

that are intellectual or literary. Of the qualities thus begotten in Newman, may be named lucidity and simplicity. Such lucidity and such simplicity as spring from genuineness and earnestness, Newman's style undoubtedly possesses in a high degree.

But—but—now a serious question. That question is, "Beyond the mark just indicated, how much may justly and wisely be attributed to Newman in the way of lucidity and simplicity?" Has he the lucidity and the simplicity of exercised and disciplined art? Critics generally say, or imply, "Yes." Or else they are "very bold" and attribute a lucidity and a simplicity far transcending art, a lucidity and a simplicity, therefore, able to dispense with art. I cannot agree.

First, whatever merit of lucidity is fairly Newman's must be reconciled with such sentences as the following—and sentences approximately such are not very infrequent in his works (I call attention with italics):

"*They* [the 'originators' of the Anglo-Catholic party] put forth views and principles for *their* own sake, because *they* were true, as if *they* were obliged to say *them* ['say' 'views and principles']; and, as *they* might be *themselves* surprised at *their* [own] earnestness in uttering *them*, *they* had as great cause to be surprised at the success which attended *their* propagation [dissemination? promulgation?]."

(The "success" in question could hardly be said to "attend" the "propagation" of the "views and principles" alluded to; the "propagation," if that result occurred, would itself constitute the "success.") Surely, writing ideally lucid does not deal in a distraction of pronouns like that exemplified in the sentence just quoted. The quotation is from the *Apologia*, p. 76.

Again, whatever simplicity may justly be credited to Newman's style must be reconciled with be-*which*-ed sentences like the following, not uncharacteristic of this author's ordinary manner; the autobiographer quotes from himself (*Apologia*, pp. 72, 73). He says:

"I speak in the Preface of 'offering suggestions toward a work, *which* must be uppermost in the mind of every true son of the English Church at this day,—the consolidation of a theological system, *which*, built upon those formularies, to *which* all clergymen are bound, may tend to inform, persuade, and absorb into itself religious minds, *which* hitherto have fancied, that, on the peculiar Protestant questions, they were seriously opposed to each other.'"

To me that sentence does not seem either very simple or very lucid. No style, in fact, can justly be pronounced exceptionally simple, and no style is likely to be exceptionally lucid, that tends to multiply relative constructions, especially to multiply relative constructions in a manner to make them depend in succession, one upon another. I cannot help thinking that a little labor of art would have been well bestowed by the writer of the sentences last quoted in disentangling them for the readier comprehension of the reader. As an incidental