



# CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. II.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 16, 1852.

NO. 49.

## UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

DR. NEWMAN'S FIFTH LECTURE.

(From the Tablet.)

On Monday, June 7th, the Very Rev. Dr. Newman delivered his fifth lecture, the subject of which was, "General Knowledge viewed as one Philosophy," which he introduced with the following remarks:—

"It is a prevalent notion just now that religious opinion does not enter, as a matter of necessity, in any considerable measure into the treatment of scientific or literary subjects. It is supposed that, whatever a teacher's persuasion may be, whether or not, or whatever kind or degree of Christianity, it need betray itself in such lectures or publications as the duties of his office require. Whatever he holds about the Supreme Being, His attributes and His works, be it truth or error, does not make him better or worse in experiment or speculation. He can discourse upon plants, or insects, or birds, or the powers of the mind, or language, or historical documents, or literature, or any other such matter of fact, with equal accurateness and profit, whatever he may determine about matters which are entirely distinct from them.

"In answer to this representation I contended last week that a positive disunion takes place between theology and secular science, whenever they are not actually united. Here not to be at peace is to be at war; and for this reason: the assemblages of sciences, which together make up universal knowledge, is not an accidental or a varying heap of acquisitions, but a system, and may be said to be in equilibrium, as long as all its portions are secured to it. Take away one of them, and that one so important in the catalogue as theology, and disorder and ruin at once ensue. There is no middle state between an equilibrium and confusion; one science is ever pressing upon another, unless kept in check, and the only guarantee of truth is the cultivation of them all. And such is the office of a university."

In order to exhibit the falsity of the opposite system of a divorce between religious and secular knowledge, Dr. Newman gave an analysis of an article which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* at the time of the establishment of the London University, in which the writer had, with great flippancy, attempted to found an argument for the exclusion of religion from a university by instancing the study of surgery, of music, or of grammar. A student might hear Sir Astley Cooper lecture on the reduction of fractures, or attend a class of Mr. Hamilton's on French or grammar; few people cared whether the music master, or dancing master, or Italian master, who attended their families was a Protestant, or a French philosopher, or a Catholic. Dr. Newman, after pointing out the weakness of the illustration, surgery, music, and grammar being affairs of skill and memory, not of philosophy, showed that people who would argue thus did not arise to the idea of a university. It was with them a sort of bazaar or pantheon, where wares of all kinds were thrown together independent of each other, a fortuitous heap of acquisitions and accomplishments destitute of any general principles or constituent ideas. What was the consequence of this on society? That the works of the age are not the development of definite principles, but accidental results of discordant and simultaneous action, of committees and boards, composed of men each of whom has his own interests and views, and to gain something his own way is obliged to sacrifice a good deal to every one else. The works of the age were accumulations from without, not the growth of a principle from within. A philosophical comprehensiveness, an orderly expansiveness, an elastic constructiveness, men had lost them, because they had lost the idea of unity—because they cut off the head of a living thing, and think it perfect all but the head. They thought if they but get together sufficient funds, and arrange in one locality a suite of distinct lecture rooms, they had at once founded a university. Catholicity, on the contrary, starts with an idea, and educates on a type, regarding a university for sciences, collecting what each science is for its own subject matter—the grasp of many things brought into one, the harmony and order of the sciences governed by an idea, or, to use scholastic language, a form impressed on the various pursuits and objects on which the intellect is employed.

To explain what he meant by the application of a form to knowledge, Dr. Newman used the following beautiful illustration of the term as applied to the idea of Worship:—

"We all understand how worship is one idea, and how it is made up of many things, some being essential to it, and all subservient. Its essence is the lifting up of the heart to God; if it be no more than this, still this is enough, and nothing more is neces-

sary. But view it as brought out in some solemn rite or public ceremonial; the essence is the same, and it is there on the occasion I am supposing; we will say it is Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament, or a devotion in honor of some Saint; it is there still, but, first, it is the lifting up, not of the heart, but of many all at once; next, it is the devotion, not of hearts only, but of bodies too; not of eyes only, or hands only, or voices only, or knees only, but of the whole man; and next, the devotion passes on to more than soul and body; there are vestments there, rich and radiant, symbolical of the rite, and odorous flowers, and a flood of light, and a cloud of incense, and music joyous and solemn, of instruments, as well as voices, till all the senses overflow with the idea of devotion. Is the music devotion? as the Protestant inquires; is the incense devotion? are candles devotion? are flowers? are vestments? or words spoken? or genuflections? Not any one of them. And what have candles to do with flowers? or flowers with vestments? or vestments with music? Nothing whatever; each is distinct in itself, and independent of the rest. The flowers are the work of nature, and are elaborated in the garden; the candles come of the soft wax, which the 'Apis Mater' (as the Church beautifully sings), which the teeming bee fashions; the vestments have been wrought in the looms of Lyons, or Vienna, or Naples, and have been brought over sea at great cost; the music is the present and momentary vibration of the air, acted upon by tube or string; and still for all this, are they not one whole? are they not blended together indivisibly, and sealed with the image of unity, by reason of the one idea of worship, in which they live and to which they minister? Take away that idea, and what are they worth? the whole pageant becomes a mummery. The worship made them one; but supposing no one in that assemblage, however large, to believe, or to love, or to pray, or to give thanks, supposing the musicians did but play and sing, and the sacristan thought of nothing but his flowers, lights, and incense, and the priest in cope and stole, and his attendant Ministers, had no heart, nor lot in what they were outwardly acting, let the flowers be sweetest, and the lights brightest, and the vestments costliest, still who would call it an act of worship at all? Would it not be a show, a make-belief, an hypocrisy? Why? Because the one idea was away, which gave life, and force, and an harmonious understanding, and an individuality, to many things at once, distinct each of them in itself, and in its own nature independent of that idea.

"Such is the virtue of a 'form'; the lifting up of the heart to God is the living principle of this solemnity; nor does it sacrifice any of its constituent parts; rather it imparts to each a dignity by giving it a meaning; it moulds, inspires, individualizes a whole. It stands towards the separate elements which it uses as the soul is to the body. It is the presence to the soul which gives unity to the various materials which make up the human frame.

The "form," then, is the living principle which makes things one whole, and separates them from everything else. The same things, viewed separately, will widely differ when they are taken and amalgamated by different forms. Dr. Newman made this an important point in his view. For instance, the human skeleton, in many respects, resembles that of a monkey or ape; but the form or idea on which it is constituted makes them so perfectly distinct that the latter could not be developed into the former. Again, various actions of different individuals may be externally the same, as, for instance, those of a Saint and an ordinary Christian. Eating, sleeping, talking, walking, may be neither good nor bad, viewed in their bare idea; but the same actions, done by different persons, may be utterly different in character and effect, good in one, bad in another. He illustrated this in various ways, and at length brought it to bear on the subject of education, in which he showed that externally the subject-matter of different universities might be the same; the Christian evidences, classics, much more experimental science, modern history, and biography, may be right and useful in their proper place, as portions of one system of knowledge, but dangerous and inexpedient in another, because they come differently, in a different connection, at a different time, with a different drift, from a different spirit in the one and the other.—

"Thus, then," said the Very Rev. lecturer, "I answer the objection with which I opened this discourse. I suppose it to be asked me, how it could matter to the pupil who it was taught him such indifferent subjects as logic, antiquities, or poetry, so that they be taught him? I answer, that no subject of teaching is really indifferent in fact, though it may be in itself; because it takes a color from the whole system to which it belongs, and has one character when viewed in that system, and another viewed out of it. According, then, as a teacher is under the influence, or

in the service of this system or that, so does the drift, or at least the practical effect of his teaching vary: Arcesilaus would not teach logic as Aristotle, or Aristotle poetry as Plato, though logic has its fixed principles, and poetry its acknowledged ornaments: and, in saying this, it will be observed I am claiming for theology nothing singular or special, or which is not partaken of other sciences in their measure. As far as I have gone hitherto, they all go to make up one whole, differing only according to their relative importance. Far, indeed, am I from having intended to convey the notion, in the illustrations I have been using, that it stands to other knowledge as the soul to the body; or that other sciences are but its instruments and appendages, as the whole ceremonial of worship is but the expression of inward devotion. This would be, I conceive, to commit the very error, in the instance of theology, which I am charging upon other sciences, at this day, of committing against it. On the contrary, theology is one branch of knowledge, and secular sciences are other branches. Theology is the highest, indeed, and wisest, but it does not interfere with the real freedom of any secular science in its own particular department. This will be clearer as I proceed; at present I have been only pointing out the internal sympathy which exists between all branches of knowledge whatever, and the danger resulting to knowledge itself by a disunion between them, and the object, in consequence, to which a university is dedicated.—Not science only, not literature only, not theology only, neither abstract knowledge simply, nor experimental, neither moral nor material, neither metaphysical nor historical, but all knowledge whatever, is taken into account in a university as being the special seat of that large philosophy which embraces and locates truth of every kind, and every method of attaining it.

He then went on to consider a compromise which is often suggested in this question, viz., that without absolutely excluding religion, universities might teach a certain modicum of it, which people imagine Catholics and Protestants hold in common:—

"There are many persons to be found who maintain that religion should not be introduced at all into a course of education, so there are many, too, who think a compromise may be effected between such as would and such as would not introduce it, by introducing a certain portion, and nothing beyond it; and by a certain portion they mean just as much as they suppose Catholics and Protestants to hold in common. In this way they hope, on the one hand, to avoid the odium of not teaching religion at all, while on the other they equally avoid any show of contrariety between contrary systems of religion, and any unseemly controversy between parties who, however they may differ, will gain nothing by disputing. Now, I respect the motives of such persons too much not to give my best attention to the expedient which they propose; whether men advocate the introduction of no religion at all in education, or this 'general religion,' as they call it; in either case peace and charity, which are the objects they profess, are of too heavenly a nature not to give a sort of dignity even to those who pursue them by impossible roads; still I think it very plain that the same considerations which are decisive against the exclusion of religion from education, are decisive also against its generalisation or mutilation, for the words have practically the same meaning. General religion is in fact no religion at all. Let not the conclusion be thought harsh, to which I am carried on by the principles I have been laying down in the former part of this discourse; but thus it stands, I think, beyond dispute, that those principles being pre-supposed, Catholics and Protestants, viewed as bodies, hold nothing in common in religion, however they may seem to do so."

He refuted this notion of teaching "general religion" by showing that all branches of knowledge constitute wholes, and that to teach half of any whole is really to teach no part of it. In politics it is so; Whigs and Tories have "general tenets" but no real unity, and the same words have one meaning in the mouth of a Whig, another in the mouth of a Tory. Religion was just the same; "the Incarnation" was a term which bore a different meaning to one who held, and to one who did not hold that Christ is in the Blessed Sacrament, and that Mary is the Mother of God. Mahometans, Jews and Catholics have all doctrines in common, but they are grafted on different ideas; they are not the same as living and breathing facts. He went on with great eloquence to dispose of what might at first sight seem an objection to this view, viz., that as a matter of fact, people have been educated in Protestant places of education, and yet not lost their Faith; and that Anglicans, for instance, who are on their way towards Catholicity, do appear to hold portions of the Catholic Faith. These objections he met as follows:—

"It is true, too, that youth can be educated at

mixed colleges of the kind that I am supposing—nay, at Protestant colleges, and yet may come out of them as good Catholics as they went in. Also it is true that Protestants are to be found who, as far as they profess Catholic doctrines, do truly hold it in the same sense as that in which a Catholic holds it. I grant all this, but I maintain, at the same time, that such cases are exceptional; the case of individuals is one thing, of bodies or institutions another; it is not safe to argue from individuals to institutions. A few words will explain my meaning:

"There are, then, doubtless, such phenomena as what may be called incoherent truths, beliefs, and philosophies. It would be both unreasonable and shallow to deny it. Men doubtless may grow into an idea by degrees, and then at the end they are moving on the same line, as they were at the beginning, not a different one, though they may during the progress have changed their external profession. Thus one school or party comes out of another; truth out of error, error out of truth; water, according to the proverb, chokes, and good comes from Nazareth. Thus, eternally distinct as orthodoxy is from heresy, the most Catholic Fathers, and the worst of heresiarchs, belong to the same teaching, or the same ecclesiastical party. St. Chrysostom comes of that Syrian theology, which is more properly represented by the heterodox Diodorus and Theodore. Eutyches, Dioscorus, and their faction, are closely connected in history with St. Cyril of Alexandria. The whole history of thought and of genius is that of one idea being born and growing out of another, though ideas are individual. Some of the greatest names in many various departments of excellence, metaphysical, political, or imaginative, have come out of schools of a very different character from their own. Thus, Aristotle is a pupil of the academy, and the Master of the Sentences is a hearer of Peter Abelard. In like manner, take a very different science: I have read that the earlier musical composition of that great master, Beethoven, are written on the type of Haydn, and that not until a certain date did he compose in the style emphatically his own. The case is the same with public men; they are called inconsistent, when they are but unlearning their first education. In such circumstances, as in the instance of the lamented Sir R. Peel, a time must elapse before the mind is able to discriminate for itself between what is really his own and what it has merely inherited.

"Now what is its state, whatever be the subject matter on which it is employed, in the course of this process of change? For a time, perhaps, the mind remains contented in the home of its youth, where originally it found itself, till in due season the special idea, however it came by it, which is ultimately to form and rule it, begins to stir; and gradually emerging more and more, and growing and expanding, it suddenly bursts the bonds of that external profession, which, though its first, was never really its proper habitation. During this interval, it uses the language which it has inherited, and thinks it certainly true; yet all the while its own genuine thoughts and modes of thinking are germinating, and ramifying, and penetrating into the old teaching which only in name belongs to it; till its external manifestations are plainly inconsistent with each other, though sooner in the apprehension of others than its own—nay, perhaps, for a season it maintains what it has received by education the more vehemently, by way of keeping in check, or guarding the new views, which are opening upon it, and which startle it by their strangeness. What happens in science, philosophy, politics, or the arts, may happen, I say, in religion too; there is such a thing as an incoherent Faith or incomplete creed, which is not yet fully Catholic, yet is Catholic as far as it goes, tends to Catholicism, and is in the way to reach it, whether in the event it actually is happy enough to reach it or not. And from the beginning such a creed, such a theology was, I grant, the work of a supernatural principle, which, exercising itself first in the rudiments of truth, finished in its perfection. Man cannot determine in what instance that principle of grace is present, and in what not, except by the event; but wherever it is, whether it can be ascertained by man, or not, whether it reaches its destination, which is Catholicity, or whether it is ultimately frustrated and fails, still, in every case, the Church claims that work as her own; because it tends to her, because it is recognised by all men, even enemies, to belong to her, because it comes of that Divine power, which is given to her in fullness, and because it anticipates portions of that Divine creed which is committed to her infallibility, as an everlasting deposit. And in this sense it is perfectly true that a Protestant may hold and teach one doctrine of Catholicism without holding or teaching another; but then, as I have said, he is in the way to hold others, in the way to profess all, and he is inconsistent if he does not, and till he does. Nay, he is already reaching forward to the whole truth, from the very