

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

of Gospel truth" above the "technical transmission of Apostolical Succession," and consequently for maintaining that the British Church conferred higher and greater blessings on this country and on the world than did the Church of Augustine.

DAVID JONES.



ART. IV.—MATTHEW ARNOLD IN HIS LETTERS.¹

IT is perhaps a natural and pardonable instinct which prompts us, in the case of a man who has played some distinguished part in public life, to get for a moment behind the scenes, and scrutinize the appearance of this or that actor on the stage of contemporary history, when, his stage-trappings cast aside, he steps down at the close of the act into the circle of home-life. "There is a divinity that doth hedge," not the king only, but every acknowledged leader of thought or action in our midst; yet we wish to watch him as he lived and moved in the sphere where "divinity" hedged him not; we wonder what his familiar words in the everyday occurrences of life may be; how the current of ideas flows during the solitary hours, in the portions of his history that are screened from public notice; what the letters may be like which he indites to the members of his own fireside—after what fashion, in short, he reveals himself when the eyes of the busy world are withdrawn.

A more than usual interest will doubtless attach itself to the family letters of a public man, if he have chanced to be a great writer, whose published words have passed into current coin of the intellectual world, or have become woven into the fabric of men's thoughts. Such letters will be invested with a peculiar pathos, for they show us "the very pulse of the machine" throbbing and working; they can alone have power to unfold the hidden movement and being of those spiritual fires which burnt so brightly through the "winged utterance" unfolded in the printed page. If the writer happen to be a *poet*, then will our interest be all the keener; we have a passion to know something more of the common days and hours wherein the poet lived his round; what (we ask) was the source of that immense zest in life which he felt so supremely, of that ineffaceable love which all things noble and fair stirred within him, of his inalienable enthusiasm for humanity, of his profoundly subtle insight into the mysteries of time? His secret

¹ "Letters of M. Arnold, 1848-1888." Collected and arranged by G. W. E. RUSSELL. In two vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.

was only half unveiled, we fancy, in the lines which have sung themselves into our hearts' core; we are full of reverent curiosity to behold the fountain of this guarded treasure-house of light and joy. Surely we may hope, in these spontaneous, unelaborated outpourings of his nature which we call his "private letters," to learn something both of the love and of the mystery.

The appearance, therefore, of the family correspondence of a man like Arnold, eminent alike as critic and poet, is an event in the literary history of the year—all the more so as we learn that no formal biography of him is to be written. Expectation beats high as we open the volumes. All the more keenly disappointing is the general effect left on one's mind by a continuous perusal of the book. Not that there are wanting many things of real and lasting interest in its pages; for the naturalness which lies in every letter here reproduced constitutes, of itself, an abiding charm. But (speaking personally) I must confess that the *tout ensemble* is not what one had looked for. Matthew Arnold, with his childlike delight in Nature, his singular refinement, his poise of judgment, his fine and cultured taste, is indeed set before us—how could it be otherwise? But it is Arnold with a difference. We miss those magical flashes of intuition lighting up a difficult problem, or clearing the darkness away from some intricacy of thought, which characterize great letter-writers. Evidently he does not belong to that little band of letter-writers to which Cicero, Horace Walpole, Cowper, or Newman (in his own inimitable way), belonged; he lacks the abandon, the exquisite ease and urbanity, which reveal themselves in the hundred little unstudied attentions to detail which indicate the writer who is, in a manner, born to it. One learns to love the writer for the kindly and affectionate interest he displays in the concerns of his friends, and for many another grace of character; but throughout there remains an uneasy consciousness that we are only viewing the surface of things, without ever having set foot within the penetralia of the poet's mind and soul. After all, Arnold, if he ever wholly revealed himself, did so in his poetry; outside this he rarely, if at all, unfolded his true self. His poems have generally been regarded as the most unclouded mirror of his thought, and rightly; for by a peculiarly happy conjunction of circumstances it was in this medium that he—I will not say chose, but alone seemed able, to move with perfect precision and ease. Hence the illuminating character of his best work, which is destined to outlive much of the more pretentious, but less really vital, poetic work of our period. In poetry we perceive his directness, both of idea and sentiment, portrayed to the fullest extent; in his other writings—and these letters may be taken

as part proof of the statement—he was less spontaneous (and therefore less delightful), more the critic than the seer, rather the professor of poetry than the poet.

One had hoped to find in the eight hundred pages occupied by these letters some really valuable references to contemporary literature, and specially poetry; but here again disappointment awaits us. What his letters do seem very clearly to indicate is that, with all his sanity of mind, and oftentimes his shrewd discernment in touching the weak points in an opponent's harness, as well as his unfailing knack of so grouping his ideas together as to bring the central thought embodied in them into due prominence, he not seldom lacked the power to appreciate the work of his contemporaries. His range of vision was strictly limited, albeit within the magic circle it was singularly searching, and, in accuracy, microscopic.

It is, then, to Arnold's poetry that we must turn if we would have the pure essence of his best and highest thought distilled into the fairest moulds. Not pregnant in fruitful ideas, not too "hopeful" of mankind and his prospects in the vulgar sense, and sternly alive to the pathos and the fallacy of much to which we pin our credence too readily in this world, he set in his poetry one fixed ideal before him—the beauty of right living, right thinking, and the love of whatever is of pure and fair report. He had drunk deep of the spiritual culture of Greece, and he cast into classic form those ideals that haunt and those doubts that vex, the heart of modern civilization.

In the five stanzas dedicated to the memory of de Senancour, Matthew Arnold has given utterance to thoughts which, when we think of the poet himself, rise spontaneously to our minds; for, though he never paraded the fact, nevertheless in his secret heart he had felt the sting of the world; while that haunting sense of the pathos of human life, at once so stately and so reserved, kept no slender hold of his imagination.

Like children bathing on the shore,
 Buried a wave beneath,
 The second wave succeeds before
 We have had time to breathe.

Too fast we live, too much are tried,
 Too harass'd to attain
 Wordsworth's sweet calm, or Goethe's wide
 And luminous view to gain.

And then we turn, thou sadder sage,
 To thee! we feel thy spell!—
 The hopeless tangle of our age;
 Thou too hast scann'd it well!

Indeed, whenever the poet contemplates the picture of our human life, all so manifold and marvellous in its sombre setting of physical necessity, there comes in, like a faintly-

heard echo, "the eternal note of sadness," mysterious, not to be repressed. But from that other Voice, speaking to us in the hushed and holy silences of life, his ear was turned away; nor did he seem able to recognise the majestic claims of Him who, through suffering, brought joy and immortality to the weary and the heavy-laden. And one cannot resist the conclusion that, precisely because he shut himself off from those channels of divine influence which bring into men's lives all that is most gracious and most ennobling, he was condemned to pay the penalty which is inseparable from the Higher Paganism of our time—he sorrowed as one without hope; and the iron of the world cut deep into his very soul.

References, as has been noted, to contemporary thought and thinkers are all too few in these pages; the pity of it therefore is that these few are all but impossible to discover, as the book has been provided with nothing in the shape of an index. To atone in some degree for such an omission, I venture to append the following selected list of references, which may possibly prove useful:

- SELF-CRITICISM, vol. i., pp. 11, 30, 32, 41, 47, 51, 57, 59, 60, 107, 108, 139, 156, 199, 201, 207, 219, 226, 229, 233, 243; vol. ii., pp. 9, 11, 20, 38, 45, 114, 117, 120, 197, 316.
- GOETHE (whom he brackets with Wordsworth as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, force in modern literature), vol. i., pp. 10, 63, 127. WORDSWORTH, vol. ii., pp. 157, 165.
- CARLYLE, vol. i., pp. 4, 7; vol. ii., pp. 139, 144, 191, 218-220, 221, 358, 369. Evidently thinks him of less permanent value than EMERSON, for whom he had a sincere regard (*cf.* his lecture on Emerson in his "American Addresses and Letters,") vol. i., p. 7; vol. ii., p. 220.
- RENAN, vol. i., pp. 111 (where Arnold remarks the points of difference between himself and the Frenchman), 203; vol. ii., p. 159.
- TENNYSON, vol. i., pp. 127, 158, 239; vol. ii., pp. 38, 168. He is singularly obtuse to the greatness of Tennyson's genius, and his remarks on him have an ungenerous savour about them. BROWNING he scarcely alludes to, but of Mrs. BROWNING he speaks contemptuously (vol. i., p. 61).
- RUSKIN, vol. i., pp. 51, 196, 200; vol. ii., p. 141. Arnold quite failed to appreciate him, as he failed to appreciate most contemporary writers.
- KINGSLEY, vol. ii., pp. 43, 121.
- SWINBURNE, vol. ii., pp. 43, 200 (where he alludes to Swinburne's "fatal habit of using one hundred words where one would suffice").
- SAINTE-BEUVE, vol. i., pp. 106, 134, 194, 218 (*cf.* *Encycl. Britannica*, *s.v.*).
- POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS REFERENCES, vol. i., pp. 10, 96, 109, 113-115, 221 (an interesting account of Disraeli); vol. ii., pp. 13, 17, 39, 41, 48, 76, 84, 112, 131 (interesting remark on Church of England and its connection with Protestantism), 137 (where he writes—1877—"I am sincerely sorry a charlatan like Dizzy should be Premier"), 141, 149, 187 (where he remarks that the country would be all the better for "a different system of Government—an *état de siège*, in

short—humanely carried out”), 191-193, 201, 268, 281 (criticising “Natural Law in the Spiritual World”), 316.

The Times (a paper which he did not like), vol. i., pp. 113, 122, 206-208; vol. ii., p. 268.

It may be mentioned that the first occurrence of the now hackneyed sobriquet “Philistines” occurs in vol. i., p. 207, and the phrase “sweetness and light” in vol. ii., p. 23.

E. H. BLAKENEY.



ART. V.—WHAT IS MEANT BY AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH?

THERE is a great deal of talk about the Established Church, and we ought to see exactly what we mean by the words.

1. *What is an Established Church?*

It means a Church which is settled; which has received a certain amount of help from the law in arranging its affairs.

2. *Does not the word apply in some degree to the Nonconformist Churches?*

Yes, though in a less degree than to the National Church, because they are much smaller individually, and their history much shorter.

3. *In what way does it apply to them?*

(a) From the time of William III. (that is, during the last two hundred years) Acts of Parliament recognise and legalize their existence as organized religious bodies, in the same way that in earlier days Acts of Parliament recognised the old National Church, and still recognise it when occasion arises.

(b) Acts of Parliament protect their property and worship.

(c) Acts of Parliament give exceptional privileges to the Nonconformist chapels and ministers. Their chapels are relieved from paying rates and taxes; their ministers are excused from serving in the militia and on juries.

(d) The courts of law enforce the fulfilment of the trust-deeds of the Nonconformist churches and chapels, and interpose to decide their internal disputes.

4. *When did this word “establishing” and “established” begin to be used?*

By the Church of England itself, in the Canons of 1603, in the reign of King James I. The Canons, or Book of Church Rules, assert that the Papal supremacy has no *establishment* in this country—that is, is not a fixed legal principle; that the worship of God in the Prayer-Book, the Thirty-nine Articles agreed upon by Convocation, and the rites and ceremonies of the Church, are by law *established*—that is, settled and con-