



CREaTE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Please cite this publication as follows:

Norman, R. P. (2018) The great sacrifice: G. M. Hopkins, H. P. Liddon, and the divine victim. *The Hopkins Quarterly*, XLV (1-2). pp. 15-48. ISSN 0094-9084.

Link to official URL (if available):

This version is made available in accordance with publishers' policies. All material made available by CReaTE is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Contact: create.library@canterbury.ac.uk



The Great Sacrifice: G. M. Hopkins, H. P. Liddon, and the Divine Victim

Critics may be wary of origins, or consign them disdainfully to those carrion-eaters of scholarship, the source hunters, but the poet-in-a-poet is as desperately obsessed with poetic origins, generally despite himself, as the person-in-the-person at last becomes obsessed with personal origins (Harold Bloom, A Map of Misreading, 17-18).

I

In 1972, James Finn Cotter argued that Liddon's Bampton Lectures on *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* were 'indispensable' to the study of Hopkins's 'theological development'. In retrospect, such a claim is not, as far as it goes, in the least bit contentious: after all, Hopkins's attendance at the lectures is one of the documented facts of his undergraduate life at Oxford. But Cotter went further than that. He also made a quite remarkable claim that in Liddon's lecture-sermons Hopkins had found 'a master plan for life' (*Inscape* 6). Cotter has not been alone in reaching this kind of conclusion. In 1994, Jude Nixon came to a similarly decisive judgment: 'Liddon's formative influence on Hopkins's religious life and poetry cannot be underestimated'. According to Nixon, it was not just that Liddon's 'formal and informal lectures informed Hopkins's Christology'; more than that, he also 'personally created the religious climate in which Hopkins's fledgling Catholicity took wing and flight' (*Contemporaries* 50). Granted the significance he discovered in Liddon, Nixon argued that the failure of Hopkins scholars to explore this influence was 'enigmatic': 'No doubt

the chief contributing factor... is the excessive attention to [Hopkins's] Jesuit life, a preoccupation that often slights significant literary and religious precursors' (50).¹

Nixon's invaluable and ground-breaking studies of Liddon's influence are essential reading for anyone interested in the topic: his work surveys the relevant aspects of Hopkins's own journals and letters, and sets the material in the historical and intellectual context of Balliol in the 1860s. Nixon's use of Liddon's diaries is of special importance: the source materials allow him to develop a convincing *historical* picture that moves beyond Cotter's largely *thematic* exploration of Liddon's influence on Hopkins. (It remains something of a puzzle that other scholars have not followed Nixon's lead and made more of Liddon's journals). That said, there are other gaps that need filling. When it comes to discussing matters of faith, both Cotter and Nixon focus attention on two main theological sources, Liddon's Bampton Lectures for 1866 (*The Divinity of Our Lord*), and Hopkins's manuscript notes on Liddon's lectures on First Corinthians (transcribed and published by Nixon in 1989/1990). Looking beyond these sources, however, engagement with Liddon's published sermons (the great labour of his life, ultimately extending to some dozen volumes) appears to have been rather less comprehensive. Between them, Cotter and Nixon refer to just six of Liddon's sermons in total, not all of them published when Hopkins was still an Anglican.² This means that some of the key sources

¹ In his excellent essay, 'Gerard Manley Hopkins and Henry Parry Liddon: An Unacknowledged Influence', Nixon argued that Liddon was 'an early and significant shaping influence of Hopkins's religious life, most notably in Hopkins's ritualism, asceticism, and Christology – all of which directly inform his poetry' (87). The lack of proper study of Liddon by Hopkins scholars was, he stated, 'enigmatic': the 'preoccupation of critics to focus almost exclusively on Hopkins's post-conversion life' was given as a potential explanation for this lacuna (100).

² Cotter makes use of 'The Risen Life' (from Liddon's *University Sermons*) to illustrate Liddon's own Christocentrism, making the relatively safe assumption that Hopkins would have likely heard it preached on April 30, 1865 (Cotter 317, n 7). Cotter also refers to 'Humility and Action' (also from *University Sermons*), in order to illustrate Liddon's theological epistemology. As this sermon was preached on February 26, 1865, this, too, represents Liddon's thought at the time of Hopkins's engagement with him (Cotter 246). That cannot be said for the third sermon Cotter uses. Liddon preached 'The Humiliation of the Eternal Son' (from the later volume, *Passiontide Sermons*) in 1871 – long after the period of contact with Hopkins. Notwithstanding this fact, Cotter nevertheless makes reference to it – quite fairly – because it represents one aspect of Liddon's thought on the key topic of the kenosis of Christ (Cotter 315, n 1). Turning to Nixon, direct engagement with Liddon's sermons is limited to the first of Liddon's *University Sermons*, 'God and the Soul', and two further sermons selected to illustrate Liddon's attitude to Darwin: 'The Creation', and the Bodleian MS for 'The Recovery of St Thomas' (Nixon 1994, 306).

relevant to understanding Hopkins at Balliol remain unexplored. There is, in particular, a need for a more comprehensive and searching account of the sermons Liddon preached and published at the time when Hopkins was under his direct spiritual guidance.

The purpose of this essay is, therefore, straightforward to explain. The argument is that it is important for scholars of Hopkins to pay renewed attention to some of Liddon's hitherto unexamined sermons (especially those published in 1865) in order to set the young poet's early theological development in context. This is no dry-as-dust exercise, for Liddon was a preacher of quite exceptional power. He evidently spoke to the religious needs of Victorians with a spiritual energy that few others could match, and the contemporary evidence of fascination with Liddon's sermons is quite overwhelming. Thus, in 1870 Mary Gladstone recorded in her diary that an address by Liddon had left her 'quite turned inside out' with the 'extraordinary effect' and 'force of his language' (Masterman 52-3). In time he was to be voted the 'greatest living English-speaking Protestant preacher' by readers of *The Spectator* – ahead of the second-placed Spurgeon (Ellison 44). Crucially, some Roman Catholics were also impressed. Come the 1880s, Lord Acton held the firm (and not at all uncritical) opinion that Liddon knew 'how to kindle and how to propel'. In this, according to Acton, Liddon could be compared to Newman; but whereas Newman knew only 'what he might have learnt in the time of Waterland or Butler', Liddon, in contrast, was 'in contact with all that is doing in the world of thought' (Paul 143).³ In Acton's Roman Catholic view, Liddon's was the 'greatest power in the conflict with sin, and in turning men's souls to God, that the nation now possesses' (Johnston 311).

³ Here, Acton's words are taken from private letters written to Mary Gladstone. The correspondence repays study, for it shows that Acton commended Liddon whilst retaining reservations over his edition of Rosmini's *Five Wounds of the Church* (1883). Acton evidently felt that Liddon had trespassed into the internal politics of the Roman Catholic Church, and had been led into a one-sided portrayal of Rosmini by agreeing to adhere to the later Rosminian suppression of a particular document. Liddon's entanglement in this suppression or censorship was, as Acton acknowledged, quite possibly one of the conditions placed on his access to documents of relevance to the *Five Wounds*. Although the matter left a bad taste in Acton's mouth, he nevertheless came out in support of Liddon. The correspondence also shows that Acton was sure that Liddon's commitment to Anglicanism was secure.

Meanwhile, to Anglicans like Edward Stuart Talbot at Oxford in the 1860s Liddon was ‘beautiful and beloved, fiery and rigid’ (*Memories of Early Life* 39). To Dolben’s and Bridges’ school friend, V. S. S. Coles, Liddon was best memorialised in words of his own: ‘A heart of iron to myself, a heart of flesh toward my neighbour, and a heart of fire toward my God’ (Briscoe, 172).

II

In the autumn of 1865, Liddon published *Some Words for God*, a collection of ten sermons preached at St Mary’s and Christ Church between 1859 and 65. This was Liddon’s first book (to this date he had only published individual sermons in pamphlet form). It sold quickly: a second edition was published just after Easter, 1866, under the new title, *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*. The publication of the second edition of the *University Sermons* therefore coincided with the delivery of his Bampton Lectures.⁴ Liddon stated in the ‘Advertisement’ to *Some Words for God* that the sermons included in the volume had ‘little in common with each other beyond a certain apologetic character’ (v). Notwithstanding Liddon’s claim, two main concerns were represented that would have been of relevance to the Bampton Lectures: a rejection of “Germanism”, and a focus on Christology.

The rejection of German idealism was stated with force in the third sermon, ‘The Freedom of the Spirit’, an attack on deterministic ideas of history. Liddon took aim at the ‘philosophy of Hegel’ because ‘the main laws... of the system of that thinker... would not be

⁴ A third edition was prepared late in 1868, including three additional sermons. From 1879, when a second volume of *University Sermons* was published, the title was modified to *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford, First Series*. All three editions carry the title, *University Sermons* on the spine, and are differentiated on the title pages. I have therefore decided to refer to the editions collectively as *University Sermons*, referring to the titles of the different editions only when necessary.

readily accepted by, English intellect'. 'We English', Liddon continued, 'do not readily enter into the statement that the real and the rational are identical, so that the development of the Idea regulates the development of Being' (73-4). The 'genuine spirit of Hegel' was, he said, 'necessarily hostile to the Christian principle of dogma' (75); the 'idealized god of the school of Hegel' was no substitute for traditional Christian belief (87). Other sermons targeted Fichte and Schelling (115), Baur (255-56), and Strauss (185-88).

Some targets were closer to home. In 'The Divine Victim', Jowett's rather bloodless moral interpretation of the suffering of Christ was judged unsatisfactory (224-25). Likewise, the fourth sermon, 'Immortality', took a swipe at 'unbelieving teachers' who retained 'the formal language of theology' only because 'in their hands, we are told, it has become the expression of a higher truth' (106). It was sad to see 'men of decaying faith, or even men whose faith has perished outright' paying 'involuntary homage to the beauty and majesty of [the] Creed, while in the very act of renouncing its authority'. 'Such men are in the position of the shipwrecked seaman, who is battling with the waves, and clinging in his strong agony by a timber of what was once his home, while moment by moment he is really drifting upon the surf or the rocks which will presently mark his grave' (107-08). The fashionable recasting of Christianity as an ethical or aesthetic system took insufficient account of the horror of suffering. Indeed, the truly rational mind saw that reason only deepened the human capacity for suffering, for, 'Like the flash of lightning which reveals to the shipwrecked seaman the watery grave which yawns to receive him, reason illuminates the horrors of human pain' (104).

The sermon from which these words are taken – one titled 'Immortality' – was preached on January 15th, 1865. In the collection, it was followed immediately by 'Humility and Action' (preached on February 26th), and 'The Conflict of Faith with undue Exaltation of Intellect' (preached on March 17th). A fourth sermon from 1865, 'The Risen Life' (preached April 30th), was also included towards the end of the book. The dates of these sermons is crucial, for they

coincide with the period in which Liddon had greatest contact with Hopkins.⁵ The two had walked together on Valentine's Day, then met for an hour and a half in the morning of March 28th, and then walked again on May 13th. Nixon (who confirmed these dates with reference to Liddon's diaries), has drawn attention to the latter walk, comparing Liddon's diary record of bluebells with Hopkins's own, and finding that Liddon 'never had the slightest eye for nature' (*Contemporaries*, 27-28). There is reason to question this verdict, for it depends upon evidence from Liddon's diaries taken in isolation from his sermons. The March 17th sermon captured the joy felt at the earliest hints of springtime in England, and revealed Liddon's own sacramental vision of nature. The passage – of obvious relevance to Hopkins's own later work – is worth quoting at length.

You walk to-morrow afternoon into the country, and you note how here and there the swelling buds, or the first fresh green of the opening leaf, reminds you that already Spring is about to re-enact before your eyes the beautiful spectacle of her yearly triumph. Everywhere around you there are evidences of the movements of a mysterious power which you can neither see, nor touch, nor define, nor measure, nor understand. The power lives speechless, noiseless, unseen, yet energetic in every bough above your head, in every blade of grass beneath your feet. It bursts forth from the grain into the shoot, from the branch into the bud, and leaf, and flower, and fruit. It creates bark, and fibre, and height, and bulk, and grace of form and lustre of colour... Although you have watched it unthinkingly from your childhood upwards, and perhaps see in it nothing particular now, you may well pause in wonder and awe before it, for of a truth it is a

⁵ Much has been made of these months in Hopkins's young life: March 12 1865 was the 'day of the great mercy of God'. For this crucial period, see also Lesley Higgins' introduction to *CW* 4 (9-14). Hopkins first met Liddon in May 1863. There are records for confessions for February 10 1864, 11 March 1864, 26 November 1864, 24 March 1865, 6 February 1866, and May 17 1866. Walks together took place on February 8 and March 7 1864, and February 14 and May 13 1865 (Nixon, *Contemporaries*, 27).

mystery... What is it, this pervading force, this life-principle, this incomprehensible yet most certainly present fact, but an assertion of the principle of mystery which robes the soil of God's earth with beauty, that everywhere it may cheer the faith and rebuke the pride of man? Yes, when next you behold the green field or the green tree, be sure that you are in the very presence of a very sacrament of nature; your eye rests upon the outward and visible sign of an inward and wholly invisible force (*Some Words for God* 171-72).

Such was the vision of nature that inspired Liddon when walking with undergraduates in the spring of 1865. It seems to have left a deep impression on Hopkins, for it was at this very time (coincidental with the February 14th walk and the March 17th sermon) that he drew up the list of books to read that included Ruskin's *Modern Painters*. What should one make of this? Taken at face value, the content of the sermon suggests that Liddon provided at least some of the impetus that propelled Hopkins's furthering interest in Ruskin.⁶

⁶ Scholars of Hopkins have not been able to date with any precision when he read Ruskin. Thus Norman White writes that 'He had probably not read *Modern Painters* thoroughly in 1863, as the work appears in a list he drew up in February 1865 of books that he should read, but he may have been familiar with *The Elements of Drawing*' (75). Following White, Ballinger states that 'by 1863 Hopkins probably had read Ruskin's *The Elements of Drawing*, and he included *Modern Painters* on his February 1865 reading list' (31). The imprecision of the observations should be noted. It is a reasonable argument that the evidence of Liddon's sermon at this crucial period of Hopkins's mental development supports C. M. Brittain's argument that Pusey and Liddon's incarnationalism provided the initial foundation of Hopkins's aesthetic synthesis. One should therefore rearrange the sequence of development presented by Ballinger (42, 79-81). The evidence of Liddon's sermon suggests that the inclination to see the world as sacramental may reasonably be attributed primarily to Liddon's theological influence, and *then* developed through closer reading of Ruskin. Such a view is supported by Tennyson's remark, 'the points at which Hopkins and Tractarian poetry most strikingly come together are nature, sacramentalism, and incarnationalism, three of the most often remarked features of Hopkins' poetry' (207). For a fuller account of the same position, see Johnson (esp.19-20). Ballinger's counter argument that 'Hopkins thought... the poetic efforts of Keble and Newman... were feeble at best' (41) needs to be approached with caution: whatever the *aesthetic* value of Keble's poems, their *thematic* content is echoed several times by Hopkins. Keble's 'Lighting of the Lamps' sequence in the *Lyra Apostolica* seems to have been re-worked in 'The Starlight Night', 'The Lantern out of Doors', and 'The Candle Indoors'. Keble's poetry lodged in Hopkins's mind and, eventually, took on a strange new form.

III

Attention also needs to be paid to Nixon's suggestion that the first sermon, 'God and the Soul' (originally preached on October 25, 1863), provides evidence that 'Liddon... introduced Saint Ignatius to Hopkins'. This is clearly an important claim, and it needs a little explanation. The sermon was essentially an articulation of 'personal religion', an invitation to enter into personal relationship with God. 'No religion', taught Liddon, 'can deserve to be termed such if it be not personal... if it does not recognize as its basis the case of the personal soul face to face with the personal God' (3). The sermon represents a profound statement of Liddon's spirituality – so profound, indeed, that at one deeply apophatic moment, under the pressure of expressing the soul's relation to God, the text broke down into aposiopesis. 'This is not a matter for many words. The deepest waters glide silently onwards. The most intimate glances between the soul and its Maker compel a reverent reserve, and cannot without injury be forced into language...' (25).⁷ Granted this content, it was not unfitting for Liddon to draw on his knowledge of Catholic spiritual writing in the preparation of this sermon: in the end, it included three quotations from the *Spiritual Exercises*. In the context of a mid-Victorian Anglican sermon this was always going to be something that invited criticism, not least because references to the source were not included in the first edition. Liddon's use of Ignatius was, in other words, cryptic. His biographer recorded a few brief details of the minor controversy that predictably followed. Charles Kegan Paul wrote an article for the *Theological Review* which identified passages from the sermon taken from Ignatius; Liddon was forced into making a response to the allegation, saying that he had indeed read and made notes on Manrèse some years before, but that he had

⁷ Comparison between *Some Words for God* (25) and the second edition of the *University Sermons* (22) show how heavily Liddon reworked the text. Paragraph breaks were re-arranged to place emphasis on the aposiopesis, an extra ellipsis was included, and vocabulary was edited to suggest a more objective, rather than subjective, dimension of the 'soul's truest and most intimate converse with its Maker'.

not consciously plagiarised the text (Johnston 79). As a consequence, correct references to Manrèse had to be supplied for the second edition of the *University Sermons*. Given these facts, it is not unreasonable to credit Liddon with Hopkins's first real introduction to Ignatius, and Nixon for one surmised that 'Hopkins no doubt heard the sermon or read the volume' in which the relevant sermon was published (1994 33). It is even possible – though not certain – that Liddon made some use of the *Exercises* in his own role as a spiritual director: it was, after all, Liddon who first got Hopkins "booking" his sins as an Anglican (Downes, *Ignatian Personality* 150).⁸

IV

The last four sermons in *Some Words for God* treated the great themes of Christology: Incarnation (Christmas Day, 1863), Crucifixion (Good Friday, 1859), Resurrection (Second Sunday after Easter, 1865), and Ascension (Ascension Day, 1860). Taken together they represented a concentrated guide to the core of Liddon's teaching at the time. They were preceded by two sermons on humility: humility of action, and humility of intellect. For Liddon, Christ was one who taught humility by example. It should be no surprise, then, that the hymn of Christ's kenosis from Paul's Epistle to the Philippians was a recurring theme. The key text, Phil. 2:7, was cited four times (155, 195, 232, 295), and this means that it occurs as many times in the *University Sermons* as it does in the Bampton Lectures. In this respect, the sermons Liddon published in 1865 were a particularly sustained statement on the self-emptying kenosis

⁸ The inclusion of references to the *Spiritual Exercises* in 'God and the Soul' had seen Liddon accused by evangelicals of 'Papistry', and by liberals of plagiarism (Atkins 136). To address this issue, later editions included three footnotes to Manrèse (*University Sermons* 10, 15, 19). For the evangelical criticism, see *Bulwark or Reformation Journal*, 17 (1867), 166-7. For broad church criticism, see Charles Kegan Paul, 'Liddon's sermons' in *Theological Review* 4:19 (1867) 589-93; 'Note', *Theological Review* 4:20 (1867), 161-2. For discussion, see Johnston, 78-80.

of Christ. Indeed, Liddon arguably treated it in greater detail here than he did in *The Divinity of Our Lord*.

The sermon from this part of the volume that demands special attention is the Good Friday address for April 22, 1859. Liddon's homily on 'The Divine Victim' has not been noted in scholarship on Hopkins, but examination of the text shows that it possesses striking features that should make it required reading for anyone interested in the development of Hopkins's theology. The reason for this is simple to state: revisions made to the sermon between 1865 and 1866 are evidence of Liddon's own concerns with Scotian Christology at the time when he was still Hopkins's confessor.

Ostensibly a sermon on Galatians 2:20 ('The Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me'), the argument moved through three points: the self-sacrifices of the humanity of Christ, the self-sacrifices of the divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of the atonement. Several themes explored in the text make it significant for understanding Hopkins, and I will set them out here sequentially.

First, the sermon contains an early statement of Liddon's own kenotic Christology. He supplied his own translation of Philippians 2:6-8: Christ, 'being in the Form of God, did not deem His equality with God a prize to be jealously retained or insisted on, but emptied Himself of His glory, by taking upon Him the form of a slave, by being made in the likeness of men. And after being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient even to death; but that death – the Cross'. According to Liddon, the kenosis of Christ went through distinguishable phases, first from pre-existence, and then on earth: 'We follow the descent from the Throne of Glory to the human life, and from the human life to the exceptional pain and ignominy of the Cross'. In these processes, the person of Christ was 'throughout the Same'. This meant that Christ's death on the cross could be seen as an extension and deepening of his

self-emptying sacrifice from pre-existent glory, and ‘the Catholic doctrine thus teaches us to approach the Cross from above more naturally than from below’ (232). It was in the character of Christ’s pre-existent person to empty and humble himself; Christ’s own person was, then, the primary cause of the sacrifice that began in heaven and extended downwards to the cross. The motive of the incarnation was *not* to be found in the need to redeem sinners; the atoning work of Christ was *not* the final cause of Christ’s coming into the world. Instead, Liddon argued that one should ‘look at the Crucifixion in the light of the dignity of our Saviour’s Person, without thinking exclusively of the needs of our own sinful souls’ (232-33). The ‘Lord’s Death’ was, Liddon suggested, one of the ‘revealed results’ of what he here named the ‘Great Sacrifice’ of Christ (233).⁹

Liddon’s use of the phrase, ‘Great Sacrifice’ with reference to kenosis in a sermon originally preached in 1859 and published in 1865 demands attention. The words – so familiar from Hopkins – have been cherished by scholars of the poet’s spiritual writings, yet Liddon’s earlier (and perhaps even originary) use of the phrase does not seem to have been anywhere noticed.¹⁰ In the sermon, the phrase is given rhetorical power by its prominent place towards the end of the paragraph describing the self-emptying of Christ, and, reading the text again, it is difficult to escape the impression that this was the source for an association of phraseology and doctrine that was to lodge in Hopkins’s mind for years.¹¹ In consequence, Liddon’s sermon

⁹ In *Some Words for God*, both words were written with initial capitals: ‘Great Sacrifice’ (233). In *University Sermons*, this was revised to ‘great Sacrifice’ (234).

¹⁰ ‘The phrase, “great sacrifice,” appears again and again in Hopkins’ spiritual writings, an expression with which he designated a kind of triple heroism in Christ: creaturehood, incarnation, and crucifixion’ (Downes, *The Great Sacrifice*, 42, n. 21); Hopkins’s ‘treatment of what he calls the “great sacrifice,” [in] one of his most carefully elaborated theological discussions... gives substance and structure to... themes in a great deal of his poetry’ (Ong, *Hopkins, the Self, and God*, 112).

¹¹ From what I have been able to determine, the phrase ‘Great Sacrifice’ is not common in Anglican theological writing in the Victorian period. In contrast, ‘Law of Sacrifice’ occurs quite regularly. It is true that ‘great Sacrifice’ occurs twice in Orby Shipley’s *Lyra Eucharistica*, in H. Trend’s translation of ‘O Panis dulcissime’ (219), and in B. E. B.’s ‘Eucharistic Thanksgiving’ (276). In both cases, however, the context is clearly Eucharistic, and neither poem makes reference to kenosis. Besides, the collection post-dated Liddon’s 1859 sermon. Liddon was to use it again, this time with reference to the atonement, in his Bampton Lectures (491).

may be recognised as a formative text for Hopkins' later development, a powerful homiletic moment that opened him to a more primal scene of instruction, the kenosis of the Word of God. 'When a man is convinced that the Incarnation means that the Infinite God became finite creature, that Christ performed the "great sacrifice" as a prototypical, perpetual act of divine love, then everything in life takes on significance in terms of this ultimate fact' (Downes, *Great Sacrifice*, 16).

Liddon viewed the sacrifice of the pre-existent Christ as something which transcended time. It was an eternal fact, for Christ was 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world [Rev. 13:8]', and the 'Lamb in His ascended glory [*was*] still "as it had been slain" [Rev. 5:6]' (236-37). This meant that the suffering of Christ deepened into the abyss of eternity: 'each detail of the Passion [*was*] illuminated with terrible meaning by the doctrine of Christ's eternal Person'. The 'majestic silence' of Christ before his persecutors was an expression of his eternity: he withstood 'sin and unbelief and error' because he could 'afford to wait'. A theological understanding of the relationship of eternity to time thus informed Liddon's Christology: Christ was, said Liddon, (quoting Augustine) 'patiens quia aeternus'.¹² The figure of the eternally 'thorn-crowned' *Christus Patiens*, whose 'nailed Hands and Feet' were 'for ever united' to 'Everlasting Being', and whose 'eternal Person' was the 'Person of the Sufferer', stands at the theological heart of the sermon (238).

It is possible to argue with some persuasion that Liddon's teaching on the *Christus Patiens* was to find echoes in Hopkins's own interest in the figure of the longsuffering, patient Christ. In 'Peace', the Lord left the gift of 'Patience exquisite'; Christ's peace was, one senses, trialling, and it came with 'work to do'. Over the years, this patience grew harder with waiting,

¹² Augustine wrote 'Deus autem patiens est quia aeternus est' *En. Ps.* 92.7. Charles Marriott's Tractarian translation of Augustine's *Enarrations* (1847-57) is reproduced with revisions in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, Volume VIII (first published 1888). The editor of the *NPNF* text, Arthur Cleveland Coxe, described the words in a footnote as 'One of those felicitous maxims in which our author abounds' (454).

finding its fullest expression in the Christological themes of ‘Patience, hard thing! the hard thing but to pray’. Where was Christ? ‘He is patient. Patience fills | His crisp combs, and that comes those ways we know’. If Christ was patient in suffering from eternity, Christians were called to face suffering in like manner. Liddon had preached that Christ crucified died for ‘each separate soul’ and that each should ‘individually realize this’ (245). He pressed the idea that Christ’s suffering should be felt with an intense and affective sympathy by each repentant sinner; each one was responsible for their own sin, as an individual, alone. ‘See in the Crucifixion the consecration of every freshened sense of the fathomless abyss of life which each of us bears within himself’ (246). ‘Who among us has not shrunk... fearfully from self – from God – from the thought of death?’, asked Liddon. ‘Who has not known hours of solitude, of anguish, of depression, during which the Holy Spirit of God has revealed to the soul its inward load of sin? At such times nothing can bring help and comfort but the sight of our Lord Jesus Christ crucified’ (245). Such sentiments seem to resonate through Hopkins’s ‘I wake and feel the fell of dark, not day. | What hours, O what black hours we have spent | This night!’, ‘But where I say | Hours I mean years, mean life’. The ‘terrible sonnets’ are, I suggest, capable of Christological interpretation once one allows that Hopkins was sustained by the example of the *Christus Patiens*. As Liddon taught, ‘The picture upon which faith loves best to dwell is the Crucifixion... in that Form, bruised and pierced, we read God’s answer to our deepest sense of need’ (247).

Having presented an account of the kenotic ‘Great Sacrifice’ of the *Christus Patiens*, Liddon proceeded to discuss the doctrine of the atonement. What did the suffering of Christ mean for the sinner in need of salvation? Brief reference was made to Anselm’s theory of satisfaction, and its use by Thomist theologians, ‘who held the redemption of man to have been the primary motive of the Divine Incarnation’. Liddon explained that the merits of this view were that it accorded with particular passages of the New Testament (John 3:16; 1 Tim. 1:5;

Gal. 4: 4-5), with the Nicene Creed, with Augustine, and with the thirty-first of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. For him, such authorities seemed ‘decisively to support the Thomist doctrine’ (241). But he also knew of an alternative view, which he explained at greater length.

The Scotist theology, laying particular stress upon certain statements of St. Paul [Eph. 1:4; Col. 1:16], rejoiced especially to exhibit the Incarnation as the eternal purpose of God, entertained irrespectively of the sin of man. According to the Scotist representation, the Incarnate Being was originally destined to be the crown and glory of a race of sinless creatures. The Passion was a modification, so to speak, of the original design; it was prescribed and accepted by Infinite Love, with a view to meeting the needs of sinful and perishing humanity. In an unfallen world the Incarnate Lord would still have offered sacrifice. For the idea of sacrifice is anterior to that of sin; it is an acknowledgement due from His most perfect creatures to the high Majesty of God. In an unfallen world, sacrifice would have been Eucharistic, not propitiatory. But when the Son of God had, by His assumed Humanity, undertaken to represent a race, which was actually a race of sinners, His Obedience to the Divine Will took the form of expiation, and that which might have been only a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the All-Good became in fact a Satisfaction for sin to the All-Just. Thus Scotist no less than Thomist theologians recognized both the need and the fact of a Satisfaction for sin (241-42).

Notwithstanding his stated preference for the Thomist doctrine, Liddon’s sermon also made clear the theological value of the Scotist view.¹³ As the prime motive of the ‘Great Sacrifice’

¹³ Although Trent Pomplun states that Liddon had some knowledge of Scotus, he does not supply the evidence that demonstrates the fact. This is an unexpected lacuna in an otherwise excellent study, and it means that his discussion of Liddon needs to be developed (see ‘The Theology of Gerard Manley Hopkins’, 9). Besides the references to Scotus given in the sermon on ‘The Divine Victim’, a more general reference to ‘the Scotists’ was made in a footnote in the Bampton Lectures (57-8). Here, the theological topic under discussion was the role of angels in theophanies. Liddon evidently made use of some of the baroque sources that Pomplun surveys. In ‘The Divine Victim’, reference is made to de Lugo (*University Sermons* 241). Meanwhile, in the Bampton

had been Christ's own self-sacrificing personal will, it would have been wrong to think that the satisfaction for sin offered on the cross was the 'mere payment of an obligation which man had incurred'. It was, in fact, 'superabundant'. 'It was offered in a finite nature, but by an Infinite Being' (242). God the Father *might* have chosen to save the world without demanding the death of God the Son; the death of the Son was not *necessary*, but was *willed* by the Son because 'Jesus was enamoured of profuse self-sacrifice'. Although the 'profusion' and 'generosity' of 'self-sacrifice' could be seen everywhere in the Passion, it had begun when Christ 'surrendered His throne on high' and 'His angel-ministers' (243). The self-emptying of the pre-existent Son shaped and formed Liddon's understanding of Christology. Christ's sacrifice was primarily an expression of the self-humbling of God the Son before God the Father; it was expressive of the loving relationships internal to the Triune Godhead; it was an aspect of God's living love, and would have happened from eternity irrespective of the Fall. In Liddon's sermon, Christological kenosis and Scotism were knitted together as mutually supporting sets of ideas.

V

Under the editorship of the Revd F. G. Lee, the *Union Review* had published Hopkins's 'Barnfloor and Winepress', together with work by Dolben, in September, 1865. Three months later, in January, 1866, the magazine published an enthusiastic review of Liddon's *University Sermons*. The anonymous reviewer described Liddon's work as 'certainly the most striking

Lectures, four references are made to Petavius (68, and 427-33). Since Pomplun's argument is that Hopkins constructed his theology of the Great Sacrifice from such sources, their mediation via Liddon is clearly important. Pomplun himself says that 'We do not know which of these sources Hopkins may have known' (10), and concludes that the evidence is 'merely circumstantial' (32). In response, I argue that although it may well be true that Petavius and de Lugo were forerunners of Hopkins, the evidence suggests that Liddon introduced him to the names of the baroque interpreters of Scotus. Liddon's sermon on 'The Divine Victim' provides the point of focus, concentration, and originary instruction from which Hopkins likely worked.

volume of sermons that has appeared among us for many years – perhaps the most striking since Dr. Newman's' (37). Special attention was paid to Liddon's use of Scotist themes.

We venture also to differ very respectfully from our author in his preference of the Thomist to the Scotist view of the motive of the Incarnation. We took occasion to record our own preference for the latter in reviewing Mr. Oxenham's book on the Atonement [*Union Review*, July 1865] , and we may refer to that volume as containing some of our reasons for it, and for what seems to us a sufficient answer to the ordinary objection based on certain passages in Scripture and the Fathers, and the language of the Nicene Creed. Neither Creed nor Scripture deal directly with the divine intention, but with revealed facts. And, as a fact, Jesus *was* incarnated "*for our salvation*," but it does not at all follow that He would not have been incarnated, if salvation, in the limited sense of redemption, had not been needed, as assuredly redemption was not the *sole* object of His Incarnation, as things now are. Mr. Liddon's statement of the Scotist view is so admirable, and shows so keen an appreciation of its force and depth, that we are not without hope of his seeing cause to reconsider his adoption of what appears to us a narrower and less thoroughly satisfactory estimate of the great fact on which Christianity is based. It is an ancillary recommendation of this view, though not, of course, one that could be pressed if it stood alone, that it recognises the truth, and therefore is an assistance in correcting the imperfections of many modern forms of theological speculation, such as Mr. F. D. Maurice's, Dean Stanley's, and Mr. Robertson's (47-48).

Notice needs to be made to the reviewer's references to Oxenham's work, as it provides evidence of further-developed interest in Scotist theology at Oxford in the 1860s. Oxenham – whose own conversion from Anglicanism to Roman Catholicism in 1857 had set an important precedent at Balliol – will be familiar to Hopkins scholars from the correspondence with

Urquhart.¹⁴ He had also once been close to Liddon, and memorialised their friendship in a potentially homoerotic poem dedicated to ‘H. P. L.’.¹⁵ Curiously, Oxenham’s theological study, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement* (1865), has not received the attention it arguably deserves, for it provides a fine example of Catholic writing on the Incarnation that was current when Hopkins was taking his decision to convert.¹⁶ The crucial point to observe is that, although Oxenham concerned himself primarily with the history of doctrine, he nevertheless – as the writer in the *Union Review* saw – also provided a contemporary defence of themes in Scotist Christology. The idea that Christ would have become incarnate irrespective of the Fall was, Oxenham argued, ‘most in accordance with the tradition of the Church, and with what revelation would suggest to us of the love of God’ (10-11). In a direct comparison of Thomist and Scotist views of the ‘primary motive of the Incarnation’, he argued in favour of the latter, finding in it a richer theological vision which ‘opens out to us... deeper meaning’. Christ, he wrote, ‘would have come to be our Brother, though we had needed no redemption’ (100-101). He argued for ‘the priority of the idea of sacrifice to the idea of sin’, because ‘Sacrifice is the spontaneous expression of the homage due from the creature to his Creator’. Although ‘Sin impressed... on all human acts of devotion, an additional character of reparation... from the beginning it was not so’. He was emphatic that, ‘If man had never fallen, the most perfect sacrifice would still have been offered to the Eternal Father in the human life, though not in the death, of Jesus’ (102). ‘Theories about ransom and satisfaction’ should, therefore, ‘sink into

¹⁴ For further information, see O’Sullivan, ‘Henry Nutcombe Oxenham’.

¹⁵ As an undergraduate at Christ Church in the late 1840s, Oxenham (together with Hopkins’s tutor, Edwin Palmer), had been one of Liddon’s closest friends. He was ordained deacon in the Church of England at the same service that saw Liddon ordained priest (Johnston 8, 29). Oxenham’s poem, ‘To H. P. L.’ (first published in *The Sentence of Kaires* in 1854) is notable for the way it addresses its subject in a seemingly erotic fashion: ‘H. P. L.’ was the ‘dearest’ to whom ‘love’s keen eye-glance’ moved ‘When hearts with hearts unite’. In later editions of his *Poems* (1867 and 1871), Oxenham re-titled the poem, ‘Trial. To H. P. L.’.

¹⁶ The one exception to this rule is Pomplun (2015). Pomplun nevertheless overlooks the discussion of Oxenham and Liddon in the *Union Review*. In his view, Oxenham was ‘much closer to Hopkins’s own inspiration’ (8). My argument here is that Liddon’s sermon contains features that make it closer to Hopkins’s own theology than that found in Oxenham, and that Liddon should therefore be judged the more significant source.

subordination to a higher truth, when the Incarnation is... looked upon... as the fulfilment of an eternal purpose' (103).¹⁷

Liddon responded to the review by adding two footnotes to the second edition of the *University Sermons* (Easter, 1866). In the first footnote, he observed the 'force and ability' of Oxenham's criticism of the Anselmic doctrine, and referred his readers to the relevant section of *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement* (241). In the second (and longer) footnote, he referred to his 'friendly critic' in the *Union Review*, who had 'plead[ed] earnestly for the Scotist view of the Divine Incarnation' (241-42). Liddon would not endorse the Scotist doctrine because he was concerned that 'Scotus anticipated some modern Pantheistic theories'. Unfortunately, on this point Liddon's occasionally careless scholarship let him down. Confusing Duns Scotus with John Scotus Erigena, he cited the Latin text of the latter's *De Divisione naturae* via the English translation of Neander's *Church History*.¹⁸ He led himself to believe that Scotist teaching was irredeemable with 'fundamental distinctions upon which Revelation itself rests' (242). In Liddon's mind, Scotism was viewed as a dangerous step towards the Hegelianism criticised elsewhere in his sermons. And yet, notwithstanding his concerns over pantheism, the text of the sermon made clear that Liddon was nevertheless in sympathy with the *Christological* doctrine of the Scotists. The writer in the *Union Review* saw this with clarity.

For all the detailed work on Scotism in Oxenham's *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, there is good reason to suppose that Liddon's sermon on 'The Divine Victim' was the more

¹⁷ When discussing Scotist Christology, Oxenham cited the commentary *In Sent. Pet. Lomb.* lii. 19, 20 and the *Summa*, Pars III. Quaest. i. art. 3 & art. 8. As Pomplun points out, this shows that Scotus was here mediated by Petavius (21 and 25).

¹⁸ The relevant part of Neander's discussion of Scotus Erigena runs thus: 'creation is not to be attributed to God as an act [*but as an expression of God's being*]... God is all in all, as he alone truly is, and all true being in everything that exists, is himself... and the end of the course of the world, to be attained by means of the redemption, is that all should return back again to the original, archetypal being in God... [*Scotus Erigena taught the*] pantheistic idea that the Absolute has veiled itself under the forms of the finite – the Absolute in its Theophanies' (Neander, VI, 167-68).

important influence on the development of Hopkins's Christology. This is because Oxenham's book on the atonement was notably silent on the key issue of kenosis. Oxenham had obviously read Gottfried Thomasius's seminal work on this theme, *Christi Person und Werk* (1853), for he cited the Lutheran theologian's book in a note on recent theology on the motive of the Incarnation (179). In the same section of his book, he also quoted directly from the German translation of Martensen's equally important *Die christliche Dogmatik* (1850), suggesting that it could be compared with the Scotist view (178-79). But neither Thomasius nor Martensen were identified as kenoticists.¹⁹ As such, one can be confident that Oxenham could have drawn the theme of kenosis into his discussion if he had so chosen, but evidently did not. One looks in vain for references to the kenotic hymn from Philippians in Oxenham's book: the key Biblical texts are simply absent from *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*.²⁰ And unlike either Liddon or Hopkins, Oxenham did not seem to have envisaged an eternal sacrifice of the pre-existent Christ before the Father. To be precise, the sacrifice of Christ was limited within the temporal bounds of his incarnate years, for, although the death of Christ was 'not an isolated act, or even an isolated sacrifice', it was 'the natural consummation of that one great act of self-devotion, whose unbroken energy stretched from the Conception to the Cross' (60). The sacrifice of Christ, in this sense, was limited to the earth, taking place in the journey from Mary's womb to Golgotha, and repeated in the Mass.²¹ For all his interest in Scotist themes, Oxenham's Christology therefore lacked the distinctive concentration on pre-existent kenotic

¹⁹ On the kenotic Christologies of Thomasius and Martensen, see David Brown, *Divine Humanity: Kenosis and the Construction of a Christian Theology*, 42-62.

²⁰ The closest approximation to the theme occurred in the course of Oxenham's discussion of St Bernard's Christology, where passing expression was given to 'the humility by which God emptied Himself' (85). Nevertheless, beyond this single incidental remark, the idea was left completely undeveloped and was nowhere expanded on.

²¹ The English phrase "great sacrifice" was used three times by Oxenham, with reference to the second-century bishop Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis (24), to Plowden's *Traité du Sacrifice de Jésus Christ* (155), and to the Catholic Mass (190). In each case, the sources described were not English-language, and the phrase was not used with any emphasis. Besides, Oxenham's use of the phrase in 1865 was pre-dated by Liddon's use of it in 1859.

emptying shared by Liddon and Hopkins. One can therefore make a reasonable supposition that, in this limited sense, the position Hopkins developed in his well-known retreat notes on ‘The Great Sacrifice’ bore the imprint of Liddon’s sermon on ‘The Divine Victim’ more than that of Oxenham’s *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*.

VI

As Hopkins noted, ‘it was only through Christ and the great sacrifice that God had meant any being to come to him at all’ (*SD* 137-38). When, in November, 1881, Hopkins set out his own interpretation of the kenotic hymn from Philippians, he fixed on a three-stage pattern of self-emptying: ‘(1) in the procession of the godhead; (2) in his entrance into creation, his incarnation proper; (3) on earth, in the ἐνανθρώπewσις, the becoming man’ (*SD* 181).²² Granted – as significant scholars have argued – that the pattern is of the utmost importance to understanding Hopkins, there is no need to set out the basic Christological model again (it has been studied in detail from various perspectives).²³ Rather more pressing for present purposes is the question of how this model contrasts with Liddon’s earlier versions of kenosis. If Hopkins was remaking the content of Liddon’s sermon, how was it remade?

As we have seen, in the sermon on ‘The Divine Victim’ Liddon’s interpretation of kenosis moved through two distinct phases, ‘from the Throne of Glory to the human life, and

²² By this time, of course, Hopkins had spent just under ten years reading Scotus for himself. Surveying the evidence, Pomplun (3-4) reminds us that Hopkins read Scotus for the first time in 1872 (*J & P* 221), and made his last reference to Scotus in a letter of 1884 (*Further Letters* 349/*CW* 2:656). If, following Devlin and Pomplun, the Long Retreat notes of 1881 represent the ‘point at which the thought of Scotus had its most “decisive effect” on Hopkins’ (Pomplun 12), it is striking how this effect was expressed using Liddon’s vocabulary of “Great Sacrifice”. It is reasonable to say that Liddon’s sermons had introduced him to the Scotian themes years earlier, and that when he later read Scotus he still did so through a Liddonian lens.

²³ For analysis of these three stages, see Downes, *Great Sacrifice*, 54; Ong, *Hopkins, the Self, and God*, 112f; Lichtmann, ‘The Incarnational Aesthetic’, 37f; Johnson, *Gerard Manley Hopkins and Tractarian Poetry*, 181f.

from the human life to the exceptional pain and ignominy of the Cross' (*Some Words for God* 232). The immediate point to observe is that Liddon's two-stage model arguably placed as much emphasis on the eternal self-emptying of the pre-existent Son as it did on his humiliation of the cross. (In this he moved beyond his supposed master, Pusey, whose own sermons on kenotic themes were focussed with concentrated intensity on the crucifixion).²⁴ The theological idea was evidently alive in his mind at this point, for he reiterated it in the 1866 Bampton Lectures, where 'Two stages of condescension' were again described, 'one within and one beyond the limits of our Lord's Human Life'. The primary act of kenosis, 'whereby He had become Man out of a state of pre-existent glory', was followed once again by a second stage, where 'Being found in fashion as a Man, He voluntarily humbled Himself and became obedient unto death' (1882, 314-15).²⁵ Yet this model was not fixed in Liddon's mind. Five years later,

²⁴ Pusey's own sermon on Philippians 2: 5-7, 'The Incarnation, a Lesson of Humility' was initially published in 1848, in the first volume of his *Parochial Sermons*. 'He emptied Himself,' said Pusey. 'Such is the full force of the amazing word [ἐκένωσεν], for which we read "He made Himself of no reputation"' (61). In this sermon, Pusey laid emphasis on the self-humbling of the Word incarnate in flesh; if Christ humbled himself, so too should Christians – those who share in the mind of Christ. In another sermon from the same volume, Pusey had drawn out the cruciform shape of this kenosis: 'Self-denying, self-emptying charity, is the faint shadow of that love which brought Him down from the Bosom of the Father, clothed Him with the form of a Servant, to save us sinners... His Cross hallows it; His Cross preaches it; His Cross sustains it; His Cross rewards it' (33). Of the Tractarian writers, it should be remembered, Pusey in particular was drawn to 'an intense and tender theology of the Cross' (Brillioth, 242). Pusey's 'theologia crucis', as Brillioth saw, was a connecting point between 'Evangelicalism and Neo-Anglicanism' (244), but it was also 'typically Augustinian' (250). Theological reflection on the *Christus humilis*, the 'self-humiliation of Christ... as the real content of the Incarnation, and also the prototype and pattern of all human self-denial' (250) was a hallmark of Pusey's thought – rather than Newman's – and it was from Pusey that the next generation of Anglican leaders learnt to focus their attention on the great sacrifice of Christ crucified. To illustrate the point, comparison may be drawn with Newman's sermon on Philippians 2:8, 'The Incarnate Son, a Sufferer and Sacrifice' which lacks any similarly developed kenotic element (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 6.6).

²⁵ Thomas Strong remembered (hazily) that Liddon had differed from Pusey only twice in his life, and that one point of disagreement had been over the 'rigour of Liddon's arguments as to our Lord's human knowledge' in his Bampton Lectures (*Centenary Memoir* 6). The published text included an extensive discussion of Christ's statement in Mark 13:32, and whether it indicated 'a specified limit to the knowledge actually possessed by His Human Soul during His ministry' (BL 466). Indeed, the ignorance of the human nature of Christ was, he said, something taught by 'Fathers of unquestioned orthodoxy' (468): 'As God, Christ did know the day of judgment; but it was consistent with the law of self-humiliation prescribed by His infinite love that He should assume all the conditions of real humanity, and therefore, with the rest, a limitation of knowledge' (469). This was not the heresy of the Agnotæ, for they 'attributed ignorance not merely to our Lord's Human Soul, but to the Eternal Word' (470). The 'co-existence of ignorance and knowledge' in the Person of Christ was another aspect of the mysterious 'co-existence of absolute blessedness and intense suffering' in the same (471). 'His Single Personality has two spheres of existence; in the one It is all-blessed, undying, and omniscient; in the other It meets with pain of mind and body, with actual death, and with a correspondent liability to a limitation of knowledge'. Indeed, such ignorance placed Christ 'in a perfect sympathy with the actual conditions of the

in his sermon on ‘The Humiliation of the Son of Man’ (1871), Liddon revised and developed the pattern in a direction that anticipates Hopkins more closely. Having signalled a renewed focus on Philippians 2:5-8 as a central *locus* for reflection on the person of Christ – ‘In no passage of his writings does St. Paul carry us more into the heights and depths of Christian doctrine than in these words’ (*Passiontide Sermons*, 1891, 18) – Liddon proceeded to preach on the kenosis of the pre-existent and eternal Son, who, though being God, ‘did not look on His equality with God as a prize to be jealously set store by’ (21). He then traced this eternal ‘self-humiliation’ in ‘three distinct stages’ in the economy of salvation (22):

[*These are*] the successive stages of the humiliation of the Eternal Son. Existing in the real Nature of God, He set no store upon His Equality with God, but emptied Himself of His Glory by taking on the real nature of a slave, and being made in the likeness of man – that is the first step in the descent – and being found in outward appearance as a man He humbled Himself among men, and became obedient unto death – that is the second; but when all forms of death were open to Him He chose to die in the manner which was most full of ignominy in the eyes of men – He became obedient to the death of the Cross – that is the third. (25)

Immediately one is struck by the fact that Liddon’s three-stage pattern of 1871 is not the same as Hopkins’s later version of 1881 – ‘(1) in the procession of the godhead; (2) in his entrance into creation, his incarnation proper; (3) on earth, in the ἐνανθρώπησιν, the becoming man’ (*SD* 181). Although it is not difficult to see how the models could be made to overlap, Hopkins evidently dwelt on the pre-existent, formally Trinitarian, aspects of kenosis more than

mental life of His brethren’ (472). Liddon evidently clarified his opinion on Pusey’s advice, since his correspondence demonstrates a commitment to Christ’s omniscience from January 1868 (Johnston, 124-25). When, in 1889, Gore suggested the real, kenotic, limitation of Christ’s knowledge, Liddon was left tortured.

Liddon did in this later sermon. By this point, Liddon's "first stage" is more or less equivalent to Hopkins's eventual "second stage". How might this be accounted for?

First, it should be observed that Pomplun's recent revisionary account of Hopkins's theology suggests that Hopkins may himself have initially thought in terms of a two-stage model of kenosis before eventually adopting a three-stage model. According to Pomplun's reading, Hopkins's Oxford sermon for July 6, 1879 (*S* 14-15) describes the sacrifice of Christ as moving through two 'moments': 'sacrifice as an act [*here*] consists of two components, offering and immolation'. For Pomplun, these two 'moments' should be 'logically separated'. 'In the first "moment" of the Incarnation, the Word no sooner finds himself in human nature than he raises his heart to the Father and offers him his very being. In the second "moment," the Son learns that his sacrifice is to be accomplished on the cross' (Pomplun 17). As such, the initial model is similar to Liddon's earlier one. This suggests that neither model should not be interpreted as fixed: for both men, the "pattern" of kenosis apparently developed and evolved.

Second, building on this, one should say that ideas of kenosis in Nineteenth Century British literature were much more complex than has often been acknowledged. Some of the more recent studies of kenotic Christology in Victorian Britain have tended to restrict discussion to dogmatic treatises alone and, as a result, have largely ignored sermons and other types of writing related to the theme.²⁶ The (quite false) impression one all-too-often receives is that English kenotic thought began with Gore's essay in *Lux Mundi* (1889) – but if that were the case, neither Liddon's sermons nor Hopkins's devotional writings can be accounted for. A different picture needs to be developed to explain the evolution of kenotic themes in Victorian

²⁶ For examples of this trend, see Brown, *Divine Humanity*, esp. 127; Thompson, 'Nineteenth Century Kenotic Christology'; Law, 'Kenotic Christology'. It is impossible to locate Liddon and Hopkins in such accounts of the history of the doctrinal theme: the dating and type of theology they represent simply do not fit within the proposed narrative.

England, and, thankfully, it is one which can be described in outline quite succinctly once greater attention is paid to sermons and philosophical literature.

In 1829, Julius Hare preached his sermon, 'The Law of Self-Sacrifice'. For present purposes, the sermon is notable for two reasons. First, it is striking to observe how Hare applied his theme to the Trinity: 'Yea, the spirit of self-sacrifice is common to every Person of the Blessed Trinity: in the work of self-sacrifice every Person of the Trinity taketh part... in the work of Creation... in the work of Redemption... [*and*] in the infinite condescension, the patient ministerings of the Comforter' (180). Building on the association of self-sacrifice with the creative act of God the Father, Hare then made an incisive move: he proceeded to interpret the creative act of *poets* as being in some sense likewise self-sacrificial:

Look for example at poetry. The might of the Imagination is manifested by its launching forth from the petty creek, where the accidents of birth moored it, into the wide ocean of being, – by its going abroad into the world around, passing into whatever it meets with, animating it, and becoming one with it. The complete union and identification of the poet with his poem, – the suppression of his own individual insulated consciousness, with its narrowness of thought and pettiness of feeling, – is what we admire in the great masters of that which for this reason we justly call classical poetry... [As] the poet must write in the spirit of self-sacrifice, so the reader of poetry, who would rightly feel and enjoy it, must in like manner pass out of himself into it... So that... such poetry... carries us out... into fresh fields of the imagination (197-98).

The consummation of Hare's sermon, the end to which this metaphysics, ethics, and aesthetics of sacrifice led, was 'the act of the most complete self-sacrifice' – the kenotic hymn of Philippians 2: 6-11 (203).

Themes from Hare's 1829 sermon were later echoed in a series of sermons by his brother-in-law, F. D. Maurice, and published under the title, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice* (1854).²⁷ For Maurice, the 'ground of sacrifice in the divine nature' was 'in that submission of the Son to the Father' (110-11). As such, 'the law of sacrifice' (Hare's phrase here re-used by Maurice) was 'involved in the very character and being of God Himself' (112-13). Maurice's sermons took kenosis and made it the essential, divine law of creation: 'The principle of sacrifice has been ascertained once and for ever to be the principle, the divine principle'. For Maurice, the law of sacrifice was 'that in which God can alone fully manifest His own eternal Being, His innermost character, the order which He has appointed all creatures, voluntary and involuntary, to obey' (226).²⁸ Here one arguably finds a developed Trinitarian account of the submission of the pre-existent Son to the Father that was almost equal to Liddon's, yet very different in its expression. Was Maurice an influence on Hopkins's Christology?

It is hard to imagine that a Balliol student of Hopkins's type would have no knowledge of Maurice's *Doctrine of Sacrifice*. It certainly influenced his friend and contemporary, Henry Scott Holland, who, in the mid-1870s, chose to echo the Maurician 'law of surrender, of self-sacrifice' in one sermon, and the Liddonian 'great Sacrifice' in another (*Logic and Life*, 83 and 287). But there is further reason to consider Maurice as a potential source for Hopkins's theological reflection. Elsewhere in *The Doctrine of Sacrifice* – in a sermon on Philippians 2:5-12 – Maurice had discussed an alternative translation for verse 6, 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God'. According to Maurice, there were those who claimed 'this passage should be translated differently... it should be taken to mean, *He did not eagerly grasp at being equal with God*'. His own view was that 'on the whole, it more nearly corresponds with the tone and purpose of the passage, than the ordinary version' (219).

²⁷ Maurice acknowledges his debt to Hare in an appended note to the volume (322).

²⁸ In his lectures on *The Epistles of John*, Maurice taught that 'The law of sacrifice is not a law for moments and crises of our existence; it is the law for the whole of it' (209).

Those who know Hopkins well may recognise a point of correlation here, for Maurice's translation of ἀρπαγμόν as "eagerly grasping" (in preference to "robbery") apparently anticipates Hopkins's 'snatching-matter' in the much quoted letter to Bridges dated February 3rd, 1883 (*L* 175). Since Hopkins himself offered the rather vague explanation, 'I got the sense of ἀρπαγμόν from Jowett or some modern critic' (*L* 177), it is not unwarranted (granted the absence of any evidence for anything of the sort in Jowett) to speculate that Maurice's *Doctrine of Sacrifice* was the actual source of the translation, misremembered by Hopkins.²⁹ This is, of course, a conjecture, though not an unreasonable one.

What can be said with confidence is that in the 1860s Maurice's theology was being promoted at Balliol by Thomas Hill Green. According to Nettleship's 'Memoir', sometime around 1860 Green had already 'assimilated... Wordsworth, Carlyle, Maurice, and probably Fichte' (Nettleship, *Memoir*, xxv), and, over the next decade, Green was evidently busy developing a synthesis of Maurician and Hegelian themes.³⁰ This process culminated in the publication of a recognisably Hegelian-tinged doctrine of Christological sacrifice in his Lay Sermon, 'The Witness of God', in 1870.³¹ However, there is clear evidence that Green was already deploying idealist conceptions of "divine emptying" as early as 1866. In his first published work – the essay 'On the Philosophy of Aristotle' – he criticised classical Platonism for its lack of 'an account of the process by which the divine spirit, emptied of its fullness,

²⁹ In the 1870s, the best available exposition of the Greek text was given in Lightfoot's commentary on *Philippians* (1st edition 1868; 4th edition 1879). Lightfoot offered his own preferred version as, 'Though He pre-existed in the form of God, yet He did not look upon equality with God as a prize which must not slip from His grasp, but He emptied Himself, divested Himself, taking upon Him the form of a slave' (111).

³⁰ It is common to refer philosophical use of the language of kenosis back to Hegel, where the word expressed the 'process of self-realization through going out into the other' (David Brown, 39). As Hegel himself wrote: 'the externalization or kenosis of substance, its growth into self-consciousness, expresses the transition into the opposite, the unconscious transition of necessity' Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans A. V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 457. See also p. 465.

³¹ See also Green's explicit references to kenosis in his lectures (c. 1871-73) on 'Justification by Faith' (197), and on 'The Incarnation' (209). On Green's Christology see R. Norman, 'The Christologies of Kant and the British Idealists: Ethical and Ontological Theories of Kenosis' in *Collingwood and British Idealism Studies*, 19:1 (2013), 113-37.

evermore refills the shell of being' (78). Irrespective of any potential Hegelian influence here, the fact that Green expressed himself with an allusion to Philippians 2:7 ("emptied of its fullness") is striking. It demonstrates that the theme of kenosis was becoming current in philosophical discussion at Balliol just at the time when Liddon had been preaching on the doctrine in his sermons and Bampton Lectures.

What might this have meant for Hopkins? For present purposes, it is crucial to recall that Green's article on Aristotle was written and published 'during the period from Michaelmas term 1865 to Hilary term 1867' when Green 'lectured and tutored Hopkins in the *Nicomachean Ethics*' (*Hopkins' Idealism*, 138).³² As an undergraduate at Balliol in the mid-1860s, it was quite possible that Hopkins was exposed to different ideas of divine emptying, in the lecture room as well as from the pulpit. If this was indeed the case, it is little wonder that the idea lodged in his theological imagination, awaiting to emerge in a new shape. If Hopkins's own version of kenosis differed from Liddon's, the explanation may simply be that awareness of philosophical accounts of the doctrine (whether he agreed with them or not) spurred him on to further creative theological work of his own.

³² Green's essay on Aristotle repays careful study since it contains in seed some of the direction of Nettleship's later concern with the themes of language, poetry, and kenosis, applicable to understanding Hopkins in the context of Oxford in the 1860s and 1870s (see R. Norman, 'Ascetic Co-operation'). In his essay, Green suggests that 'knowledge' is not more explicable than 'language' (50), and that the question 'What is a thing... is equivalent to, What is the meaning of its name?' (55). As such, 'in the very act of naming, *i.e.* of knowing them, we transmute them' (72). Green further argued that 'The process of thought appears as one not of abstraction but of concretion' (63), as objects were determined by a 'creative spirit' to be in relation one to another, 'as a rhythm', on a 'thread of spiritual unity' (69). Each particular, individual object 'projected' its form 'from within', thus 'individualising the thing known' (71), and yet 'this very limitation' simultaneously implied 'a relation of each to the other, which constitutes an element of absolute continuity' (72). For Green – as for Hegel – 'pure being, instead of being dead matter, [was] a "principle of motion,"' the work of 'a creative spirit' (80). The 'deity' was 'the fullness of the world instead of its emptiness' (85), and a 'permanent source of unshaking activity' (91). Christianity was represented as holding to 'the idea of a God, who realised himself in the particularities of nature and man's moral life' (79). The 'philosopher', the 'poet', and the 'saint' in different ways expressed an 'anticipatory assimilation of the world as spiritual', 'conscious of a presence which is always his own, yet always fresh, always lightened with the smile of a divine and eternal youth' (90).

VII

Readers who know Liddon's name primarily through biographies of Hopkins may associate him, more than anything else, with failure: he was the man who failed to keep Hopkins in the Church of England, the man who could offer only milky inspiration for the young, but not the red meat of Newman's Roman Catholicism. Joined to this verdict, there often follows a thought that Liddon was a man for whom it would be difficult to have personal sympathy today. He is frequently presented as a particularly arch Victorian. Martin, for instance, wrote of the 'slight distaste' for Liddon 'that a modern reader may feel' – this was a man who was 'faintly suspect' (39). Although Martin hastily added the proviso that Liddon was 'one of the most popular men at Oxford', not much was offered to explain how or why this was the case (40). In contrast to this kind of modern view, the reminiscences of many of those who knew Liddon suggest that he had – more often than not – been remembered with a mixture of warmth and awe-struck fascination. Yes, they typically shared his Victorian cultural assumptions, and yes, they were usually his religious sympathizers, but to many of his contemporaries Liddon was neither unpopular nor suspect. He was intelligent; he was educated; he had the power to inspire and propel; he had – according to Acton – intellectual advantages over Newman. He was, if anything, a figurehead of Anglo-Catholic religious devotion.

Opinions of Liddon, and of his influence on Hopkins, are in pressing need of revision: evidence from his *University Sermons* suggest that he was a source of inspiration for the young Hopkins's sacramental vision of nature, that he may well have been the initial point of introduction to the Ignatian *Exercises*, that he may similarly have been the first point of introduction to Scotist theology, and that he was responsible for teaching a doctrine of Christ's kenosis as a 'Great Sacrifice'. What this means is this: all the major theological themes of

Hopkins's work are to be found, in seed and root-form, in Liddon's first book – a neglected volume of sermons published when he was Hopkins's confessor in 1865. Of course Hopkins grew away from his Anglican past, and, as a Jesuit, distanced himself from Liddon. Nevertheless, to understand his growth, one must understand where he began. 'Mine, O thou lord of life, send my roots rain'.

Works Cited

- Anon. 'Liddon's University Sermons'. *The Union Review: A Magazine of Catholic Literature and Art*. Vol. 4 (January 1866). 35-48.
- Atkins, Gareth. 'Ignatius Loyola'. *Making and Remaking Saints in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Ed. Gareth Atkins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016. 127-43.
- Atlay, J. B. *Sir Henry Wentworth Acland, Bart. K.C.B., F.R.S. Regius Professor of Medicine in the University of Oxford. A Memoir*. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1903.
- Bell, G. K. A. *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury*. Vol. I. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Brillioth, Yngve. *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933.
- Briscoe, J. F. V. S. S. *Coles: Letters, Papers, Addresses, Hymns and Verses, With a Memoir*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1930.
- Brown, David. *Divine Humanity: Kenosis and the Construction of a Christian Theology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011.
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Cotter, James Finn. *Inscape: The Christology and Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972.

- Downes, David Anthony. *The Great Sacrifice: Studies in Hopkins*. New York: University Press of America, 1983.
- . *The Ignatian Personality of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. New York: University Press of America, 1990,
- Ellison, Robert H. *The Victorian Pulpit: Spoken and Written Sermons in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. London: Associated University Presses, 1998.
- Francis, Keith. 'Sermon Studies: Major Issues and Future Directions'. *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901*. Ed. Keith Francis and William Gibson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 611-30.
- Gibson, William. 'The British Sermon 1689-1901: Quantities, Performance, and Culture'. *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901*. Ed. Keith Francis and William Gibson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 3-30.
- Higgins, Lesley, ed. *Gerard Manley Hopkins. Complete Works, Vol. IV: Oxford Essays and Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hill, Roland. *Lord Acton*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *Lord Acton. A Study in Conscience and Politics*. Chicago: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Jalland, Patricia. 'Mr Gladstone's Daughters'. *The Gladstonian Turn of Mind*. Ed. Bruce L. Kinzer. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985. 97-122.
- Johnson, Margaret. *Gerard Manley Hopkins and Tractarian Poetry*. Farnham: Ashgate, 1997.
- Johnston, John Octavius. *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1904.

Liddon, Henry Parry. *Some Words for God: Being Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, chiefly during the years 1863-1865*. London: Rivingtons, 1865.

-----. *University Sermons: Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*. 6th ed. London: Rivingtons, 1876.

-----. *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. 9th ed., revised. London: Rivingtons, 1882.

-----. *Sermons on Old Testament Subjects*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1891.

-----. *Clerical Life and Work. A Collection of Sermons*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.

-----. *Sermons on Some Words of St. Paul*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898.

-----. *Some Elements of Religion: Lent Lectures, 1870*. 6th ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1904.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*. 4th ed. London: Macmillan, 1879.

Martin, Robert Bernard. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Very Private Life*. London: HarperCollins, 1991.

Masterman, Lucy. *Mary Gladstone (Mrs. Drew). Her Diaries and Letters*. London: Methuen, 1930.

Neander, Augustus. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Volume VI*. Trans. Joseph Torrey. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852.

Norman, Ralph. 'The Christologies of Kant and the British Idealists: Ethical and Ontological Theories of Kenosis'. *Collingwood and British Idealism Studies*, 19, no. 1 (2013). 113-37.

Norman, Ralph. "'Ascetic Co-operation": Henry Scott Holland and Gerard Manley Hopkins'. *Collingwood and British Idealism Studies* 23, no. 1 (2017). 67-96.

Nixon, Jude V. 'Gerard Manley Hopkins and Henry Parry Liddon: An Unacknowledged Influence'. *Renascence* 42, no. 1-2 (1989-90). 87-110.

-----, *Gerard Manley Hopkins and His Contemporaries: Liddon, Newman, Darwin, and Pater*. New York: Garland, 1994.

O'Sullivan, Wayne M. 'Henry Nutcombe Oxenham: "Enfant Terrible" of the Liberal Catholic Movement in Mid-Victorian England'. *The Catholic Historical Review* 82, no. 4 (Oct. 1996). 637-660.

Ong, Walter J. *Hopkins, the Self, and God*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Oxenham, Henry Nutcombe. *The Sentence of Kaïres, and Other Poems*. Oxford: T. and G. Shrimpton, 1854.

-----, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement: An Historical Inquiry into its Development in the Church*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865.

-----, *Poems*. Third edition. London: R. Washbourne, 1871.

Palmer, Bernard. *High and Mitred. Prime Ministers as Bishop-Makers, 1837-1977*. London: SPCK, 1992.

Paul, Herbert, ed. *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*. London: Macmillan, 1913.

- Pomplun, Trent. 'The Theology of Gerard Manley Hopkins: From John Duns Scotus to the Baroque'. *The Journal of Religion* 95:1 (2015): 1-34.
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie. *Parochial Sermons*, Volume 1. Fourth edition. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1852.
- Roberts, Andrew. *Salisbury: Victorian Titan*. London: Phoenix, 2000.
- Rosmini, Antonio. *Of the Five Wounds of the Holy Church*. Ed. H. P. Liddon. London: Rivingtons, 1883.
- Shiple, Orby, ed. *Lyra Eucharistica*. 2nd edition. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864.
- Talbot, Edward Stuart. *Memories of Early Life*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1924.
- Tennyson, G. B. *Victorian Devotional Poetry: The Tractarian Mode*. London: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- White, Norman. *Hopkins: A Literary Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.