



# FAITH & REASON

THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTENDOM COLLEGE

Winter 1982 | Vol. VIII, No. 4

---

---

## NEWMAN-THE ECUMENIST?

*John R. Griffin*

---

---

*John Henry Cardinal Newman (1801-1890) remains one of the most diversely cited figures in recent history. Touted as a champion by a host of religious, political, literary and historical interest groups, the great scholar has been controversial since his entry into the Catholic Church in 1845. Despite the unmatched clarity of Newman's prose, his devotees have frequently formed biased impressions, not the least of which is the view that Newman was the great proto-ecumenist, anticipating the directionality of post Vatican II Catholicism. In the article below, John R. Griffin uses Newman's own words, from his major works to his letters, in an effort to clarify Newman's relationship with the ecumenical movement.*



ONE OF THE MARKS OF CARDINAL NEWMAN'S GREATNESS AS A WRITER IS TO BE found in the wide variety of readers who have been attracted to his work and claimed Newman as one of their own. It is scarcely too much to say that every modern school of philosophers, theologians, literary critics, and religious thinkers have described Newman as a kindred soul, and it was only to be expected that members of "the fastest growing discipline in contemporary Christian life"<sup>1</sup>-ecumenism-should have found in Newman's life and work the seeds of their own enterprise-the reunification of Christian churches, in particular the Church of England with the Catholic Church. According to this interpretation, Newman was a prophet of the "ökumenische gestalt" of our time and a participant in the original ecumenical movement of the last Tractarians.<sup>2</sup>

Almost twenty years ago, Father Atkins offered an ecumenical reading of Newman's *Apologia*,<sup>3</sup> drawing lengthy analogies between the *Apologia* and the work of the German ecumenist, Max Lackmann, who urged the ideal of a corporate reunion of the Christian churches versus individual conversions. In Lackmann's phrase, there should be "no emigrants" from one religion to another.<sup>4</sup> More recently, John Coulson and others offered an ecumenical seminar on Newman at Oxford with the expressed ideal of "bringing Newman home" to England and showing the ecumenical aspects of his work. In his "Introduction" to the volume of papers that resulted, Coulson wrote:

That Newman was a master of the spiritual life and a great apologist for Rome was not in question. At times, as in the Lectures on Justification, he writes with a deliberately constructive or ecumenical intention; at others his situation obliges him to be polemic-and in this he was a man of his age. But it is in the underlying themes and motives of

his work which make him uniquely the pioneer of unity.<sup>5</sup>

The meaning of the above is obvious: when Newman was at his very best, he was an ecumenist and if his Catholic volumes do not always yield an ecumenical reading, that was largely the fault of his situation. We must search the Cardinal's motives and "underlying themes" if we would understand his unique achievement as a pioneer of Christian unity.

Still more recently scholars of various religions gathered at Rome to celebrate the ecumenical significance of Newman's cardinalate, and the general conclusion of the papers given on that occasion was to the effect that Newman might be regarded as a "bridge for men of good will" between the Church of England and the Catholic Church.<sup>6</sup>

## A CHALLENGE

In this paper I wish to challenge such a reading of Newman's life and work, and will offer a brief survey of many of his Catholic volumes, especially those that contain some discussion of the claims of the churches of England and Rome, with the intention of showing a different reading of Newman's achievement in his own time. I will discuss at some length those volumes which have been described as ecumenical, *The Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1846) and the *Apologia* (1864), but will not discuss the *Via Media* in either its Anglican or Catholic form. My reason for ignoring that work is that Newman wrote it originally as an argument against Rome and edited it in 1878, with extensive revisions, to keep Anglicans from using its arguments to remain in the Church of England. The reviewers of the revised edition knew very well that Newman had "slain his former self" with the new edition.

*The Essay* is the first of the texts that has been described as ecumenical, but it was expressly addressed to the Anglican arguments against the Roman Catholic Church, namely, the Roman Church had grossly added to the original deposit of faith that was given to the first Apostles—the very argument that Newman had himself used during the Oxford Movement against Rome. The basic objection to the idea behind the *Essay*, from an ecumenical standpoint, was that the candidates for reunion could not know the doctrines to which they were committing themselves. One scholar has evaded the implications of this obstacle by noting that Newman was himself unhappy with the *Essay*, with the implication that if Newman were unhappy with the text, the idea of development might be put aside as an obstacle of Christian unity.<sup>7</sup> I see, as did the *Essay's* first readers, the idea of development as a major obstacle to Christian unity, but there are many other items in the *Essay* that tell absolutely against an ecumenical reading of it. Almost the entire "Introduction" is a demonstration of the historical absurdity of Protestantism: "To be deep in history," wrote Newman, "is to cease to be a Protestant.... What-

ever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this."<sup>8</sup> Combined with this pervasive critique of Protestantism, including English Protestantism, was a defense of Catholic faith and disciplines, including two that were most offensive to the Anglo-Catholics: the devotions paid to Mary in the Catholic Church and Papal Infallibility<sup>9</sup>

The early Catholic essays were equally damning to English Protestants. In his review of Keble's second volume of poems, the *Lyra Innocentium* (1846), Newman described Keble's position in the church of England as a "blameless Donatism,"<sup>10</sup> meaning that Keble's religious views were at once alien to his own church and Rome. The "John Keble" essay, moreover, has a series of devastating comments on the breakdown of discipline in the Church of England, and it ends with something like a prayer that Keble's patron, Mary, the Mother of God, would lead him into the Catholic Church.<sup>11</sup> In an essay of 1850, "Characteristics of the Popes," Newman praised Gregory the Great for his struggles with alien governments and peoples. A real bishop, he contended, could never be what was then called a "conservative; i.e. to look out for number one,"<sup>12</sup> a comment that sounds like a satiric thrust at the Anglican bishops which Newman later made explicit in his Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.

The next major volume was a series of lectures given in the spring and summer of 1850, and published under the title *Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*. Owen Chadwick has described the work as "impossible to forgive" because of its satiric portrait of the national church and the "gentlemen" clergy who were its ministers. Newman was indeed severe with the national church, but Chadwick missed the most devastating element in the text: the extensive comments on the intellectual absurdity of "Anglo-Catholics" who professed a creed that scarcely "half a dozen" persons in the whole of Christianity followed. The only way these "Puseyites," a phrase that Newman used in his correspondence, could sustain themselves was by turning their backs on their earlier pledges to obey their bishops and oppose the state (erastianism). Anglican scholars partly confirm the accuracy of Newman's account by pointing out that Pusey and his followers were opposed by the "whole of the episcopate," but these scholars virtually turn their backs on the burden of history when they write of the "triumphs" of the Anglo-Catholic party in the years after Newman's succession. This is not the place to examine the accuracy of Newman's account of the original Oxford Move-

ment, but no one would call the Difficulties ecumenical. The Anglo-Catholics could survive only through setting up themselves as “popes and doctors” in a church that had no historical reality. Those who would be consistent with their professions of 1833, though no one knew it when the Tracts first made their appearance, belonged to Rome, “the one ark of salvation.”<sup>13</sup>

The following year Newman wrote an equally devastating account of English Protestantism, and his main theme was the hypocrisy of the English in their assertion of moral superiority over Catholics. In the process of the lectures, Newman made a series of comments on Father Achilli’s sordid past in order to discredit him as a witness against the evils of Rome. It is worth remarking, however, that Newman’s target included the whole of the English church, for the “Puseyites” had been even more active than the Protestants in their assertions against the moral deterioration that occurred when men went over to Rome. It was, after all, Keble’s closest friend J. T. Coleridge who gave Newman the “Puseyite sermon” on his deterioration since becoming a Catholic, and there is good reason to suggest that Coleridge took his text from Keble.<sup>14</sup>

Neither set of lectures has ever been described as ecumenical, and it is little wonder that both have been passed over by those who wish to suggest that Newman was sympathetic to either the Church of England or the Anglo-Catholics within the church. What is relevant is that so many of the ideas in both volumes were reproduced in the next volume, the *Apologia pro vita sua*, which has been described as ecumenical. The *Apologia* was, of course, written to answer Kingsley’s charge that Newman had been crypto-papist during his years in the Church of England and that he, like his Roman brethren, were permitted to lie under the patronage of St. Alphonsus Liguori, “the patron saint of lying.”

It has been suggested that Newman deliberately stirred up the controversy with Charles Kingsley so that he might address his Anglican friends, Keble and Pusey, in terms of ecumenical friendship.<sup>15</sup> Father Atkins has suggested that one proof of Newman’s ecumenical sympathies is to be found in Newman’s comments in the *Apologia* to the effect that he had been slow “in making converts.”<sup>16</sup> Other scholars have supplied an ecumenical reading of the *Apologia* because of its comments on Tract 90 and *Via Media*. Each of these readings would require a much longer paper to discuss and evaluate, but it should

be noted that none of the *Apologia*’s first readers interpreted the work as ecumenical in spirit or theme.”

The *Apologia* is in fact a kind of polemic or, (Newman’s phrase) “manifestation,” against the charge that he had clouded his reputation since his earliest days in the Oxford Movement. But he was addressing a much larger audience of judges than Charles Kingsley, including Dr. Pusey and the Anglo-Catholics. Indeed, his response to Kingsley’s use of some of his writings is a fair measure of the kind of defense that Newman formulated for himself and for the Catholic Church. Kingsley had cited Newman’s comments on the “filthy, lazy, story-telling beggar woman” who had a glimpse of heaven that was absolutely closed to the most righteous statesman who was without divine grace. In his response, Newman cited the scriptural passage about harlots and publicans going into heaven before the Pharisees as a measure of the hypocritical stance of the English Protestants towards Catholics, the very point that he had made in the lectures of 1850 and 1851.



As for the alleged gesture of friendship towards the Anglo-Catholics who had remained in the Church of England, it should be remarked that neither Keble nor Pusey read the *Apologia* in that manner. Indeed, the text came to be a sort of forbidden book with both men. Neither mentioned it in their extensive correspondence of that time and it appears that Coleridge removed the letter in which Keble discussed the *Apologia* when he gave Keble’s papers to the Bodleian. That letter is the only one missing from the collection. It is true that Keble wrote a letter of gratitude to Newman for some of the letter’s comments about him in the *Apologia*. But it is equally true that Keble had at first attempted to dissuade Newman from answering “such trash” as Kingsley’s charge, and there are many reasons why Keble might have wished for Newman to keep silent.

Keble’s discomfort at what Newman might write in response to Kingsley may have included Keble’s early participation in the Oxford Movement and his earlier obedience to his bishop.<sup>19</sup> Whatever may have been Keble’s reasons for attempting to persuade Newman not to answer Kingsley’s pamphlet, the *Apologia* comments on Keble’s Toryism- “The creed of Oxford”-are not a com-

pliment if we remember a Christian's habitual use of the word creed. With Pusey, Newman was even more severe. Here are the comments:

He was a man of large designs; he had a hopeful, sanguine mind; he had no fear of others; he was haunted by no intellectual perplexities. People are apt to say that he was once nearer to the Catholic Church than he is now; I pray God that he may one day be far nearer to the Catholic Church than he was then; for I believe ... in his reason and judgment, all the time that I knew him, he never was near to it at all. When I became a Catholic, I was often asked, "What of Dr. Pusey?" When I said that I did not see symptoms of his doing as I had done, I was sometimes thought uncharitable. If confidence in his position is, (as it is,) a first essential in the leader of a party, this Dr. Pusey possessed pre-eminently.<sup>20</sup>

The comments need to be understood in terms of Victorian usage. The statement that Pusey was the leader of a "party" is a devastating indictment of Pusey's leadership of the Anglo-Catholics in the year after 1845. Pusey, as Newman had foretold, was a kind of "pope" and "doctor" in a system that was largely the outgrowth of his tendentious reading of the Apostolic Fathers. Such a method was a kind of "Patristico-Protestantism," solely dependent on the selective readings of Dr. Pusey. Being a Catholic, moreover, meant following legitimate authority, and it was Pusey's boast that he "never trusted the bishops." He was "always independent," as one of his biographers noted.<sup>21</sup> It might only be added that Pusey grumbled to Newman about those comments.

The comments on the Church of England also drew the fire of Protestant critics, and rightly so, for Newman described the national church as no more than a "half-way house" between atheism and Rome. The English church was a breakwater against infidelity, but the best that could be said for it was that it kept out evils "worse than its own."<sup>22</sup>

The next Newman volume was published under the title *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, written as a response to Pusey's *Eirenicon* of 1865. Pusey's volume was not read as an *Eirencon* at the time, and I believe that it could be proved that Pusey never intended it to be. His first point, as he himself admitted, was to answer the recently published pamphlet of Manning's against the English Church, *The Crown and Council: A Second Letter to an Anglican Friend*

(1864). Newman's response was a patient explanation of the place and tradition of Mary in the Catholic Church. In this context it is worth noting George Tavad's comments on Newman's Letter:

Ingratitude is often times the lot of peacemakers. They are misunderstood, and the result of their efforts [is] to provoke new quarrels. Pusey's book was well received in some Catholic circles in England and elsewhere. But Newman himself misunderstood it. He answered Pusey in an ironic and somewhat humorous tone. As a matter of fact, his Letter to Reverend Pusey of 1866 denied the existence of incriminating practices. But to deny what others had seen is never an answer.<sup>23</sup>

This is not the place to comment on the details of Tavad's reading of either the Pusey or the Newman book, but Tavad is far from accurate in his comments on the Catholic response to Pusey's *Eirenicon*. Newman's Letter was easily the most charitable and sympathetic of the numerous Catholic books that were written in response to Pusey.<sup>24</sup> What is important about the Tavad comments, however, is that Newman apparently missed the one opportunity to do his part in the promotion of Christian unity, and if Newman failed to take advantage of that occasion, what is to be said for the numerous other volumes which were written to defend either the Church or himself?

*The Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* was the last of Newman's major controversial volumes. As in the case of the above, the Letter contains a rigorous defense of Catholic doctrines and devotions along with a sharp attack on rival systems. Ecumenical scholars have sometimes written as if the *Letter* were written against the English Ultramontanes because of Newman's comments on the place of conscience in Catholic life.<sup>21</sup> It is true that Newman qualified the doctrine of Papal Infallibility in obvious contrast to the interpretations of Manning and Ward, but Newman's defense of Papal Infallibility is surely one of the most effective defenses of the doctrine's meaning and application in the English language.

What is really significant about the *Letter*, in my judgment, is the defense that Newman provides for the Syllabus of 1864 and the "line" taken by Pius IX. The vigorous mandates that Pius offered against the Liberalism of his time were proof of his illustrious genealogy, going back through Clement to the earlier popes of the middle ages and antiquity. A willingness to fight for doc-

trine and discipline was one of the distinctive illustrations of the pope's divine gift, for almost every one of the great popes and bishops had been involved in one struggle or another with the state and its agents:

Mr. Gladstone ought to have chosen another issue for attack upon us, than the Pope's power. His real difficulty lies deeper; as little permission as he allows to the Pope, would he allow to any ecclesiastic who would wield the weapons of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine :.. It is not the existence of a Pope, but of a Church, which is his aversion.<sup>26</sup>

How very different, said Newman, was the conduct of the Anglican bishops whose power derived from the state: "Does any Anglican bishop for the last 300 years recall to our minds the image of St. Basil?"<sup>27</sup> -an echo of Newman's earlier comments in the essay of 1850 in which he suggested, not stated, that the business of the Anglican bishops was to "look out for number one." And if Newman was critical of the Anglican bishops, how much more so was he of the leading exponent of the English heresy of erastianism, Mr. Gladstone himself:

The Pope tells us that all Catholics should recollect their duty of obedience to him, not only in faith and morals, but in such matters of regimen and discipline as belong to the universal Church ... And surely this is what every one of us will say with the Pope, who is not an Erastian, and who believes that the Gospel is no mere philosophy thrown upon the world at large.<sup>28</sup>

The very mention of the word erastianism was a kind of insult to Anglicans of every religious description, and its abiding presence in the Church of England was the greatest reason for Newman's reluctance to participate in the ecumenical activities of his time or to encourage those activities in others. In Newman's view the Church of England was no more than a department of the government. It had no religious existence of its own and could not survive without the protection and emoluments of the state.

## NEWMAN'S THEMES

Knowing how little of the ecumenical spirit is in evidence in Newman's published volumes, scholars have suggested that Newman's "motives" and "underlying themes" are different from what is to be found in the Catholic works. I am not sure if I understand the phrase

underlying themes, but the now published correspondence is perhaps the best source of examining Newman's "motives." What emerges from the Catholic correspondence is rather different than what Professor Coulson has suggested. As vigorous as is the published defense of the Catholic Church, the letters are yet more vigorous. So far as I have been able to discover, there is not a hint of anything suggestive of an ecumenical temper on the part of Cardinal Newman.

Throughout the letters, the Catholic claims of the church of England are examined. Nothing positive is said about the national church except that it kept out evils worse than its own. As far as England was concerned, the national church was the most important religious institution of the land. It kept out, as far as it was able, the growing infidelity of the times. Otherwise, it had no significance as a religious institution. The Catholic Church was the only church that could confer grace through itself. Late in his life, Newman wrote to a prospective convert:

In saying that he must pray for grace, for strength, in order that he may be able to enter the Catholic Church, I imply that the Holy Ghost vouchsafes to act upon the souls of His creatures external to the Catholic Church ... I have to add, ... that when it is said 'Out of the church is no salvation' it is meant, there is no religious body but One in which is salvation. The contrast is between the Catholic Church and other bodies. We have grace through her, if we are her members; but we never can receive grace from the Church of England ... any more than an infant could receive nourishment from the breast of its dead mother.<sup>29</sup>

The Church of England, as far as Newman was concerned, was the result of the upheavals in the sixteenth century, the work of Henry and his heirs; and its history in the nineteenth century amply testified to that inglorious origin.

With the Anglo-Catholics Newman was yet more severe. Writing to a prospective convert (T. Allies), he remarked:

... persons like yourself should recollect that the reason why I left the Anglican Church was that I thought salvation was not to be found in it. This feeling could not stop there. If it led me to leave Anglicanism, it necessarily led me and leads me to wish others to leave it.... It is impossible then but

that a convert, if justifiable in the grounds of his conversion, must be an enemy of the Communion he has left. Moreover, he will feel most anxiously about those whom he has left in it, lest they should be receiving grace which might bring them into the Catholic Church, yet are in the way to quench it.... Especially will he be troubled at those who put themselves forward as teachers of a system which they cannot trace to any set of men, or any doctor before themselves; who give up history, documents, and theological authors.<sup>30</sup>

Pusey was of course the principal “doctor” who had no authority higher than himself, and in dealing with some of Pusey’s disciples, Newman was especially severe:

Do you really wish me to commit myself to the guidance of one who in point of doctrine belongs to no Church whatever that ever was. Can you mention the Church which ever held that system which Dr. Pusey holds. Is it not an eclectic system, part from the early Church, part from the Anglican, part from the Roman, Whom does he follow? himself.<sup>31</sup>

The correspondence is filled with other such remarks on Pusey’s hopelessly eclectic “system” of churchmanship and his use of personal authority over others.

With the leaders of the ecumenical party, Newman was usually polite but never encouraging. In his letter to Dr. Lee (on the Anglican side) there is the gentle suggestion that Lee was not pursuing the proper means to achieve his goal. With Dr. Pusey, Newman was more direct. Having mentioned some of the Anglican difficulties with Rome, he remarked,

But in saying this, you must not suppose . . . that I could myself ever have been induced so to act-I should say myself, “The Roman Communion is either the church or it is not; if it is not, don’t seek to join it,-if it is, don’t bargain with it-beggars must not be choosers.”<sup>32</sup>

With Ambrose Phillips, on the Catholic side, Newman exchanged very little correspondence, but he noted to another friend the absurdity of Phillips’ activities:

But what I wrote to you [E. Thompson] about is to congratulate you on fixing A. Phillips on a spit, if he is made to see it. I want it to come out as the turning point of controversy-viz, that we

did not pray for the conversion of the Church of England as such, any more than we pray for the Fishmonger Company, as such, because we did not allow its religious existence.<sup>33</sup>

The message of the above letters could be multiplied a hundredfold in the Catholic letters, and if the twenty odd volumes of letters could be said to yield a single theme, that theme might well be that it was morally imperative for those seeking religious truth to join the Catholic Church. If there is any real “sympathetic appreciation of the English Church,”<sup>34</sup> as a church, throughout the whole of the Catholic correspondence, it has escaped me.

What is noteworthy in Newman’s ecclesiastical thought in the years after 1845 is not the growth of ecumenical sympathies, but rather just the opposite: a narrowing of sympathy towards those Anglicans whom he had left behind. Even that patience towards ecumenists, which Father Atkins has described as one of the vital requisites for an ecumenist,<sup>35</sup> is lacking in Newman’s Catholic letters. Towards the end of his life, Newman once expressed a belief that it would be very hard for an Anglican to appeal to the privilege of “invincible ignorance,”<sup>36</sup> given the history of the English Church in the nineteenth century, to defend his position. In spite of the Gorham Decision, the Denison Trial, and a host of other secular trials of Anglo-Catholic doctrines and practices, a modern ecumenical scholar has written:

... it is incorrect to hold that the Anglican Church is a conglomeration of the most diverse and contradictory dogmatic, liturgical and ecclesiastical ideas.<sup>37</sup>

Such a statement is a complete contradiction of all that Newman had believed and observed throughout his life, Catholic and Anglican. Before his conversion, he had described the national church as a combination of two rival factions: Socinian and Catholic; and as the Oxford Movement progressed, he slowly came to understand that the Catholic party within the national church had no existence, except on paper. The Via Media was a “paper theory,” he remarked in the *Apologia*, and it represented a system that had never had any real effect on the traditions and history of the church of England. This was one of the minor reasons why he urged the “puseyites” to leave the church of their Baptism. (The best reason, of course, was that the Catholic Church was the “one ark” of salvation.)

It may be that the Catholic party in the Church of England is now the “dominant party,” but there are three hundred years of Protestant history in the Church of England that need to be accounted for, before its Catholic claims can be taken seriously. And even if Newman were wrong—though he had an almost infinite advantage of learning and background over modern scholars—his repeated judgments against the Church of England and his incessant efforts to bring persons into the Catholic Church tell against the idea of his being regarded as an ecumenist.

There is one final area of Newman’s life and work that might be addressed in this paper: the charge that he was “backward” in the business of making converts. The charge, coming possibly from either Wiseman, who anticipated the conversion of England in the nineteenth century, or some of the converts of 1850 and beyond, should be understood in its historical context. With the Catholic Restoration of 1850 and the series of trials of Anglo-Catholic doctrines, many did think that the “Puseyites” were ripe for conversion, though Newman never entertained such a grandiose vision. But as far as the charge can be lodged against Newman’s writing and personal efforts, it is absolutely false, like the original charge of Charles Kingsley.

Quite apart from the various volumes that he wrote in favor of Catholicism and against Anglicanism, there is the enormous personal ministry that Newman conducted throughout his Catholic years; and surely one of the most impressive feats of Cardinal Newman is the

number of converts that he brought into the Catholic faith and the perhaps greater number of modern converts who owe their membership in the Catholic Church to his writings.

In addition to Newman’s lengthy correspondence with prospective converts, a careful reader in his letters will notice the physical activity that Newman exerted in his efforts to bring others into the fold. As stationary as his life normally was, when the question of marking a convert was at issue, he was unsparing in his efforts. For example, there was the long and expensive trip to visit Dr. Pusey in 1846, when Newman heard that he was dying, and another trip in 1884 to Mark Patterson under the same circumstances, and a great number of visits in the intervening years. We can partly measure the intensity of his concern by noting that he started Mass every day with a prayer for those who had died in Anglicanism<sup>38</sup> and that he frequently expressed regret that he had failed to bring so many higher than what is called “Puseyism,” or, as we would call it, Anglo-Catholicism.

It might be that Newman’s anti-ecumenical stance will prove to be one of the major obstacles in the on-going cause of his beatification or it might be that his zeal for the Catholic faith will prove to be a part of the rationale for his elevation to the catalogue of saints. But whichever result obtains, there can be no question that Newman lacked an ecumenical spirit, and that he fought for conversions to the Catholic Church as to the one true Faith of Christ.



# NOTES

- 1 Atkins, "Newman's Apologia and Lackmann's Ecumenism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 2 (1965), 406; hereafter, Atkins and JES.
- 2 Cf. W. Becker, "Newman als Okumenische Gestalt," *Newman Studies*, III (1956) and materials cited in J. Griffin, "Newman and Ecumenism," *Newman: A Bibliography of Secondary Studies* (Front Royal, Va., 1980), 77-8.
- 3 Atkins, 416ff.
- 4 Quoted in Atkins, 419.
- 5 J. Coulson, "Introduction," *The Rediscovery of Newman edited by Coulson and Parker* (London, 1967), xii.
- 6 Cf. Griffin, "The Cardinalate," *Newman: A Bibliography. ...*, 95; especially T. Parker, "Newman and the English Church."
- 7 Cf. E. Kelly, "Newman More Ecumenically Read: Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," *JES* 5(1968), 365-70; also see *JES*, 5(1968), 370ff.
- 8 *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London, 1900), 8. 9 Essay, 415ff.
- 10 "John Keble," *Essays, Critical and Historical* (2 vols. ; London, 1890) II, 432.
- 11 "John Keble," 451-53; there is an unconscious irony in Newman's comments on Keble's patron, Mary: when the *Lyra* was being published, Keble turned away, in part, from his patron; cf. J. Coleridge, *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble* (London, 1880), 218ff.; also J. Griffin, "John Keble: A Report from the Devil's Advocate," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XLVIII (June, 1979), 230-31.
- 12 *Essays and Sketches*, edited by C. Harrold (London, 1948) II, 340.
- 13 *Difficulties Felt by Anglicans* (2 vols. ; London, 1850) I, 4.
- 14 Cf. J. Griffin, "The Anglican Response to Newman's Conversion," *Faith and Reason*, 3 (Summer, 1977), 17-34.
- 15 M. Svaglic, "Why Newman Wrote the Apologia," *Newman's Apologia: A Classic Reconsidered*, edited by V. Blehl and F. Connolly (New York 1974).
- 16 Quoted by Atkins, 417.
- 17 Cf. J. Griffin, "Satirical Elements in Newman's Apologia" *Revue de l'Universite d'Ottawa*, LVI (June 1974), 254ff.
- 18 *Letters and Diaries*, edited by C. S. Dessain and T. Gornall, XXXI (1976), 259-60; hereafter L&D.
- 19 Cf. J. Griffin, "John Keble: A Report from the Devil's Advocate," 224-6; also Griffin, *The Oxford Movement: A Revision* (Front Royal, Va. 1980), ch's II, V.
- 20 *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, edited by D. DeLaura (New York, 1968), 60.
- 21 G. L. Prestige, *Pusey* (London, 1933), 105.
- 22 See materials cited in "Satirical Elements ... " note. 14.
- 23 *Two Centuries of Ecumenism* (S. Bend, 1960), 46.
- 24 Cf. G. Budd, *Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon: A Study of the Anglican Scheme for Reunion*, Diss. Gregorian University, Rome 1966. 1966, pp. 65-159.
- 25 Cf. J. Coulson, "Newman on the church-His Final View, Its Origins and Influence," *The Rediscovery of Newman*, 154.
- 26 *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, edited by A. Ryan (S. Bend, 1962), 100.
- 27 *Letter*, 98.
- 28 *Letter*, 120.
- 29 L&D, XXX, 34.
- 30 L&D, XVI, 108.
- 31 L&D, 108.
- 32 H. Liddon, *Life of E. B. Pusey* (London, 1894), IV, 149.
- 33 L&D, XVIII, 12.
- 34 J. D. Holmes, "Personal Influence and Religious Conviction: Newman and Controversy," *Newman Studies*, X (1978), 35.
- 35 Atkins, 419.
- 36 Liddon, IV, 257.
- 37 Van Pol, *Anglicanism in Ecumenical Perspective* (Louvain, 1965), 97.
- 38 L&D XVII, 484.