

BLACKFRIARS

and thankfulness.' But if there is a pragmatic argument for all that is 'Catholic' in the movement, there is also a pragmatic argument against all that is distinctively 'Anglo' which indicates that 'not within Anglicanism can the divinely appointed goal and fulfilment of the movement be attained, and that, in so far as it persists in being *Anglo-Catholic* it mistakes its providential purpose.' It is an empirical fact, to which converts bear unanimous witness and which Anglo-Catholics not seldom acknowledge or betray, that there is much half-conscious unrest, uneasiness and misgiving among them regarding both the Catholicity of their Church and the validity of their Orders. (A 'Romanist' may indeed feel difficulties about the truth of Catholicism; but he can never question the Catholicism of 'Romanism.' There is no Anglo-Catholic but has entertained misgivings about the Catholicism of Anglicanism, loyally as he may 'censor' his misgivings and relegate them to the sub-conscious.) The Anglo-Catholic Movement is *essentially* a movement, a tendency and not a completed entity; and it must be judged by the efficiency with which it pursues its objective. To the extent that it is for its members a transition towards Catholicism it is showered with divine blessings; to the extent that it deviates from its real purpose it is necessarily a source of uneasiness and dissatisfaction to the Catholic aspirations of its adherents. The moral seems to be that the Catholic apostle should recognise gladly all that is good and supernatural in the movement as a testimony to the Faith, but at the same time strive to induce the Anglo-Catholic to face boldly his secret misgivings, to analyse their source, and to open his eyes to the overwhelming historical and theological case against distinctively *Anglo-Catholic* claims.

V.W.

THE LIGHT THAT FAILED. Reflections on the Oxford Movement.
By J. C. Hardwick. (Basil Blackwell; 1/-).

Mr. Hardwick's pamphlet should be read by all who realise or seek to realise the significance of the Oxford Movement. It is curious that although we are in agreement with a number of his conclusions few of his premisses can be accepted without reservation. Yet he possesses high talent as a debater, and making his points clearly and emphatically, he inevitably stimulates his readers, if only to opposition. Thus we would agree that the whole movement benefited by the opportune death of Mr. Rose and the slow dissolution of the Hadleigh group, but Dr. Pusey's influence is dismissed too summarily. The Anglo-Catholic apostolate among the poor seems quite unduly depreciated and the passage on Newman's theory of development and the

REVIEWS

Edwardine modernists suggests a wide miscomprehension of recent Catholic history; a fresco-painter of the *seicento* would have shown Newman's cardinalate as the official apotheosis of his teaching, and we must look among modern Catholic theologians for the legitimate heirs to his thought.

On more fundamental issues we note the same recurring divergence and agreement between Mr. Hardwick's standpoint and our own. It is probably true that Newman's latent liberalism was in part responsible for his secession, there was always a dynamic quality in his thinking; Dr. Pusey's thought was more static and he stayed where he was. Yet we cannot accept the underlying thesis, the antithesis between authority and individual liberty, they are necessary complements rather than possible alternatives.

G.M.

The Tractarian Series. (Philip Allan; 6/-.)

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. By Frank Leslie Cross. Pp. 182.

JOHN KEBLE. By Kenneth Ingram. Pp. 184.

PUSEY. By Leonard Prestige. Pp. 174.

Of the lives of the three leaders of the Tractarian Movement here under review, that of Newman by Dr. Cross of Pusey House is at once the most original and the most open to criticism. In it a new theory is put forward to account for Newman's conversion, a theory which involves the contention that the *Apologia* though accurate in detail is fundamentally misleading in its whole staging of the story, because it places intellectual difficulties in the forefront of discussion whereas the dominant motive for Newman's change was a psychological one. It appears to us that Dr. Cross puts forward strangely little evidence to support his theory. He classes Newman as belonging to Nietzsche's *Ressentiment* type, and tells us that this element alone in his character accounts for many incidents in his life—including his conversion. The Church of England, after the affair of Tract XC, disowned him. His temperament would not allow him to raise his voice in self defence, and so he took refuge in an act of retaliation of the *ressentiment* kind. He retired to Littlemore, and ultimately disowned the Church that had disowned him. The proof of this appears to lie mainly in the fact that there is very little in the way of sustained theological reasoning either in his correspondence or in his written works between 1841 and 1845. It is a little surprising to find Dr. Cross making the quite bald statement that no one could derive from the Doctrine of Development