

either on the one side or on the other, by prescription or by convention, and shall pronounce, in praise or in blame, not according to probable public expectation, but only according to the perceived and perceivable reason existing in the particular case.

Cardinal Newman first attracted public attention as a preacher. His later fame was that of a writer; but his sermons still constitute a very important part of his published production. These, in fact, may be considered to have attained a distinction rare for sermons, that of challenging for themselves a commanding place in standard English literature. Exceptional double fame like this, undeniably Newman's, makes it fit that he, though only by virtue of being an eminent preacher brought within the view of the present series of critical papers, should yet, by exception, be treated here primarily as a literary man.

It is a great satisfaction to the critic constitutionally desirous of concurring rather than of differing, to be able to begin by according at once to this eminent writer, and according in full measure, the supreme literary virtue of thorough-going genuineness in style. Newman's style is the pure and perfect mirror of the man himself. To the critically observant reader, it is a matter of self-evidence that it reflects the writer's thought, his feeling, his temper, his character, without obscuration, without exaggeration, without distortion. His style itself is, in a sense, Newman's true autobiography.

The man thus revealed in Newman's style is a high, clear, brave, loyal, strenuous, intent, unworldly nature, penetrated with religion; but with a nature narrow, intense, with the intensity proper to narrowness, and having imagination or fancy in such ascendant proportion to reason, or rather in such a sort, as to constitute it a virtual flaw in the soundness of the judging mind.

The style that holds a faithful mirror up to such a nature must necessarily have great excellences, but, as I have intimated, the capital excellence of Newman's style consists in its consummate fidelity to what it had to represent, that is, in its genuineness. Of course, in one sense, and that an important sense, every style is, by the unescapable necessity of things, doomed to represent the author who writes in it exactly such as he is. It may be an affected style, but, if so, it only shows the author to be capable of affectation, and not superior to it; it may be a showy style, but then it exhibits the author truly, as one willing to pass for all that he is, and perhaps for something more; it may be an involved style, but then it simply reflects the encumbered and partly ineffectual movement of the author's mind; and so on, through all the possible vices or virtues of literary expression.

Obviously, it is not in this sense that I predicate genuineness, that is, fidelity in expression to the thing to be expressed, of Newman's