract XXXVIII. he used the following epithets as applied to certain doctrines of the Roman Church:—"Unscriptural, profane, impious, bold, unwarranted, blasphemous, gross, monstrous, cruel, administering deceitful comfort, and unauthorised!"

These Tracts were first issued in 1833-34. Dr. Newman admitted the authorship of these particular Tracts in the "Advertisement" to his "Essay on Development." In 1837 he published his "Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church," wherein he says that not being Romanists, we are bound on several accounts to show that we are not Romanists, and how we differ from them; protesting "that the main object in discussion should be not to refute error, but to establish truth." It must be admitted that he took the most effectual and emphatic means of proving that Romanism is a novelty, a fraud, and a hideous abortion.

The scandal arising from the more than doubtful expressions used in some of the later Tracts, particularly in Tract XC. (1836), from the pen of Dr. Newman, "On certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles," that he deemed it necessary to repel the charge of being a Romanist in disguise, which it was considered his then writings warranted; accordingly he tells us that these "Lectures, as far as their very form goes, were chiefly written against Romanism, though
their main object was not controversy, but edification."—P. 8.

That he succeeded in vindicating himself from the charge of being a Romanist, the reader must admit if we accept his utterances as his real opinions. But if it should transpire that he was all along not uttering his own opinions, but merely echoing the generally accepted view of Anglican Divines in their controversy with Rome, and delivered merely as a cloak to disguise his real religious opinions entertained at this very time, in order to repel the charge brought in accusation against him,—if that be so, we become bewildered at the boldness and daring of a Minister of the Gospel who could hold forth before an audience such sentiments, and republish them, and now deliberately tell us that what he had said was with a mental reservation, in order to approve himself to persons he respected, and as necessary for his position; and that he was not, in fact, expressing his own opinions.

My present object is to record here what were Dr. Newman's publicly expressed religious opinions, as set forth in these Lectures, touching the Roman system; bearing in mind what he has said in his "Apologia," that "the departure from any given belief is a slur upon the man who has felt so certain about it." The following are but a few samples of the many passages we find in his "Lectures," and I take them according to their order as we meet them, without classifying the subjects:—

"Romanism supplies a doctrine, but as we conceive, an untrue one."—P. 8.

"The true voice of revelation has been overpowered by the mere clamorous traditions of men."—P. 3.

"Before Germany had become Rationalistic and Geneva Socinian, Romanism might be considered as the most dangerous corruption of the Gospel."—P. 23.

"We agree with the sectaries around us so far as this, to be ready to take their ground, which Romanists cannot and will not do, to believe that our Creed can be proved entirely, and to be willing so to prove it solely, from the Bible. We are willing to argue with them with texts; they may feel the force or not; we may convince them or not, but we convince ourselves; we do confute them with the weapon they have assumed as their own, and we know we do; and we are able to convince and convert others by means of it, though not
them; which proves its cogency in our use of it. We have joined issue with them, and done all that can be done.”—P. 36.

“We rely on Antiquity to strengthen such intimations of doctrine as are but faintly, though really, given in Scripture. Romanists do not appeal to Scripture unconditionally; they are not willing to stand or fall by mere arguments from Scripture; and therefore if we take Scripture as our ground of proof in our controversies with them, we have not joined issue with them.”—P. 37.

“Romanists have to show not only that there was such a traditionary system, and that it has lasted to this day, but that their peculiarities are parts of it.”—P. 42.

“How, then, are we to meet the Romanists, seeing we cannot join issue with them, or cut short the controversy, by a mere appeal to Scripture? We must meet them, and may do so fearlessly, on the ground of Antiquity, to which they betake themselves. We follow the Protestants’ challenge, in arguing from mere Scripture in our defence; we must not, and need not, shrink from the invitation of the Romanist to stand or fall by Antiquity. Truth alone is consistent with itself; we are willing to take either the test of Antiquity or of Scripture.”—P. 47. “We do not deny the force of Tradition in the abstract; we do not deny the soundness of the argument from Antiquity; but we challenge the Romanist to prove the matter of fact. We deny that his doctrines are in Antiquity any more than they are in the Bible; and we maintain that his professed Tradition is not really such—that it is a Tradition of men, that it is not continuous, that it stops short of the Apostles, that the history of its introduction is known.* On both accounts, then, his doctrines are innovations, because they run counter to the doctrine of Antiquity, and because they rest upon what is historically an upstart Tradition.”—P. 48.

“Our controversy with Romanists turns more upon facts—the very force of the word corruption implies this to be the peculiarity of Romanism. All error indeed, of whatever kind, may be called a corruption of truth; still, we properly apply the term to such kinds of error as are not denials but perversions, distortions, or excesses of it. Such is the relation of Romanism towards Catholicity. It is the misdirection and abuse, not the absence of right principle.”—P. 51.

* See “Novelties of Romanism” (Religious Tract Society), wherein the dates and circumstances of the introduction of every doctrine and custom of the Roman Church are given by me.
"We Anglicans do not profess a different religion from the Romanists; we profess their faith all but their corruptions." —P. 53.

"That there is in Romanism something very unchristian I fully admit, or rather maintain." —P. 54.

"Romanism—viewed indeed in action, and as realised in its present partisans—is but one of the many denominations which are a disgrace of our age and country." —P. 56.

"The reproach of the present Romanists is that they are inconsistent; and it is a reproach which is properly felt to be just." —P. 56.

"The principles professed by both parties (Anglicans and Romanists) are at once the foundation of our own theology, and what is called an argumentum ad hominem against theirs. They profess to appeal to primitive Christianity; we honestly take their ground as holding it ourselves; but when the controversy grows animated, and descends into details, they suddenly leave it and desire to finish the dispute on some other field." —P. 59.

"Whatever principles they profess in theory, resembling or coincident with our own, yet when they come to particulars, when they have to prove this or that article of their Creed, they supersede the appeal to Scripture and Antiquity by the pretence of the Infallibility of the Church, thus solving the whole question by a summary and final interpretation both of Antiquity and to Scripture." —P. 60.

"In the Creed of Pope Pius not a word is used expressly about the Church's infallibility; it forms no Article of Faith there." —P. 61.

"Romanism, which even in its abstract system must be considered a perversion or distortion of the truth, is in its actual and public manifestation a far more serious error. It is, then, a disproportionate, a monstrous development of a theory in itself extravagant." —P. 61.

In reading the following extracts from the same "Lectures" published in 1837 by Dr. Newman while professedly in the Anglican Church, we cannot but be impressed with his earnest determination in expressing his conviction—and no one was more competent to give an opinion on the subject—that Romanism was wholly incompatible with the teaching of the Fathers, and in exposing the shifts and excuses to which Romanists are put when brought face to face with their testimony. When the reader has fully appreciated the force and
effect of the next seven paragraphs, let him turn back and judge of the sincerity of the following assertion which Dr. Newman wrote in 1866 while a Priest in the Roman Church, in a letter addressed to Dr. Pusey on the publication of his then recent “Eirenikon.” Dr. Pusey had given very extensive quotations from the writings of the Fathers on the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith. Dr. Newman at bay thus retorts (in pages 27, 28) :—“Hopeless as Dr. Pusey may consider it, I am not ashamed to declare that I will take my stand upon the Fathers, and do not mean to budge.” He adds:—“The history of these times is not yet an old almanac to me.” The Fathers, he says, made him “Catholic,” and he is not now going to kick down the ladder by which he alleged he ascended into the Church. Was Dr. Newman here again writing truthfully, or under mental reservation? for he tells us in the “Lectures” under consideration that—

“They (Romanists) extol the Fathers as a whole, and disparage them individually; they call them one by one Doctors of the Church, yet they explain away one by one their arguments, judgment, and testimony. They refuse to combine their separate and coincident statements; they take each by himself, and settle with the first before they go on to the next. And thus their boasted reliance on the Fathers comes at length to this,—to identify Catholicity with the Decrees of Councils, and to admit those Councils only which the Pope has confirmed.”—P. 71.

“Romanist, heretic, and infidel unite with one another in denying the orthodoxy of the first centuries; just as at this moment the same three parties are banded together to oppose ourselves.”—P. 74.

“The Fathers are only so far of use in the eyes of Romanists as they prove the Roman doctrines, and in no sense are allowed to interfere with the conclusions which their Church has adopted; that they are of authority when they seem to agree with Rome, of none if they differ.”—P. 53.

“How useless then is it to contend with Romanists, as if they practically agreed to our foundations, however much they pretend to it! Ours is Antiquity, theirs the existing church.”—P. 85.

“According to the avowed or implied conviction of their most eminent Divines, there is much actually to censure in the writings of the Fathers, much that is positively hostile to the Roman system.”—P. 97.
"Enough has been said to show the hopelessness of our prospects in the controversy with Rome. We have her own avowal that the Fathers ought to be followed, and again that she does not follow them; what more can we require than her witness against herself which is here supplied us? If such inconsistency is not at once fatal to her claims, which it would seem to be, at least it is a most encouraging omen in our contest with her."—P. 99.

"As far as it is Catholic and Scriptural, it (Romanism) appeals to the Fathers; as far as it is a corruption, it finds it necessary to supersede them. Viewed in its formal principles and authoritative statements, it proposes to be the champion of past times; viewed as an active political power, as a ruling, grasping, ambitious principle—in a word, what is expressly called Popery—it exalts the will and pleasure of the existing Church above all authority, whether of Scripture or Antiquity, interpreting the one and disposing of the other by its absolute and arbitrary decree. We must take and deal with things as they are, not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances towards her as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relative, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within their reach. No; dismissing the dreams which the remembrance of early Church history and the high theory of Catholicity will raise in the mind, let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief when she can. In saying and acting on this conviction, we need not depart from Christian charity towards her. We must deal with her as we would towards a friend who is visited by derangement; in great affliction, with all affectionate tender thoughts, with tearful regret and a broken heart, but still with a steady eye and a firm hand. In truth, she is a Church beside herself, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are; or, rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac. Thus she is her real self only in name, and, till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were that evil one which governs her" (p. 101).

"Of this evil system the main tenet is the Church's Infallibility."—P. 102.

"Romanism, by its pretence of Infallibility, lowers the standard and quality of Gospel obedience, as well as imparts its mysterious character, and this in various ways."—P. 121.

"If, indeed, there is one offence more than the rest characteristic of Romanism, it is this—its indulging the
carnal tastes of the multitude of men, setting a limit to their necessary obedience, and absolving them from the duty of sacrificing their whole lives to God. And this serious deceit is in no small degree the necessary consequence of that completeness and minuteness in its theology to which the doctrine of Infallibility gives rise."—P. 124.

"Surely I may assert without breach of charity, that the Papist would under circumstances destroy the Fathers’ writings, as he actually does disparage their authority,—just as he consents to cut short dispute, by substituting the Vulgate for the original inspired Text, and by lodging the gift of Infallibility in the Pope rather than in a General Council."—P. 131.

"Romanism, though claiming for the Church the gift of Infallibility, cannot tell us how individuals are to know for certain that it is infallible; nor in the next place where the gift resides, supposing it to have been vouchsafed. It neither determines who or what is infallible, or why."—P. 146.

"They can determine in theory the nature, degree, extent, and object of the Infallibility which they claim; they cannot agree among themselves where it resides. As in the building of Babel, the Lord hath confounded their language; and the structure stands half-finished, a monument at once of human daring and its failure."—P. 150.

"The Church of Rome is a political power; and if she stunts and distorts growth of the soul in spiritual excellence, it is because, whether unconsciously or not, she has in view political objects, visible fruits, temporal expediency, the power of influencing the heart, as the supreme aim and scope of her system."—P. 127.

We might multiply such extracts, of which the above are fair samples. Dr. Newman was equally decided in his condemnation of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish Church. One or two instances will suffice.

With reference to the Roman doctrine of Purgatory he says:

"All Protestants are sufficiently alive to the seriousness of this error" (p. 209); and he insists "that there is no Catholic tradition for Purgatory in early times, and that instead of it certain texts of Scripture interpreted by individuals [all which he had examined and refuted] were put forward as proof of the doctrine."—P. 217. And after quoting at large the well-known repudiation by Pope Gregory I. of the title of "Universal Bishop," and its assumption by any single Bishop to be the forerunner of Antichrist, and after giving a full explanation of the various texts usually quoted on this claim
of Supremacy, he concludes his seventh Lecture with a warning to "those whom it concerns to be cautious how they countenance a procedure [that is, forcing texts of Scripture] which has not only led to Arianism, but to tenets which Protestants of every denomination will agree in condemning —Purgatory and the Pope's Supremacy."

The dogmas of Purgatory and the Invocation of Saints (supposed to be in Heaven) involves the various theories, propounded from the earliest times, of the state after death. On this head Dr. Newman quotes the observations of the Benedictine Editors of the works of Bishop Ambrose in the Admonit. in Libr. de Bono Mortis. "The following passage (he writes) occurs in this introduction to one of the works of St. Ambrose, on occasion of that Father making some statements at variance with the present Roman views of the intermediate state:—'It is not indeed wonderful that Ambrose should have written in this way concerning the state of souls; but what seems almost incredible is the uncertainty of the holy Fathers on the subject, from the very times of the Apostles to the Pontificate of Gregory XI. and the Council of Florence*; that is, for almost the whole of fourteen centuries—for they not only differ from one another, as ordinarily happens in such questions before the Church has defined, but they are even inconsistent with themselves, sometimes all wrong, sometimes denying to the same souls the enjoyment of the clear vision of the Divine Nature.' It may be asked, How is it the fault of the Benedictines if the Fathers are inconsistent with each other and with themselves on any point; and what harm there is in stating the fact, if it is undeniable? But my complaint with them [the Romanists] would be on a different ground, viz., that they profess to know better than the Fathers; that they, or rather the religious system which they are bound to follow, consider questions to be determinable on which the early Fathers were ignorant,

* The Council of Florence (A.D. 1439) was the first Council that took upon itself to give a dogmatic decision on this vexed question, which, as Veron in "Rule of Catholic Faith" (Waterworth's Translation, Birmingham, 1833, p. 82) tells us, "has since been decided in the affirmative by the Council of Florence, namely, whether the souls of the blessed are received in Heaven, and enjoy the clear vision of God before the resurrection and the last day of final judgment." The italics in the text are Dr. Newman's.
and suppose the Church is so absolutely the author of one faith, that what the Fathers did not believe we must believe under pain of forfeiting heaven. Whether Rome be right or wrong, this instance contains an acknowledgment as far as it goes, that her religion is not that of the Fathers.”—Pp. 78-79.

It will be perceived that at this time (1837) Dr. Newman had not conceived the theory of Development of Doctrines.

In order to impress upon his hearers and readers the sincerity of his boldly-expressed convictions thus unmistakably given, he laid it down as a moral maxim:—“No rule of secrsery [that is the law of mental reservation] could lead honest men to make statements diametrically opposed to their real belief” (p. 97). In his subsequent official announcement, however, on his joining the Roman Church, he repudiated all that he had said or written against the Church. Not that it had pleased God to enlighten his mind and understanding to enable him to see the errors of his former convictions, and that he was now convinced that he had been labouring under a delusion.* On the contrary, he clearly and deliberately and repeatedly informs us that “the obstacles he had spoken of as laying in the way of communion with the Church of Rome were destitute of solid foundation, the supposed difficulties he considers himself now bound to avow were merely imaginary”—that in passing over from one Church to the other he “experienced no change whatever,” although “dogma had always been his stronghold; what he believed in 1816 he believed in 1833 (when a don of Oxford) he believed in 1864,” when he was safely housed in his Oratory. All that he had said and written against the Church of Rome, he now avows, was with a mental reservation, and that he was not uttering his own sentiments, but what he said was in order to repel a charge brought against

* When Cranmer was accused of inconsistency for renouncing the errors of Romanism, how very different was his reply: “After it had pleased God to show unto me by his word a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of him by little and little, I put away my former ignorance. And as God of his mercy gave me light, so through His Grace I opened my eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God and remain in darkness. And I trust in God’s mercy and pardon for my former errors, because I erred but of frailness and ignorance.” (Quoted by Todd in his “Vindication of Cramer,” 1826, p. 13).
him of being a Romanist in disguise; and all this he tells us was passing in his mind at the very time he expressed himself most forcibly against Romanism, as we have seen. I give his repudiation and explanation in his own words:—

"I said to myself, I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a concensus of the divines of my Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say I am safe. Such views too are necessary for our position. Yet I have reason to fear still that such language is to be ascribed in no small measure to an impetuous temper, a hope of approving myself to persons I respect, and a wish to repel the charge of Romanism." — Development of Christian Doctrine, p. 9, London, 1845; and "Apologia pro vià suà," p. 128, London, 1864.

In fact he was (as he candidly informs us in his "Apologia," p. 210), doing the work of the "Devil's Advocate." That is, as I understand the term, practically engaged to betray his own client.

Such an acknowledgement may find a ready justification in the code of moral theology of the Roman Church, under the head of mental reservation, but among honest men his conduct would receive its appropriate designation.

"Has God any need of your falsehood that you should speak deceitfully for Him?" (Job xii. 7, Douay version).

And this is the individual who is deemed worthy to be promoted to the highest place of honour in a Church he had so vigorously vilified, and to be lauded and congratulated by leading laymen of that communion!

Neither in his "Apologia," nor in his "History of his Religious Opinion," has Dr. Newman advanced one single argument, document, or fact to nullify, counteract, or even to explain away the grave charges he had deliberately brought against Romanism either as a political or religious system.

* * On transmission to the Author, 23 Lincolns-Inn Fields, London, of six penny stamps, three copies will be forwarded by post in return.
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