The Fantasy *of* Reunion

Anglicans, Catholics, and Ecumenism, 1833–1882

MARK D. CHAPMAN

THE FANTASY OF REUNION

The Fantasy of Reunion

Anglicans, Catholics, and Ecumenism,
1833–1882

MARK D. CHAPMAN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Acknowledgements

Contents

Abbreviations

Frequently cited references are abbreviated as follows

Eirenicon, i   Edward Bouverie Pusey, *The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of restoring Visible Unity: An Eirenicon, in a letter to the Author of 'The Christian Year'* (Oxford: Parker and London: Rivingtons, 1865).

Eirenicon, ii   Edward Bouverie Pusey, *First Letter to the Very Rev. J.H. Newman in explanation chiefly in regard to The Reverential Love due to the Ever-blessed Theotokos, and the Doctrine of her Immaculate Conception; with an analysis of Cardinal de Turrecremata's Work on the Immaculate Conception* (Oxford: Parker and London: Rivingtons, 1869).

Eirenicon, iii   Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Is Healthful Reunion Impossible? The Second Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman D.D.* (Oxford: Parker and London: Rivingtons, 1870). *Eirenicon*, iii is the second edition, *Healthful reunion as Conceived Possible before the Vatican Council* (1876).

Herzog, *AAK*   Eduard Herzog, 'Hirtenbrief über die kirchliche Gemeinschaft mit der Anglo-amerikanischen Kirche', in *Gemeinschaft mit der Anglo-amerikanischen Kirche: Beobachtungen und Mitteilungen* (Bern: Wyss, 1881).

LD   C. S. Dessain et al. (eds), *John Henry Newman, Letters and Diaries* (London: Nelson and Clarendon Press from 1961), 31 vols.

Liddon, *Life*   Henry Parry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* (London: Longmans, 1894), 4 vols.

Tracts   John Henry Newman et al., *Tracts for the Times* (London: Rivington and Oxford: Parker, 1839) they are numbered 1–90. References are from the collected new edition.

Other Abbreviations

APUC	Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom
ARCIC	Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission
FCC	*Foreign Church Chronicle and Review* (London: Wells Gardner, 1877); from 1879 (London: Rivington's).
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LBV	Liddon Bound Volume of Pusey's Correspondence (PHL), Oxford
LPL	Lambeth Palace Library, London
PHL	Pusey House Library, Oxford
WR	*Weekly Register* (London: George Cheek, 1866)

Introduction

This is a book about historical imagination and Christian identity in a period of profound social and political change. Its principal focus is on the different understandings of 'catholicity' that emerged in the interactions between the Church of England and other churches—particularly the Roman Catholic Church[1]—from the early 1830s to the early 1880s. What I present is a kind of pre-history of ecumenism which, at the same time, helps to isolate some of the most distinctive features of the ecclesiological positions of the different churches as these developed through the turmoil of the nineteenth century.[2] Discussion of conversations between the churches, even when such dialogue was frequently little more than polemics, clearly illustrates the differences as well as similarities and continuities between the participants. Thus, although the history of ecumenical dialogue can make gloomy reading and can be distressing for those promoting reunion, for the historian of theology discussions between those from different churches can help clarify the leading thrusts and specific emphases of the theology and identity of the separated communions. In the process of encounter, different views of what is essential and what is merely accidental are tested and discussed.

The story is complex and many-sided, since all Western European churches were undergoing significant adaptation and development as they responded to the changed circumstances of post-Napoleonic Europe. Traditional narratives of Christian identity, which were integrally related to their host political and social structures, were being reshaped and renewed as the European settlement developed through

---

[1] For a comprehensive overview of relations between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church, see Bernard and Margaret Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries* (Oxford: Mowbrays, second edition, 1981).

[2] There is a modest amount of earlier literature dealing with ecumenism in this period. See Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (eds), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948* (London: SPCK, 1954), esp. 196–215, 271–82; H. R. T. Brandreth, *The Œcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement* (London: SPCK, 1947); S. L. Ollard, *Reunion* (London: Robert Scott, 1919), 1–42; and Elizabeth Bridget Stuart, 'Roman Catholic reactions to the Oxford Movement and Anglican schemes for reunion, from 1833 to the condemnation of Anglican orders in 1896', unpublished D.Phil. diss., the University of Oxford, 1988.

the nineteenth century. Fundamental to this theological and ecclesiastical project was an increasingly productive historical imagination which profoundly affected the churches across the continent. This book explores the historical imagination of a range of churchmen and theologians, who sought to reconstruct their churches through an encounter with the past whose relevance for the construction of identity in the present went unquestioned. The past was no foreign country but instead provided solutions to the perceived dangers facing the church of the present. Through the nineteenth century the construction of history became key to the formulation of many different identities: just as nations and nationalism relied on the elevation and isolation of distinctive national myths,[3] so, as this book demonstrates, alternative ways of imagining history and of conceiving of the relationship of past to present were equally important to the churches as they reconceived their roles in a changing world.

I begin this study in the 1830s, since this marks the beginning of a distinctive re-imagination of the identity of the Church of England. As I show in Chapter 1, the Tractarians, centred in the highly traditional environment of the University of Oxford which remained a purely Anglican institution even after Catholic Emancipation in 1829,[4] faced up to many of the social and political implications of modernity and liberalism through a particular approach to the history of the church. While often deeply hostile to Roman Catholicism, they nevertheless emphasized the continuity, catholicity, and apostolicity of their own church which they regarded as one and the same as the undivided church of the first few centuries of the Christian era. Much of this book addresses the ecclesiological implications which

---

[3] See the now classic studies in Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); and E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[4] On Oxford at the beginning of the 1830s, see M. G. Brock, 'The Oxford of Peel and Gladstone', in M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (eds), *The History of the University of Oxford: Nineteenth-Century Oxford, Part 1* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 7–71. For the Tractarian influence in Oxford, see Mark Chapman, 'Newman and the Anglican Idea of a University', *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte/ Journal for the History of Modern Theology* 18: 2 (2011), 212–27; Peter. B. Nockles, 'An Academic Counter-Revolution: Newman and Tractarian Oxford's Idea of a University', *History of Universities* 10 (1991), 137–97; W. R. Ward, *Victorian Oxford* (London: Frank Cass, 1965), esp. ch. 6; H. F. G. Matthew, 'Noetics, Tractarians, and the Reform of the University of Oxford in the Nineteenth Century', *History of*

emerged from the characterization of catholicity in the early years of the Oxford Movement, and which continued to shape conversations between Roman Catholics and catholic-minded Anglicans in the period up to and immediately following the First Vatican Council of 1870. Edward Bouverie Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Christ Church, Oxford, and John Henry Newman, who became ecumenical conversation partners in the late 1860s, cut their theological teeth as loyal members of the Church of England in the 1830s. What will become clear through these pages is that both maintained a profound interest in its catholic identity, even after Newman's conversion to the Roman Catholic Church in 1845.

At the same time as the Oxford Movement, a number of Roman Catholics—under the influence of a group of converts from the Church of England led by Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle—began to re-imagine their newly adopted church as the historical embodiment of the great undivided Western Church of medieval Christendom. Their profound influence on religious aesthetics and taste, which was dominated by the vision of the great pioneer of the Gothic Revival, the architect and designer, A. W. N. Pugin, quickly spread beyond their own church, with some members of the Church of England reconceiving their own church in similar terms, often accompanied by a revival of medieval ritual.[5] There was frequently a great deal of sympathy between these Romantic medievalists in both churches, which led them to initiate some joint ecumenical ventures. In Chapter 2, I offer a detailed analysis of the first major ecumenical organization with significant support from the two churches, the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom which rose to prominence in the years following the establishment of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England in 1850. As will become clear, however, these early ecumenical endeavours were largely private initiatives sponsored by strong-willed enthusiasts with potent historical imaginations, who were often quite unrepresentative of the broader opinion of their churches. In the mid-nineteenth century ecumenical discussion, although not new, was certainly in its infancy. Ecumenism did not become part of the ecclesiastical

---

Universities 9 (1990), 195–225; and A. Dwight Culler, *The Imperial Intellect: a study of Newman's Educational Ideal* (New Haven: Yale, 1955).

[5] On ritualism and reunion, see also Nigel Yates, *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830–1910* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), esp. ch. 6.

mainstream in the Church of England or the Roman Catholic Church until well into the twentieth century.

There was a complex interaction between these related but different reform movements. They maintained different conceptions of history, which can be illustrated from an account of the ways in which the different churches—and groups within churches—related to one another during this period which can be regarded as one of the first major ecumenical exchanges of the post-Reformation Western churches. On the one hand, the Tractarians and neo-medievalists shared much in common: both were deeply conservative in their theological, social, and political attitudes and frequently found common ground in a shared resistance to what they perceived as the secularizing forces of modernity. Many in both camps saw reunion as a kind of popular front against the atheism and liberalism of the nineteenth century, and far more important than the maintenance of confessional difference. Many neo-medievalists looked admiringly at the Oxford Movement in January 1841. Ambrose Phillipps, for instance, wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury, one of the most prominent Catholics of the period, that the 'Catholick movement at Oxford I certainly regard as the brightest symptom of England's reconversion'.[6] Similarly he wrote to Charles Forbes René de Montalembert, one of the leading French Catholic controversialists, that 'there is no point of the globe at the present moment in which a more important work is going on for the glory of the Catholick Church, than that which is in progress in Oxford'.[7] On the other hand, however, many Tractarians remained deeply suspicious about any form of catholicism which downplayed the fundamental authority of the early church. As Pusey's ecumenical work reveals, the two different versions of the historical identity of the Catholic Church did not always see eye to eye.

It is also crucial to bear in mind that neither the Tractarian emphasis on continuity with the early church, nor the renewed medievalism of some influential Roman Catholics, represented anything more than a minority view in their respective churches. The influence of both groups should not be over-emphasized: they were

---

[6] Edward Sheridan Purcell, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle* (London: Macmillan, 1900), 2 vols, i, 107.

[7] Louis Allen, 'Letters of Phillipps de Lisle to Montalembert', *Dublin Review* 228 (1954): 463, 53–64; 464, 196–205, 229; 467, 77–89; 468, 188–211, here no. 463, 62.

often deluded about the level of support for their positions. The strength of the personalities involved, as well as the liveliness of their historical fancies, should not blind the historian to their relatively marginal position within their own churches. While both groups were influential in their different ways, other long-held conceptions of history continued to dominate, especially among those in important positions in the respective hierarchies. The negative polemics which had characterized the self-definition of churches from the time of the sixteenth-century divisions still dominated thinking in Western Christendom. The antagonistic identities which had prevailed during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation proved far stronger than any of the nineteenth-century alternatives. Thus in the Church of England there continued to be a widespread demonization of the Roman Catholic Church; for the most part the rhetoric of Reformation times continued to hold sway and at times escalated into popular unrest.[8] Although the nineteenth century brought increasing bureaucratization, regulation, and diocesan identity to the Church of England,[9] the new Church bureaucracy tended to be more concerned with internal affairs, together with defence against secularism and alternative versions of Christianity.[10]

Similarly, in the Roman Catholic Church in England there was an increasingly self-confident sense of identity famously characterized by Newman in 1852 as the 'second spring'. This described a Church which had moved from the marginal position it had occupied in penal times to the ecclesiastical mainstream after Catholic Emancipation and the huge growth in numbers after the influx of Irish immigrants.[11] What was for a long time a small church dominated by wealthy catholic gentry and relatively independent from external influence, mutated into a mass and self-confident church increasingly controlled from

[8] See: John Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade in Great Britain, 1829–1860* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); D. G. Paz, *Popular Anti-Catholicism in mid-Victorian England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992); and Edward Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1968).
[9] On this, see esp. Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
[10] See, for example, the controversies surrounding *Essays and Reviews* (1860). See Ieuan Ellis, *Seven against Christ: A Study of Essays and Reviews* (Leiden: Brill, 1980); and Josef L. Altholz, *Anatomy of a Controversy: The Debate over Essays and Reviews, 1860–1864* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994).

Rome after the establishment of a hierarchy in 1850.[12] The time seemed ripe for the 'reconversion of England'.

This increased self-confidence in the churches was not restricted to England: there was a degree of 're-confessionalization' across Europe. Given that most churches appeared to be growing rapidly, there was little need to join together to try to stem decline. For many, the maintenance of boundaries against a perceived foe, sacred or secular, became increasingly important and certainly more important than reunion.[13] This meant that the dissonant discourse of anti-Romanism, anti-protestantism, and anti-secularism remained a potent force in the volatile situation of continental Europe, particularly in the run up to the First Vatican Council in 1870 and its aftermath. Despite the complexities of this situation, as I demonstrate in Chapters 4–7, a number of Tractarians and their successors remained extremely vigorous in their endeavours to continue dialogue with Roman Catholics in Britain and in continental Europe in the late 1860s. Ecumenical engagement became a central activity for Pusey, undisputed leader of the Anglo-Catholics, as well as for many of his associates, including his protégé Alexander Forbes, Bishop of Brechin and Henry Parry Liddon, his future biographer. It was in ecumenical discussion that Pusey refined his theological views. And it was through engaging with Pusey, that Newman continued to work out the implications of his understanding of catholicity and the doctrine of development. By addressing the extensive correspondence and controversial writings between the leading protagonists, I chart their different perceptions of

---

[11] In 1851 at the religious census there were approximately 750,000 Roman Catholics in England compared with 40–60,000 in 1778, the First Catholic Relief Act. See Edward Norman, *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). On the history of the English Catholics from the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth I to the establishment of a hierarchy, see John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community 1570–1860* (London: DLT, 1975).

[12] Norman, *The English Catholic Church*, ch. 2.

[13] There has been a significant historical debate, mainly in Germany, over Olaf Blaschke's understanding of the nineteenth century as a 'second confessional age' which questions the dominant thesis of secularization. See esp. Olaf Blaschke, 'Das 19. Jahrhundert: Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?', *Geschichte und Gegenwart* 26 (2000), 38–75. What will become evident through the course of this book is that 'confessionalization' was itself a product of the historicization of all thought. As a response to the naturalism of the Enlightenment, the historical attitude was nonetheless one of the narratives of modernity. See the classic study by Ernst Troeltsch, *Der Historismus und seine Probleme* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1922).

the catholicity of the Church and their effects on the possibility of reunion.

The Vatican Council in 1870 completely transformed the situation. It represented the triumph of the church of the present in supplanting alternative visions of Christian identity based on a lively historical imagination. This fundamentally altered the relationships between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church and put an end to serious dialogue for a very long period. Nevertheless, despite the triumph of the papacy and the visible church of the present, the First Vatican Council did not altogether put an end to ecumenism. The years immediately following the Council reveal extraordinary vigour among senior leaders of the Church of England, as well as in the developing Anglican Communion, for engagement with disaffected European Catholics who had separated from the Roman Catholic Church. The Council had led to the emergence of a third form of catholicity embodied in the so-called Old Catholic churches. For a short time these churches were seen by a far more representative cross-section of members of the Church of England than the predominantly Anglo-Catholic ecumenists of the 1860s as offering huge potential for reunion and as a bulwark against the supremacy of Rome. The idea of a federation of national 'Old' Catholic churches in opposition to Rome appealed to many in England, particularly those establishment High Churchmen such as Bishop Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln, for whom the English Church was the pinnacle of Christian development: the Book of Common Prayer represented a particularly refined form of catholicism purified by the English of the worst excesses of the Roman system. More generally, pan-European nationalism blended with the long-term anti-papalism of the Church of England to create a window of opportunity to allow it to capitalize on the new situation in the Roman Church. At the same time, a number of English churchmen began to detect significant similarities between their national church and the churches of the Orthodox East, which were playing increasingly prominent roles in the volatile situation of the breakdown of the Ottoman Empire especially in its European territories. The Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875, which are discussed in detail in Chapter 9, represent the high point of ecumenical activity for the Church of England.

This promising ecumenical situation did not last long: the failure of the Old Catholic churches to attract significant numbers of followers meant that by 1880 or so, the senior leadership of the Church of

England lost interest in further discussion. Instead, attention was directed away from Europe and towards the Anglican Communion. There was increasing missionary zeal to build up an alliance of national Catholic churches across the British Empire. Anglicanism rather than ecumenism became the project for the Church of England in the high point of Victorian imperialism. It is for this reason that I conclude my account in the political and ecclesial turmoil of the 1880s. Ecumenism was halted in part by an increasingly complex European situation and an energetic expansion of the British Empire, which saw the rise of Pan-Anglicanism.

1

The Oxford Movement and Ecumenism

As I suggested in the Introduction, the Tractarian or Oxford Movement[1] can be seen at least in part as one of the many conservative responses in Europe to the collapse of the Holy Alliance in the period leading up to the revolutions of 1830.[2] In the English context this was characterized by the consolidation of the pluralization of politics at the end of the 1820s with the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 and Roman Catholic Emancipation the following year: this marked a rapid and definitive change in the social order which decisively shaped the character of the British constitution.[3] In 1832, the Great Reform Act enfranchised a significant if limited number of the middle classes, while at the same time removing some of the grossest abuses of the system including the so-called rotten boroughs, where small numbers of voters were able to control parliamentary elections. For many, this marked the end of the old world and the dominance of a 'spirit of liberalism which motivated an Erastian

---

[1] There is a wealth of literature on the Oxford Movement: recent reliable introductions are Michael Chandler, *An Introduction to the Oxford Movement* (London: SPCK, 2003); and George Herring, *What was the Oxford Movement?* (London: Continuum, 2002). The most comprehensive account remains Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). See also Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (London: SCM Press, 1987), 2 vols, i, 167–211.

[2] See, for example, Nigel Aston, *Christianity and Revolutionary Europe, c.1750–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), ch. 8. For comparisons between the Oxford Movement and developments on the Continent, see R. William Franklin, *Nineteenth Century Churches: The History of a New Catholicism in Württemberg, England, and France* (New York: Garland, 1987).

[3] J. C. D. Clark, *English Society: 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure, and Political Practice During the Ancien Regéime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), esp. 418.

Parliament'.[4] As Richard Hurrell Froude, one of the early polemicists and one of the most radical members of the Oxford Movement, wrote: 'The extinction of the Irish Protestant Boroughs, and the great power accidentally given to Dissenters by the Reform Act, gave a concluding blow to the ancient system.'[5] Resistance to these changes by the bishops and clergy had often resulted in abuse and criticism: for instance, the Bishop of Bristol's palace was burnt down on 31 October 1831 by an angry mob.[6] Nevertheless, it was to the 'ancient system' that the Tractarians looked as a solution to the problems of the present day, even if they were forced to redefine it in relation to the changed political, social, and ecclesiastical conditions of the 1830s.[7] The Oxford Movement was part of a counter-revolution against 'the poison of Rousseau and Voltaire'.[8]

Despite these changes to the British constitution, however, what remained virtually unchallenged in the 1830s was the sense of the supremacy of the Church of England as the sole legitimate embodiment of the church, at least within England. Consequently although they famously located the Catholic Church in the period of the undivided church of the first four ecumenical councils,[9] a view which was to some extent shared with other churches, the Tractarians did little to question the authority and superiority of their own church as the successor of that primitive church: this is hardly surprising given that after Catholic Emancipation in 1829, Roman Catholics in parliament and in other positions of power posed as much of a threat to the established order as did dissenters.[10] This attitude was noted by William Palmer of Magdalen College, Oxford, one of the pioneers of

---

[4] T. L. Harris, 'The Conception of Authority in the Oxford Movement', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 3 (1934), 119.

[5] Richard Hurrell Froude, *The Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude* (London: Rivington, 1838), 4 vols, here, iii, 207. See Piers Brandon, *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (London: Paul Elek, 1974).

[6] See Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, i, 24–32. Frank Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), 169.

[7] See S. A. Skinner, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[8] Harris, 'The Conception of Authority', 117–8.

[9] These are the First Council of Nicaea (325); the First Council of Constantinople (381); the Council of Ephesus (431); and the Council of Chalcedon (451).

[10] See Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, ch. 2.

ecumenical engagement with the Orthodox churches. Explaining the Oxford Movement to the Russian theologian Khomiakoff, he wrote:

> It began in a spirit of the most loyal Anglicanism evoked by the successful attacks of the Protestant sectaries and the Roman Catholics, aided by a Liberalist Government, upon the Established Church. It proceeded up to a certain point, in a spirit of resolute hostility to Popery no less than to Sectarianism.[11]

Despite what Peter Nockles calls its 'Froudean bravado and fighting talk',[12] the polemics of the Oxford Movement in general retained a high view of the alliance between throne and altar uniquely embodied—at least in England—by the National Church. Thus, according to John Keble writing in one of the earliest tracts, the Church of England was 'the only church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure that she has the Lord's Body to give to his people'.[13] This meant, according to the rhetoric of the Tractarians, that the English Church was one and the same church as the church of the apostles. The natural correlate was that all that had been achieved at the Reformation was to rid the Church of the worst abuses of the Roman system. It would consequently be quite wrong to see the catholic revival in the Church of England initiated in the 1830s as in any way inspired by an ecumenical vision.[14]

As the most prominent leaders of the Oxford Movement, John Henry Newman, John Keble, and later Edward Bouverie Pusey shared a strong sense of the historicity and fixity of the deposit of faith which they regarded as having been handed down to the Church of England from the time of the apostles. The Tractarian historical imagination

---

[11] W. J. Birkbeck (ed.), *Russia and the English Church During the Last Fifty Years, Volume I: containing a correspondence between Mr William Palmer, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford and M. Khomiakoff, in the years 1844–1854* (London: Rivington for the ECA, 1895), 22.

[12] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 83.

[13] Tract 4: *Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the Safest Course* (1833), 5. The pages are not numbered consecutively but start afresh with each tract. Although there are anti-establishment tendencies in Keble's thought, Tractarians for the most part retained a high view of the sacral character of the monarch as defender of the Church of England. See Mark Chapman, 'John Keble, National Apostasy and the Myths of 14 July', in Kirstie Blair (ed.), *John Keble in Context* (London: Anthem Press, 2004), 47–58; and S. A. Skinner, '"The Duty of the State": Keble, the Tractarians and Establishment', in Blair, *John Keble*, 33–46.

[14] For an alternative view see E. C. Miller Jr, *Toward a Fuller Vision: Orthodoxy and the Anglican Experience* (Wilton: Morehouse Barlow, 1984), 61.

was directed towards the early church and its contemporary representative, the Church of England. Although Newman later departed from the Church of England after adopting a very different understanding of catholicity, his early Tractarian writings display an understanding of catholicity almost completely in terms of apostolicity. Politically this meant that no apostate nation could ever touch this apostolic sense of authority. Catholicity was consequently understood as something fixed and enshrined in the doctrine of apostolicity identified in terms of what the Tractarians called the 'Apostolical Succession', which was tantamount to seeing the contemporary church as representative of the undivided church of the early fathers.[15] Perhaps the clearest example of such an understanding of the catholicity of the church was given by John Keble in his sermon on 'Primitive Tradition'. He limited the catholic tradition solely to what he called 'those rules, in which *all* primitive Councils are uniform, those rites and formularies which are found in *all* primitive liturgies, and those interpretations and principles of interpretation in which *all* orthodox Fathers agree'. The Catholic faith was to be found in the 'genuine canons of the primitive Councils, and the genuine fragments of the primitive Liturgies'. This was both a definable and a relatively modest body of sources, 'reducible into a small space'. The boundaries of apostolic truth were clear: doctrine consisted of what was taught before 'the division of the Eastern and Western churches, including the six first Councils general, and excluding image-worship and similar corruptions by authority'.[16]

This apostolic method was exemplified by the *Tracts* from the very beginning, as is clear in Keble's original draft for the project, which emphasized apostolicity. Considering, 'that the security, by Him no less expressly authorized, for the continuance and due application of that Sacrament, is the Apostolical commission of the Bishops, and, under them, the Presbyters of the Church' those who committed themselves to the project of writing Tracts pledged themselves to

---

[15] This is stated most obviously in Newman's, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism* (1837) (revised ed., London: Longmans, 1901). For a somewhat polemical view, see Turner, *John Henry Newman*, ch. 7.

[16] John Keble, *Primitive Tradition Recognised in Holy Scripture* (London: Rivington, 1836), 40. The number of councils fluctuated, although in general the line was drawn before the seventh council (the Second Council of Nicea) of 787 which ruled on the veneration of icons.

'be on the watch for all opportunities of inculcating on all committed to our charge a due sense of the inestimable privilege of Communion with our Lord through the successors of His Apostles' and providing and circulating 'Books and Tracts, which may tend to familiarize the imaginations of men to the idea of an Apostolical Commission, to represent to them the feelings and principles resulting from that doctrine in the purest and earliest churches, and especially to point out its fruits as exemplified in the practice of the primitive Christians'.[17] This apostolic method was clearly exemplified in the very first of the *Tracts* which was published in September 1833 and entitled *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission*. Although written by Newman it was addressed to the clergy by one simply identifying himself as a 'presbyter', presumably to emphasize his standing in continuity with New Testament times. 'Fellow-Labourers', he writes, 'I am but one of yourselves—a Presbyter.' His rhetorical strategy was clear: since the state had betrayed the church there was a need to identify the true source of the church's authority. Thus Newman asks: 'on *what* are we to rest our authority, when the State deserts us?'[18] His answer was both direct and simple: the clergy of the Church of England were 'the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES'. He went on:

> I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built,—OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT.
>
> We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of GOD. The LORD JESUS CHRIST gave His SPIRIT to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives.[19]

Although there is little subtlety in such views, Tract 1 clearly illustrates the profoundly historicist views of the early Oxford Movement. This relied on a particular reading of the past and a simple historical

---

[17] Draft of Paper by John Keble, included at *LD*, iv, 42. This project later mutated into a proposed loosely organized 'Friends of the Church' which would co-ordinate the production of the *Tracts* and promote 'the unbroken Succession of the Episcopal Order' and the 'inviolateness of our Liturgical forms' (Memorandum of 2 December 1833, *LD*, iv, 129).

[18] Tract 1: *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission*, 1.

[19] Tract 1, 2. As so often in the early Tracts, emphasis is through capitalization of words.

version of what can be called 'temporal catholicity': it was not the church of all times that constituted the criterion for catholic identity, but the church of a very particular time which had been passed down to the present. To all intents and purposes the tradition was complete by the time of the Council of Chalcedon which was held in AD 451. The role of the contemporary church was to bear witness to the church of the undivided church of the early councils, from which it derived its authority. This meant a reorientation of the church away from its reliance on social status and privilege towards what they saw as the true source of its authority, Jesus Christ himself. The bishops needed 'willingly and affectionately [to] relinquish their high privileges and honours', but there could be no encroachment 'upon the rights of the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES; we touch not their sword and crosier'. Newman's rallying cry to the clergy was based on the real source of their authority:

> Therefore, my dear Brethren, act up to your professions, Let it not be said that you have neglected a gift; for if you have the Spirit of the Apostles on you, surely this is a great gift . . . Make much of it. Show your value of it. Keep it before your minds as an honourable badge, far higher than that secular responsibility, or cultivation, or polish, or learning, or rank, which gives you a hearing with the many.[20]

Tract 2, entitled *The Catholic Church* continued in a similar vein. The attacks on the church forced clergy into what Newman called (again writing anonymously), 'the duty of our active and zealous interference in matters of this world . . . There is an unexceptionable sense in which a clergyman may, nay must be *political*.'[21] There was a need to return to '[t]he One Catholic and Apostolic Church',[22] which was to be located in the 'existing Society, Apostolic as founded by the Apostles, Catholic because it spreads its branches in every place; i.e. the Church Visible with its Bishops, Priests, and Deacons'. Christ did not depart from this world to leave us as orphans, 'but appointed representatives of Himself to the end of time'.[23] These were powerful words which offered both security in the apostolic authority of the contemporary church but also functioned as a battle-cry to resist the increasingly secular forces which threatened the Church of England.

---

[20] Tract 1, 3.   [21] Tract 2: *The Catholic Church*, 1.
[22] Tract 2, 2.   [23] Tract 2, 3.

The *Tracts* quickly gained a wide readership, with Newman noting that he had heard back from the publisher that they had sold well, and that the Librarian of the British Museum had requested more copies.[24] A Memorandum 'endeavour[ing] to engage real friends of the principles advocated in the Tracts . . . in their respective neighbourhoods' instructed them to 'engage a publisher, or other fit person, in the nearest considerable Town, to sell them on profit; To provide him with a board, painted "Tracts for the Times against Popery and Dissent," and to see that it occupies a conspicuous place in his shop window . . . To advertise on the . . . first days of each quarter in their County Newspaper, in the following or such-like form, "Popery and Dissent. This Day are published the Quarterly Tracts for the Times, at &c."'[25] Despite the re-energizing of the Church of England's catholic and apostolic identity, however, resistance to the *Roman* Catholic Church among members of the Oxford Movement remained strong throughout the Tractarian period,[26] even if it was more restrained than the anti-Romanism of many more traditional High Churchmen. Few went as far, for instance, as the other William Palmer of Worcester, a High Churchman associated with the Tractarians. Palmer later sought to deny Nicholas Wiseman, at the time vicar-apostolic of the Central District and Bishop of Melipotamus and later to become the first Archbishop of Westminster, the right to exercise his episcopal ministry without a licence from his 'legitimate Diocesan, the Bishop of Worcester'.[27]

Although they may not have gone as far as Palmer, many of the Tracts were decidedly anti-Roman or at the very least anti-papal in their thrust. In Tract 15, for instance, Newman was to claim that the Church of England had not initiated the schism from Rome, but stood in continuity with the past and had simply delivered itself through the agency of the 'civil power' from the oppressive system of what he called 'Papal tyranny':

---

[24] 'Fragmentary Diary' entry, 6 December 1833, *LD*, iv, 12.

[25] The Memorandum was included with a letter from Newman to Samuel Rickards, 1 March 1836, *LD*, v, 247–8. See also Lawrence N. Crumb, *Publishing the Oxford Movement* (Cambridge: Teaneck, NJ; Chadwyck-Healey; Somerset House, 1990), 5.

[26] On this see R. H. Greenfield, 'The Attitude of the Early Tractarians to the Roman Catholic Church', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, the University of Oxford, 1956.

[27] William Palmer, *A Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D. (calling himself the Bishop of Melipotamus)* (Oxford: Parker, 1841), 4.

The English Church did not revolt from those who in that day had authority by succession from the Apostles. On the contrary, it is certain that the Bishops and Clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation, and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of those kingdoms from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation, while at the same time they gradually removed from the minds of the people various superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages, and which, though never formally received by the judgment of the whole Church, were yet very prevalent.[28]

Newman even went as far as claiming that the Church of Rome was 'heretical', had 'apostatized', and had bound 'itself in covenant to the cause of Antichrist'.[29] Similarly in Tract 20, Newman spoke of 'the very enmity I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel'.[30] In distinction to the corruptions of Rome, Newman claimed, God 'has wonderfully preserved our Church as a true branch of the Church universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal error. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical.'[31] Again, in Tract 15, Newman insisted that the Church had properly 'reformed itself. There was no new Church founded among us, but the rights and the true doctrines of the Ancient existing Church were asserted and established.'[32]

As the decade wore on, Newman increasingly came to understand the Church of England as a *via media* between the Church of Rome and the dissenting bodies. This was discussed in Tract 38 and Tract 41, entitled *Via Media I* and *Via Media II*.[33] Both sides, Newman held, were equally in error. Thus, on the one hand, dissenters had lost their continuity with the church of the apostles, while, on the other hand, the Roman Church had added to 'the means of salvation set forth in Scripture . . . the Church of Rome has added other ways of gaining heaven'.[34] This threatened the cardinal protestant principle maintained by the Church of England that the Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation (Article VI). This sense of 'adding' to the content of the faith was contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England. As something complete and fixed

[28] Tract 15: *On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*, 4.
[29] Tract 15, 10.   [30] Tract 20: *The Visible Church: Letters to a Friend*, 1.
[31] Tract 20, 3.   [32] Tract 15, 3, 4.
[33] Tract 38: *Via Media No. 1* and Tract 41: *Via Media No. 2*.
[34] Tract 41, 2.

there was no sense in which doctrine could be said to develop. Thus, although in one sense the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion were an addition to the Creeds, in reality they were understood as an explanation and were to be tested against the principle of the sufficiency of Scripture as a measure of doctrine. Comparing the Roman Articles of the Council of Trent and the English Articles, Newman wrote:

> As I will not consent to be deprived of the records of the Reformation, so neither will I part with those of former times. I look upon our Articles as in one sense an addition to the Creeds; and at the same time the Romanists added their Tridentine articles. Theirs I consider unsound; ours as true.[35]

The reason for this difference was stated explicitly. Newman distinguishes between a true catholicity based on continuity with the early church and what he calls the system of 'Popery':

> even the one true system of religion has its dangers on all sides, from the weakness of its recipients, who pervert it. Thus the Holy Catholic doctrines, in which the Church was set up, were corrupted into Popery, not legitimately, or necessarily, but by various external causes acting on human corruption, in the lapse of many ages.[36]

Newman's parochial lectures of 1837, which formed the basis of his well-known *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, continued in a similar vein. In this well-known text he spoke of the Church of England as holding the space between what he called 'Romanism' and 'Popular Protestantism'. Continuing to see Roman Catholicism as dangerous, he felt it was liable to lead the 'inexperienced mind' astray. Although we 'need not depart from Christian charity towards her', he wrote, we 'must deal with her as we would towards a friend who is not himself'.[37] He went on to stress antiquity as the means for discerning truth from what he regarded as the falsehood of infallibility which could undermine the principle of antiquity as the test of doctrine:

> In Romanism there are some things absolutely good, some things only just tainted and sullied, some things corrupted, and some things in themselves sinful; but the system itself so called must be viewed as a whole, and all parts of it as belonging to the whole, and in connexion

---

[35] Tract 41, 9.   [36] Tract 45: *The Grounds of our Faith*, 1.
[37] Newman, *Prophetical Office*, 103.

with their practical working and the end which they subserve. Viewed thus as a practical system, its main tenet, which gives a colour to all its parts, is the Church's infallibility, as on the other hand, the principle of that genuine theology out of which it has arisen, is the authority of Catholic Antiquity.[38]

Even towards the end of the Tractarian period, then, there was still little sympathy with the practical system of the Roman Church: it was only insofar as it was apostolic that the Roman Church could be understood as catholic.

As late as 1840, in his essay in the *British Critic* on 'The Catholicity of the English Church', Newman continued to differentiate between the Roman Church with what he regarded its departures from the primitive norms of the creeds, and the Anglican Church, which, while in schism, was nevertheless in continuity with the Church of the Fathers. 'Rome', he claimed, 'has but a party in the Roman Catholic Church, though it has the active party; and much as the Church has been identified with that party in times past, and is still identified, yet it is something to find that what the English Church wants of perfect Catholicity, supposing it to want anything, may be supplied without going all the way to Rome'.[39] He held that the contemporary Roman Church was 'an assemblage of doctrines which . . . have scarcely closer connection with the doctrines whether of the primitive Creed or the primitive Church than the doctrines of the Gospel have with those of the Law'.[40] In distinction he suggested: 'The Anglican view of the Church has ever been this, that its separate portions need not be united together, for their essential completeness, except by the tie of descent from one original.'[41] The conclusion was clear: a collection of separated churches each bound to the past rather than communion in the present was the 'normal' condition of the church. What the Tractarians sought, above all, was a purification of all churches by a return to the past rather than unity in the present. Such a conception of catholicity obviously ruled out the contemporary Roman Catholic Church, which appeared to be developing a far more expansive understanding of tradition.

---

[38] Newman, *Prophetical Office*, 104.
[39] John Henry Newman, 'The Catholicity of the English Church', *British Critic* (January 1840), 40–88; here 65.
[40] Newman, 'The Catholicity of the English Church', 48.
[41] Newman, 'The Catholicity of the English Church', 54.

The following year, Newman was able to articulate the differences between Popery and Roman Catholicism in his open letter to Bishop Bagot of Oxford following the publication of Tract 90, where he had (notoriously) defended purgatory. Newman affirmed that he could not speak against the Church of Rome as in some senses a 'true Church', since 'viewed in her formal character . . . she is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Cornerstone"'. Similarly, he could not 'speak against her private members, numbers of whom, I trust, are God's people, in the way to Heaven, and one with us in heart, though not in profession'. Nevertheless he continued to speak strongly against what he called 'that energetic system and engrossing influence in the Church by which it acts towards us, and meets our eyes, like a cloud filling it, to the eclipse of all that is holy, whether in its ordinances or its members'. It was this system that he called 'Romanism or Popery'. He continued:

> By Romanists or Papists I mean all its members, so far as they are under the power of these principles; and while, and so far as this system exists, and it does exist now as fully as heretofore, I say that we can have no peace with that Church, however we may secretly love its particular members. . . . This view . . . presents her under a twofold aspect, and while recognizing her as an appointment of God on the one hand, it leads us practically to shun her, as beset with heinous and dangerous influences on the other.[42]

For Newman, the solution to the problem of Romanism was quite simple: like all other churches, Rome had to be purged of its excesses, which expressed themselves in the system of Popery, by returning to antiquity.[43]

PUSEY

In his Tractarian period, Pusey adopted a similar approach to Newman. His principal interest was also in internal reform of his own

---

[42] John Henry Newman, *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford, on the Occasion of No. 90 in the Series called The Tracts for the Times* (Oxford: Parker, 1841), 201.

[43] See Tract 79: *Against Romanism III—On Purgatory* (March 1837). See Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 311–13.

church. Before there could ever be an outward and visible union of the churches, he claimed, there would need to be a renewal within each church as they conformed ever more to the teachings of the primitive and undivided church. What I have called Pusey's 'Catholicism of the word',[44] which will be discussed at length in Chapter 3, was defined not primarily in terms of development and accretion nor even of episcopal authority but solely on the basis of a return to the explicit teachings of the undivided church. In 1839, for instance, Pusey had written a lengthy open letter to Bishop Bagot of Oxford countering the charges of Romanism in the *Tracts for the Times*. Defending the primitive method and alluding to Article XXI on the 'Authority of General Councils', he clearly differentiated between general and ecumenical councils: 'We believe that (although Councils which have been termed "General," or which Rome has claimed to be so, have erred,) no real Œcumenical Council ever did; that is, no Council really representing the Universal Church.'[45] According to Pusey, doctrine was to be defined in terms of the Ecumenical Councils until Chalcedon, which had determined the teachings of the undivided church. Pusey stressed the unity of the early church: its authority was based on the fact that the 'Church then was one, and it was to His one Church, and as being one, that our Lord's promise was made. And now, on that ground, her functions are, in this respect suspended; she cannot meet as one.'[46] Its lack of unity severely limited the claims of the contemporary church.

Consequently, although he refused to rule out the possibility of a further ecumenical council, Pusey nevertheless held that as long as the state of disunity persisted, all that the church could hope for was purification through returning to what was indisputably taught by the undivided church of the universally accepted ecumenical councils. This process of purification applied equally to all separated churches, including the Roman Catholic Church. Like Newman, Pusey differentiated between true catholicity and the distorted catholicity of the Roman system. Pusey thus claimed:

---

[44]   See March Chapman, 'A Catholicism of the Word and a Catholicism of Devotion: Pusey, Newman and the first *Eirenicon*', *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte/Journal for the History of Modern Theology* 14, 2 (2007), 167–90.

[45]   Edward Bouverie Pusey, *A Letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard Lord Bishop of Oxford on the Tendency to Romanism imputed to Doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church* (Oxford: Parker, 1839), 44.

[46]   Pusey, *Tendency to Romanism*, 44.

For the present what has been bestowed in the period of unity; the main articles of the faith have been fixed and guarded by her, and we possess them in her Creeds, and believe that the Church shall, by virtue of her Saviour's promise, preserve them to the end. With this, Rome is not content; *we* take the event, (as it is ever ruled to be) as the interpreter of prophecy; *she* would bind her Lord to accomplish it in her own way.[47]

Pusey then goes on to outline something like a *via media* differentiating between the 'ultra-protestant' view and that of the Church of Rome. Both had imposed their own limits on the true Church of Christ which had been delivered to the Church of England. Pusey thus writes:

The Anglican view regards the promise as belonging to the universal Church, but restrained to those Articles of the faith which were delivered to her, and to which in her real Œcumenical Councils she has defined; one may add, the Ultra-Protestant view narrows the promise, like the Church of Rome, in extent, to a handful of believing Christians, and, like Rome also changes the subjects of the Faith, substituting a system of its own for Catholic truth; differing, as before, from Rome in this, that what Rome claims to the Churches of her own communion, it applies to individuals.[48]

Rather than representing either of these polar extremes, the Church of England was the 'representative of the Universal Church' to which submission was owed.[49] At the same time, she had no right to add anything to the faith that could not be proved on the basis of the tradition of the primitive church grounded in Scripture and could impose nothing new.[50]

 Following the controversies surrounding Newman's Tract 90, Pusey published a lengthy open letter to Richard William Jelf of Christ Church in 1841 where he developed similar ideas. Again referring to

---

[47] Pusey, *Tendency to Romanism*, 45.
[48] Pusey, *Tendency to Romanism*, 49.
[49] Pusey, *Tendency to Romanism*, 52.
[50] A similar statement occurs in the prospectus of the great Tractarian translation project, *The Library of the Fathers*. The *Library* would help to point out 'the great danger in which Romanists are of lapsing into secret infidelity, not seeing how to escape from the palpable errors of their own Church, without falling into the opposite errors of Ultra-Protestants. It appeared an act of especial charity to point out to such of them as are dissatisfied with the state of their own Church, a body of ancient Catholic truth, free from the errors, alike of modern Rome and of Ultra-Protestantism.' (Cited in Richard W. Pfaff, 'The Library of the Fathers: The Tractarians as Patristic Translators', *Studies in Philology* 70 (1973), 329–44, 331).

Article XXI, he claimed that 'there is ample scope for our Article in asserting that "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred," without touching on the ecumenical'.[51] When applied to the process of renewal in the churches this meant that the excesses of all ecclesiastical systems—which included those matters which had been decided and introduced by erroneous general councils—would need to be purged through application of the ecumenical or 'patristic' principle. For Pusey, as will become clear in Chapter 3, this was to become something like the functional equivalent of the *sola scriptura* of the Reformation, to which Peter Nockles refers somewhat unflatteringly as 'patristic fundamentalism'.[52] Indeed Pusey believed—with a less than accurate account of earlier Anglican theologians[53]—that the patristic principle which regarded the Fathers as supremely authoritative under Scripture had been retained through the English Reformation. While it is true that the Fathers had provided the theological basis for the great Anglican apologists such as John Jewel in their critique of the Church of Rome, they were used to amplify and justify the importance of the Reformation rather than to downplay its significance. Writing to Jelf, Pusey betrays a very different understanding of the role of the Fathers:

> We have remained since the Reformation, as before, a branch of the Church Catholic; we were placed on no new platform; our Reformers did not, like Luther, form for us any new system of doctrine, such as that which bears his name; they ever appealed to catholic antiquity; submitted their own judgement to hers.[54]

---

[51] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *The Articles treated on in Tract 90 reconsidered and their Interpretation vindicated in a Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D.* (Oxford: Parker, 1841), 27.

[52] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 145.

[53] On the use of the Fathers by the Tractarians in relation to the earlier Anglican tradition, see the impressive work by Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 4–7; see also Nicholas Lossky, 'The Oxford Movement and the Revival of Patristic Theology', in Paul Vaiss (ed.), *Newman: From Oxford to the People* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996), 76–82. On John Jewel, see Mark Chapman, *Anglican Theology* (London: T & T Clark, 2012), ch. 3.

[54] Pusey, *The Articles*, 8. Pusey and the other Tractarians worked on a massive translation of the Fathers with the telling title: *A Library of the Fathers, anterior to the division of the East and West. Translated by members of the English Church*. See Liddon, *Life*, i, ch. 18; see also Richard W. Pfaff, 'The Library of the Fathers', 329–44. The series sought to prove that 'the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic is founded upon Holy Scripture and the agreement of the Universal Church, and that therefore the knowledge of Christian antiquity is necessary in order to understand and

As Pusey's later controversies with Newman in the years leading up to the Vatican Council exemplify, such an approach to catholicism presented a very clear account of what precisely could be held to be *de fide* by the Catholic Church. Since catholicity was defined primarily in terms of a return to the teaching of the primitive church or what Pusey called the 'first deeds',[55] this meant that reunion was regarded by Pusey—as it had been for Newman in his Anglican years—as a second-order activity which could take place only after a cleansing process in all the churches. Catholicity understood as apostolicity was at the heart of Tractarianism: its historical premises relied on a clear and accessible fixed deposit of faith handed down from the early Church.

RIVAL VERSIONS OF CATHOLICITY

As Newman moved away from the Church of England so his understanding of catholicity began to distance itself from Tractarian historicism. Reflecting later in life in his *Apologia* on the differences between what he called 'the Anglican Via Media and the popular religion of Rome', Newman—who in 1845 had converted to the Roman Catholic Church and by that stage in his career knew both churches from the inside—clearly distinguished between catholicity understood 'temporally' as apostolicity and a quite different version of catholicity which united Christians across space. According to Newman, 'the Anglican disputant took his stand upon Antiquity or Apostolicity, the Roman upon Catholicity'. He characterized the differences through an imaginary conversation where the Anglican disputant pointed to antiquity, and the Roman to unity through the

maintain her doctrines, and especially her creeds and her liturgy' (Cited in Liddon, *Life*, i, 416). See also Franklin, *Nineteenth Century Churches*, 250–2. The republication of Patristic texts also served to 'produce, out of Christian antiquity, refutations of heresy, (such as the different shades of the Arian,) thereby avoiding the necessity of discussing, ourselves, profane errors, which, on so high mysteries, cannot be handled without pain, and rarely without injury to our own minds'. They also revealed the 'real practical value of Catholic Antiquity, which is disparaged by Romanists in order to make way for the Later Councils, and by others in behalf of modern and private interpretations of Holy Scripture' (Cited in Pfaff, 'The Library of the Fathers', 331).

[55] Pusey, *The Articles*, 181–3.