

The Letters and Diaries
of
John Henry Newman

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

[[January 1841]]

I think all nice persons are called Mary; but how could you think I could, with our present unhappy habits, take the liberty of writing [Mary Mordaunt]¹ in the book of a Lady I have seen but once? Am I Archbishop or Abbot? am I a Monk of the desert? And yet I wish very much to be civil and kind.

Ever, My dear H, Yours affly J H N

↑Rogers is *much pleased* with the Ecclesiastics of Milan,² as simple, honest, and kind;¹ but perhaps it is best not to talk about it.

FRIDAY 1 JANUARY 1841 Circumcision Daman and Church went did duty in afternoon read Number 192 dined with C M in Common Room

SATURDAY 2 JANUARY Ward, Bloxam, Wilson [of] Magd to dine in Common Room had C M evening [?]

TO FREDERIC ROGERS

Oriel: January 2, 1841.

A happy new year to you. You do not say how long you stay at Rome, so I write there . . . The ‘Times’ has put in three columns on Bowden’s ‘Hildebrand,’ a puff, though confessing he goes lengths.³ Palmer of Magdalen is returning ἀπρακτος⁴. The Russians will not believe him against the evidence of all the English they ever

¹ [[H. W. cut out the words ‘Mary Mordaunt’ and sent them to Acland]]. Mary, daughter of Sir Charles Mordaunt, M.P. for the county of Warwick, was married to T. D. Acland on 14 April. She and her friend Mary Anne Dyson had compiled a series of prayers for schools which Newman had had printed and was using at Littlemore.

² See letter of 9 Dec. 1840 from F. Rogers printed before that of 10 Jan. to him.

³ ‘The study of ecclesiastical history, long considered the peculiar province of the theologian and the antiquarian, is daily becoming a subject of general and increasing interest. The desperate struggle which appears to be now impending between the principles of the reformed church and those of Romanism, the zealous and apparently successful, propagation of the peculiar tenets of Romanism, backed as it has been by the concession of civil power to their supporters, and, lastly, the gradual encroachments of the state on the temporal as well as spiritual privileges of the church . . . have tended to awaken men’s minds . . . to the value and importance of obtaining a clearer and more definite insight into the long-neglected regions of ecclesiastical history.

‘Much, indeed, of the misapprehension as to the position and the privileges of the church, existing in the minds of many of her members, may be ascribed to the misrepresentations by modern historians of some of the most important parts of her history. The solemn trust of drawing a faithful picture of men and times which have exerted the greatest influence, for good or evil, on society, has hitherto fallen into the hands of men morally disqualified for understanding a task which demands, if not political, at least religious, sympathy . . . This prevailing tendency of modern historians may be partly attributed, in our own country, to the degraded position which the church has held in its relation to the state for the last century and a half.

‘We have before hinted that we were not prepared to accept without some qualification the apologies which Mr Bowden makes for the unjustifiable conduct of Gregory in several instances. . . .’ *The Times*, No. 17,566, 1 Jan., p. 3, reviewing J. W. Bowden’s *Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh*, two volumes, London 1840.

⁴ ‘unsuccessful’. ‘William Palmer . . . was one of those earnest-minded and devout men, forty years since, who, deeply convinced of the great truth that our Lord had instituted, and still acknowledges and protects, a visible Church—one, individual, and integral—Catholic, as spread over the earth . . . considered it at present to exist in three main branches . . . the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican, these three being one and the same Church, distinguishable from each other only by secondary, fortuitous, and local, though important, characteristics. . . .

‘. . . he hoped to obtain from the Imperial Synod such a recognition of his right to the Greco-Russian

3 JANUARY 1840

saw before. They think him a theorist or worse. He comes home in the spring. [Henry] Balston was buried in Magdalen. Daman, Marriott, Church, and Pritchard came up to the funeral, and with Coffin and me were the pall-bearers. He suffered a good deal at last from restlessness, but took it all very gently and patiently, and has left a tender thought of him in many hearts.

SUNDAY 3 JANUARY 1841 2nd Christmas letter from Harrison strange thunderstorm with fire balls did duty morning and afternoon Bloxam assisting in Holy Communion C. M. preached for me dined in Common Room—Bridges with C M. freezing again hard

TO H. E. MANNING

Oriel, 3rd January 1840. [1841]

My dear Manning

My best congratulations to you.¹ I hope it will turn out all that your own anxieties can wish, or the Church anticipate. I had had a report of it from Charles Marriott, but hardly knew, as he, whether to believe it. I will not forget your wish . . .

Ever yours, with the best wishes of the season,

J. H. Newman.

MONDAY 4 JANUARY 1841 went to Littlemore and read Copeland, Pattison and Kerr to dine with me, Mr Williams, Fox and Green with Marriott wrote to R Palmer, Hook, and Manning

TUESDAY 5 JANUARY letters from C.[.] Berkeley, Mr Hill and anon. C M had letter from Rogers. C M went dined in C R by myself? wrote to F inclosing C's letter to him

WEDNESDAY 6 JANUARY Epiphany letters from Perceval, C[.] and Mr Russell did duty in forenoon read Number 328 dined by myself wrote to Perceval, Mr Russell inclosing £1.1. to C R N inclosing £10

TO A. P. PERCEVAL

Oriel In fest. Epiphani. 1841.

My dear Perceval,

I feel very much obliged by a sight of your Letter,² which, speaking at once from the fulness of my heart, I say I think one of the most beautiful and effective things I have seen a long while. But aliorum judicium est.

Sacraments, as would be an irrefragable proof that the doctrine of the Anglican divines was no mere theory, and that an Anglican Christian was *ipso facto* an Oriental Orthodox also.

'Mr Palmer demanded communion, not as a favour, but as a right; not as if on his part a gratuitous act, but as his simple duty; not in order to become a Catholic, but because he was a Catholic already.' W. Palmer, *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the Years 1840, 1841*, selected and arranged by Cardinal Newman, London 1882, pp. v–viii. Despite a friendly reception and the building up of long-term contacts, he was not admitted to sacramental communion.

¹ To the surprise of many, the anti-Tractarian Bishop Shuttleworth had appointed Manning to the Archdeaconry of Chichester at the end of Dec. 1840 (see Volume VII, 460). However, William Dodsworth wrote to Pusey on 26 Jan. to report that: 'The Bishop of Chichester has just given a *stall* to the representative of the low-Church people in C. [Chichester]. I suppose as a set off against Manning.' Though a different sort of story concerning Manning and Shuttleworth seems to have got into circulation. See note to diary entry for 26 Feb.

² Perceval was circulating for comment a 'Letter' which he had prepared for submission to the Editor of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*. The 'Letter' was a broad defence of the original principles of the Oxford Move-

6 JANUARY 1841

I have nothing to add that would not perhaps incurber it. If you want additional evidence that the Irish See business was the cause of the movement, vid Keble's Assize Sermon preached July 14(?) 1833 on National Apostacy [sic]¹; also Preface² to Tracts for the Times vol. 3, which is quite to your purpose. The subjects of the *first* Tracts show clearly that the two objects were what you state. 1. Apostolical Succession. 2. Integrity of Liturgy.

I also send two papers, one of which your letter alludes to.

If you think it necessary for explicitness, clearness of statement, or any other reason, I have no feeling against my name being put in the place of —.

With the kindest wishes of the Season,

Very sincerely yours John H Newman

TO FREDERIC ROGERS

Epiphany. [6 January 1841]

I sent you a slip in Marriott's letter to you just now. I take up my pen to say that Arthur Perceval sent me, in slips, a most beautiful letter in defence of Froude (really against Sewell), which is to appear in the 'Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.' It ought to be written in letters of gold. It is the most striking thing I have read a long while. It quotes his letters of '33, '34; defends him from the charge of conspiracy most happily by extracts, and whitewashes (while he hits) Keble and me. But to say that it hits at Sewell is rather to give *my* feeling than Perceval's intention.³

ment, occasioned by a critical letter from William Sewell which had appeared in the November 1840 number of the *Journal*. Perceval had been one of those present at the famous Hadleigh meeting of July 1833, and had been a good friend of Hurrell Froude, whose *Remains* Sewell was particularly opposed to. The 'Letter' soon appeared in pamphlet form as an appendix to Perceval's *Letter to the Rev. Thomas Arnold* . . . , London 1841.

William Palmer (of Worcester College) wrote to Perceval on the same day, ' . . . I believe as far as I can recollect, that the statements as to the origin of the "Oxford Movement" are correct . . . With reference to the mention of my name I would say that I should rather it was suppressed, for this reason—You are perhaps aware that towards the close of 1833 I urged with all my power the necessity of appointing some committee of revision in order that no *incautious* expressions should appear in the Tracts. In the course of a very extensive correspondence amongst the Clergy I had observed the great offence given by mere careless expressions which were quite unnecessary to the argument, and it seemed to me that if everyone was to write exactly what he pleased without any check whatever (for this was the principle insisted on by other friends) there would be danger of divisions, of crude assertions, of admissions which artful Romanists and opponents of the Church might lay hold of, and that I myself should be made responsible for what I might think very mistaken. Having *ineffectually* urged all this, I felt that I could no longer continue to act together with our friends as I had previously done, and from that period to the present I have not been in their councils; nor engaged in any of their proceedings; while at the same time I have endeavoured to the best of my power to promote the great objects and principles on which we have always cordially agreed, and I have refrained from ever uttering a single expression of condemnation or hostility. I have been numbered continually by the world among the Oxford tract writers, and I have sometimes felt tempted to disclaim that honour, but I was restrained by a consideration that it might imply some censure on men whom I cordially esteem and regard. . . . ' (Pusey House Papers.)

Keble wrote to Perceval the following day: 'I thank you with all my heart for your kind and friendly and as I think seasonable statement, which seems to me to have not a word in it for which we ought not to be grateful to you, both personally and as friends of our dear Hurrell and in respect of our common cause. . . .' He went on to make on or two minor suggestions, particularly regarding Froude, whose increasing calmness of expression towards the end of his life he felt Perceval could have brought out more.

¹ *National Apostasy considered in a Sermon preached in St Mary's, Oxford, before His Majesty's Judges of Assize, on Sunday, July 14, 1833*, Oxford 1833. See Volume IV, 5, and *Apo.*, p. 35.

² A three-page 'Advertisement', dated 'Oxford, The Feast of All Saints, 1836', which Newman wrote for *Tracts for the Times*. By Members of the University of Oxford. Vol. III. for 1835–6.

³ See previous letter and first note.

8 JANUARY 1841

THURSDAY 7 JANUARY 1841 letters from Rivington and Luxmoore and J.[.] H W and H hoar frost dined with Copeland at Trinity taking Walker of B N C with me—a large party.

FRIDAY 8 JANUARY letters from C. and Berkeley thermometer in inner room down to 20° Fa[h]renheit. went in evening to Provost's to meet W. Barter and Jelf. wrote to H.[.] C.[.] J.[.] Berkeley, Harrison, Ellacombe, Mr Hill, Luxmoore, Rivington

TO H. T. ELLACOMBE

Oriel Jan 8/41

My dear Ellacombe,

Had I thought my criticism worth your having, or that your Latin needed it, you should have had it at once. On second thoughts I just write to say that the inscription is a very nice one, and worthy the *act*, which is saying a good deal.

I am glad you were pleased with Mozley's letter

Yours very truly John H Newman

Compliments of the season to you, i.e. of Jack Frost. I wish the writer in the *British Critic* had had an opportunity to mention your Churches—but as it was he threw over two thirds of his matter for want of room.¹

TO MRS THOMAS MOZLEY

Oriel Jan 8/41

...²

I wrote to Rivington to say (I copied it but have mislaid the paper) that T. would take the Editorship at £25 a quarter and 7 guineas a sheet for four sheets, if he wrote so much, every one else having 5 guineas—and he wrote back the inclosed.

...

Pusey was so short a time at Clifton, that I had not an opportunity of doing what I promised about Mr S. <(I cannot recollect his name)> which I much regretted.

I dare say I have left out something I have to say

Ever Yrs affly John H Newman

¹ T. Mozley in 'New Churches', *Brit. Crit.*, 28, 1840 (Oct.), 471–522. Ellacombe had been appointed to the living of Bitton, Gloucs., in 1817, and had restored the church five years later. He went on to build a further three churches within the parish and, in 1843, was presented with a testimonial to his work in providing accommodation for nearly 2,300 worshippers and schoolrooms for over 800 children.

² The top half of the page is torn off and so the identity of the correspondent is not certain, but the mention of T. Mozley and his taking on the editorship of *Brit. Crit.* and the business terms make Harriett Mozley the likeliest candidate. Francis Rivington wrote to Newman on 9 Jan., '... I should add, that in acceding to the arrangement which will take place with Mr Mozley, I had found upon examining that state of the accounts of the *British Critic* for that purpose, that the balance of the expenses for Contributors was rather in our favour under the arrangement of compensation for the advanced rate of £7. 7s. by your *gratuitous contributions*.' L. N. Crumb, 'Publishing the Oxford Movement: Francis Rivington's Letters to Newman', *Publishing History*, 28 (1990), 31.

8 JANUARY 1841

TO MRS JOHN MOZLEY

Jan 8/41

My dear J

As you ask about C., voici—I am glad to say his letter which he inclosed has made it up with Frank.

I have never thanked you for your kind remarks on my new Volume of Sermons.¹ Generally speaking, I hear nothing agreeable about any thing I do. I could prophecy [sic] about my other volumes pretty well—but have been doubtful whether the present would be useful. As to the B. C. I am not sorry to seem to *understate* M's offence²—I wished his extracts to speak for themselves. At the same time I do *not* go further than I say. I think him indefinitely *unreal*, and that he does not know *where* he is. The Article you take for Tom's, is Oakeley's.³

We have lost Choules and Bavin—Sheen too the grocer has died suddenly. I was shocked about Mr Macaulay—not knowing him. We buried Balston in Magdalen yesterday week—four of our fellows came up.

Not very good accounts of Rogers, but *do take care* this does not get to his family. At least I cannot but be anxious about him. He has had a little cough.

I am solus in College

Ever Yrs affly J H N

P.S. I am not satisfied about my having told you that about F. He did not tell me to keep it secret, yet he may have meant it in confidence.

SATURDAY 9 JANUARY 1841 letters from F.[.] R Wilberforce with news of his being Archdeacon and Church dined by myself in Common Room—Eden returned

SUNDAY 10 JANUARY 1 Epiphany letters from Pusey[.] H W[.] Rivington and Marriott thick snow early Sacrament. Only 5—I feared there would not be a congregation did duty morning and afternoon preached Number 220⁴ dined by myself in Common Room thaw wrote to Rogers (3rd letter) *Jelf came into residence*

FROM FREDERIC ROGERS

Rome. Decr: 9th. 1840.

My dear Newman

In the first place, with what degree of seriousness can you possibly be taking to heart my sisters' piece of pertness about the B. C. I don't believe they took your joke in any degree for, or in

¹ Newman's sister replied: '... I am surprised yet pleased that you should think so much of what I say of your fifth volume of sermons, because it shows how little you know of the estimation in which they are generally held. I think you will be glad to hear what I hear from all quarters, that they are more read than any of your writings; indeed it is a great comfort to me, for I cannot but think they are calculated to be of immense benefit to the most important class. I am sure it is a great gift, that insight you show into human nature. When I think of people one calls decidedly "clever men," I see what I estimate in you is not their sort of talent; it is nothing intellectual; it is a sort of spiritual perception; and I wonder whether it is anything like the gifts in the Corinthian Church. Perhaps we might have the same gift in ours now if it was not so sadly neglected. Perhaps it may be met with in private clergymen, but I do not see it in any published sermons as strongly as in yours.'

² The liberal theological tendencies of H. H. Milman in his *History of Christianity*, three volumes, London 1840, which Newman had reviewed in *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (Jan.), 71-114; *Ess.* II, 186-248.

³ 'Ancient and Modern Charity', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (Jan.), 44-70. ⁴ P.S. VII, 15, 'Mental Prayer'.

earnest. At least I am very much mistaken in their understandings if they did—only they thought that your gentle jeer at young ladies privileged them to retort a little impertinence of their own upon you. Thank you for telling of your brother's letter. Hope tells me that Gladstone's book is much less open (he believes) to your objections than the titles seem.¹

I hardly know what I told in my last letter—I think pretty much all that was to be told at Milan. We saw Manzoni again, but nothing very much came of it—and the Vitalis²—cozing comfortably over their fire in the evening with a couple more of black cassocked friends. I thought two or three times we were a queer set—One of them who is³ most warmly bent upon Hope's conversion was confined to his bed I am afraid of consumption—and be sought us quite pathetically to make 'un pas d' avance' 'je mourrais [sic] content'.—I think I mentioned that his brother, the man of business of the family, a plain straightforward good hearted fellow, talks of visiting Oxford.—They had been in the habit of reading English a good deal[,] inter alia Shakespeare and *Byron*. I left them a Christian Year to correct some of their notions of English literature.—We were both a good deal amused with a professor of dogmatic Theology to whom we paid a visit at his own desire, he wanting to get from England *Paley's Evidences* and such other good books of Evidences as H. [Hope] could send him. He was the only Italian we met 1st. who offered us anything to eat or drink—2ndly. who talked against Ultramontaniam—<Manzoni talked of all not Ultramontane as inconsistent (afterwards) and said that any who did not receive the bull Unigenitus⁴ (which seems the point on which the Pope *has* spoken without the Church) were no Catholics and would be treated as such if they spoke out but they were obliged to keep their opinions secret, just as an Atheist might—at least so H. and I understood him.> which Hope was malicious enough to set him on, little to the edification of the Vits [Vitalis] who were present—being Ultramontanes—but were not up to shewing fight. His view was summary—that Ultramontaniam was not only untrue, but it was only held as a theory by its supporters—and if a case really arose where the Church universal hesitated to accept the Pope's dictum, they the Ultramontanes, in spite of all their talk, would suspend their judgement too. (The Unigenitus was spoken of but I do not recollect what he made of it—or Hope)—In fact that it would be absurd to base an article of faith on the Pope [']s personal infallibility which was not de fide itself.—He was a very jovial kind of fellow I should guess—and would do very well for a Canon of Ch. Ch. [Christ Church] We had disturbed him in the billiard room one of which is kept for the professors and spiritual director of the Seminary.

I should be afraid Milan was a detestable place—though Manzoni and his friends tried to make the best of it.—At least it was bad enough to shock a thoroughly profligate French artist with whom and another Russian of the same kind it was my fate to be shut up on the road to Genoa—certainly I heard him mentioning frightful things both as general and as within his own knowledge—and those must have been the middle class of whom Manzoni spoke best.—

Whether from ill humour or from bad weather I confess I have not taken with Rome as yet. I am half afraid it is the weather—for I must allow I do feel uncommonly listless about what I have seen or am to see. With this preface, and hopes for amendment allow that St Peter [']s disappointed me very much—I can appreciate little more than the two facts that it is very large and must have cost a great deal.—but as to solemnity of effect I *have* been more struck on entering St Paul's. However I have only been there two or three times. The Churches that I have seen strike me certainly as very magnificent in their way—but I cannot say that any of them have to my mind the same kind of sweetness (if it is not an absurd word) that good Gothic architecture has. However I am conscious of some bigotry. They are to me no relief from the dreary blighted look that the streets seem to have;—any more than the gay English parties into two or three of which my fate has already precipitated me.

Severne [Severn] has been very civil to me; as has Richmond a young artist, a good kind of fellow Italian [?], to whom Bowden furnished me with an introduction, and with whom I think I shall strike up an alliance. I had a lionizing walk with him yesterday. To me the great sight we

¹ W. E. Gladstone, *Church Principles, considered in their Results*, London 1840. The work 'was written as a companion volume to his book on Church and State to make more intelligible the theological position that underlay it . . . As a theological work, however, it had little impact.' P. Butler, *Gladstone: Church, State, and Tractarianism*, Oxford 1982, p. 59.

² Ambrogio Vitali was Secretary to the Archbishop of Milan. Giuseppe, his brother, was a Professor at Monza.

³ The paper is torn at the edge here and below.

⁴ The Bull of Pope Clement XI, promulgated in 1713, which condemned the main propositions of Jansenism.

fell across was a procession of Franciscans—with image etc—preceded and followed by a military band.—There were some fine looking fellows among the young ones whom one could fancy a good deal of good about—but I must say the elderly ones did seem to me to have a most uncomfortable kind of look about them. The Jesuits, we hear, are getting on very much here—they got a great credit by their behaviour during the Cholera—when they say the other priests were rather backward but *they* were everywhere and everything. Hope does not seem to get much out of his friend the ‘Father General’—who has handed him over for information to a certain Father Glover—an English Jesuit—with the regular specious manner and as close as war. He liked the F. G. very much; and is not *entirely* discouraged.

He has been exceedingly struck by *Overbeck*¹—who from his account must be a cut above anything we have seen.—Everyone speaks most highly of him. M. Abekin [Abeken] and others (who ‘would’) with a mixture of affectionate pity, as *weak* and bigotted. I have not seen him—nor should I gain much at present by doing so seeing he only speaks German and Italian.

Thank Marriott, if he is with you, for his letter which arrived safe days ago and tell him I found his friend Dr Badham here: who insisted forthwith in vaccinating both of us—the small pox having done terrible damage here.—We have dined with him today—and very hospitable and good natured he is—but he appears to me more cognizant than a protégé of Marriott’s should be, of the difference of effect produced the next morning by *too much* good, and *too much* bad Champagne—He may have been speaking merely medically—but there was an apparent assumption of experience in his tone which did not to me look well for Marriott’s character. He is going to take us to a soirée at an Italian Improvisatore when he says we stand a chance of hearing Bishops improvise. Cardinals he says do such things occasionally but he does not hold us out any hopes of hearing them.

Dr Baines Bishop of Siga seems to have taken Wiseman’s place here as preacher at the English ladies.—I just met him at a party the other evening when he surrounded himself with such and seemed to talk away very successfully.

11th: I have not had an opportunity of going on with my letter before—and have just received yours with Church’s via Florence and one from home—which and some fine weather have helped me to a certain extent out of certain very objectionable megrims which were taking possession of me.—what you say about yourself and St Mary’s is no small comfort, and I quite understand it.—You sent me a board filled with all sorts of horrible imaginations—a great horror of the act of joining Rome, (whether for a Church or an individual) and so mixing oneself up again with from which we have quouo modo shaken ourselves free—and all sorts of and hopelessnesses and disappointments about the English Church and everything else. However I won’t write anymore about this; as writing the last 5 lines has kept me about $\frac{1}{2}$ an hour remeagrimsing myself: and my thoughts on such subjects are apt to be so little edifying or pleasing that I am beginning or shall begin to try and keep most of them out of my head.—Now I have written this I am ashamed of having written it to you who have so much more on your mind.—And it seems as if it were telling you not to write to me about such things—I hope you will not so understand it—for of course there is nothing I am so anxious to hear about—or am more thankful for hearing.

Thank Marriott for his letter from Guernsey—which I shall answer—to Oxford. And tell Bowden if you are writing to him that Richmond is very discouraging about the prospect of getting a good copy of any picture here. A M. Kestner, and Abekin say however that there are German artists who would do it well—suggest to him a copy of a ‘presepis’ in the Vatican ‘detto della Spineta’ by Perugino Raffaele and Pinturicchio <(10 palm. Rom high, by 7 broad)>. Hope will make more enquiries and write to him—tell me in your next his address—Also tell Church that I know of no papers concerning Bridgewater and Sheen.² I am glad Taunton owns the delinquency of mislaying the Old Lease.—Also tell him that I have not had anything to do with Convents: but will try and get answer to his question. I think you can answer it—it was about private intimacies among monks. Abekin talks of the *learning* of Rome having departed in Wiseman—whom however he talks of as a most unscrupulous controversialist. Hope appears likely to rush about to fine parties of ambassadors etc with a certain Lady Davy who is an old friend of his—we have met Dr Bayne [Baines] twice now at her house—English ladies are

¹ See Volume VII, 252.

² R. W. Church was Junior Treasurer of Oriol at this time. A. Bridgewater was a local chandler, and Richard Sheen a grocer. Rogers had held the Junior Treasurership for a while.

10 JANUARY 1841

certainly his line. He is smooth—but disgusts H. by having claimed jurisdiction over part of the Salisbury Diocese. Kindest remembrances to Church Mozley etc

Ever yr affly F R.

TO FREDERIC ROGERS

January 10. [1841]

The news is as follows: Robert Wilberforce is *Archdeacon of the East Riding*. Claughton is said to be about to marry Lord Ward's sister,¹ and C. L. Cornish to marry Monro's sister. But do not tell these matches, for it is only what is generally said and believed.

The 'Anglo-Catholic Library' is in a tottering condition.² Copeland has given up the editorship because our divines do not go far enough for him, and Maitland has withdrawn from the committee because the concern is in Copeland's, etc., hands. Meanwhile Parker has been diligently collecting the subscriptions, and the Protestants of London have started an Opposition Society³ which is to bring out cheaply Reformation works. To complete it, the first volume (Andrewes' Sermons) is just through the press, and very well edited.⁴ I do not see my way at all. It is no plan of mine, and neither Pusey nor I was warm about it, but the question is, What is to be done under the circumstances?

Henry Wilberforce has not been well, and, I think, rather alarmed about himself. If the weather changes (which it is just now promising to do), he is to come this week and pay me a visit here.

I think you are apt to be unfair to those unhappy Romanists. As to the ceremonies, I confess I liked what I saw as little as you; but there is such a thing as uncharitableness. We are much cautioned in Scripture not to go by appearances. How often has a person a pompous, etc., manner in England whom we think well of. Demureness is the Roman manner, as pompousness is the Church of England's. Marriott says upon it, 'The impression of hollowness in ceremonies is almost necessarily exaggerated, unless one enters into them with complete enthusiasm.' You may be right in being so suspicious of Rome, but still such prejudice and suspicion, I do think, disqualify you as a witness of facts against her. You seem to *like* to catch at something bad. You caught at that Lutheran's saying that Dr. W. was an unscrupulous controversialist. I dare say he is. But who is not? Is Jeremy Taylor, or Laud, or Stillingfleet? I declare I think it is as rare a thing, candour in

¹ T. L. Claughton married Julia-Susannah Ward on 14 June 1842. She was the only surviving sister of William Ward, tenth Lord Ward, and later Earl of Dudley, whose tutor Claughton had been, and by whom Claughton was presented to the important living of Kidderminster.

² See Volume VII, 190–1 on the origins of the project, and letters of 12 Jan. to E. B. Pusey and 14 Jan. to C. Crowley on the current debate about it.

³ *The Parker Society, for the Publication of the Works of the Fathers and early Writers of the reformed English Church*. A prospectus and list of subscribers was published, dated 31 Dec. 1840, and a supplement issued covering additional subscribers enlisted during January 1841. Annual reports covering the years 1841–55 were published between 1842–55. Lord Ashley was President of the Society, and its offices were at 33, Southampton Street, Strand.

⁴ *Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes . . .*, four volumes, Oxford 1841. They were edited by John Posthumus Wilson, of Magdalen College.

10 JANUARY 1841

controversy, as to be a Saint. So you see, on the whole, I think that Mr. Close, under the same circumstances, would be as hollow as the Pope, and Mr. Townsend as unfair as Dr. Wiseman. Should you like Manzoni or Vitali to judge of us either by Cheltenham or Durham?

I fear I tire your eyes. Perhaps it is a foolish thing to write so small and keep the letter so long, but I am growing stingy of paper, for my stationer's bill the past year has come to pretty nigh £10.

Carissime, I wish you were here again, and will you give a good account of your health when you write? Were I anxious about you, for which I see no reason, much more should I be anxious about H. Wilberforce, Bloxam, and Bowden, not to say Hope.

FROM FREDERIC ROGERS

Rome. Jan. 16. 1841.

My dear Newman—

Very many thanks for your most acceptable letter—especially, as always, for what you say about yourself. I don't remember what I said against Rome which you think wrong—I hope it was nothing insolent, or flippant or selfcongratulatory. I must own however a strong aversion to her present form which has been growing on me ever since I have been here—It is a wretched thing to be travelling among foreign Churches with the feeling that one must see faults in them in order to justify our own (Anglican) position; and I know I have had that feeling about me—very strongly—and I dare say it has made me say things more bitterly than I ought to have done—particularly, I am afraid, in letters I have written since yours.—All I can say is I have tried not to allow it to make me believe lies. It is a little cruel of you to talk in that quiet way about inserting my 'most merciless criticism' on Sewell,¹ whose explosion is certainly most amusing. I shall be anxious to know if he deigns to express any feeling about it, for you make me remorseful. I am *very* sorry to hear what you say about Bowden's winter—cannot he get away?

However as to my own proceedings—I am sorry to say that I am as idle as ever and begin to give up all hopes of being anything better while I am here—However the last two or three days have been more worth having than anything I have seen before here.—Hope has got himself introduced to a certain priest named Pentini who is concerned in an interesting system of 'retraites' for the poorer classes and soldiers; which he is to shew us the whole history of—and on Thursday he took us over the building and gave us a lecture on their proceedings. They are a society of 12 priests, incorporated by the pope, but quite independent; with 12 (or more) working men (without authority) under them, who simply buy a house—large enough to accommodate about 70 people with beds, a kitchen, a chapel <and oratory>, lecture room and yard to walk in; catch their 70 men, partly with, partly against their will, and then inflict upon them 8 or 9 days of preaching—silence—meagre diet—finishing with confession and communion.—When we went through the house they had got some 50 or 60 soldiers in hand. They came, we were told, of their own free will—BUT those who would not come of their own free will were forced to come—It seemed to me from his account as if it were fairly part of the military discipline to send them all once in so many years. When they went out; a batch (*muta*) of townsmen were to come in; and so Pentini said about 12 or 15 hundred people passed through their hands during the year, with, on the whole, the very best results. Sometimes, he told us, men were sent who were known to cherish certain evil intentions in order to have them worked out of them, and he shewed us a stiletto

¹ William Sewell's *Christian Morals*, London 1840, had been the leading subject of Rogers's article, 'Utilitarian Moral Philosophy', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (Jan.), 1–44. Among the several of Rogers's observations to which Sewell may have taken exception: 'Mr Sewell considers written instruction as infinitely short of oral in vivacity and truth, and his book we should say bears the impress of his theory. It is spoken, not written. We seem to be in company with a rich and rapid mind, evolving its own thoughts. . . This adds great interest to a book, but has the disadvantage of a certain want of method and accuracy.' (p. 4.)

hidden in a pipe which had been given up, after a few days of their discipline, by a man who had been sent there as known to be planning revenge on another. The Society was self elected—with no necessary connexion with the parochial system, and each '*muta*' required 7 priests to manage it—the whole thing being divided into 4 room-fulls and none ever left alone. Pentini himself seems a thoroughly earnest simplehearted little man, apparently anxious to shew every thing from the firm faith he has in its excellence—so I hope we shall see a good deal there.

Also I have been much amused at a dinner which we had at a convent of Franciscans at Albano under the guidance of a certain tame deacon named Trifoni who is in Hope's employ and whom I confess I respect as little as well may be—being a regular Graeculus esuriens,¹ who professes himself ready to spend '*even his life*' in H's service, and whom the said H. has been obliged to prohibit from lying in his behalf, he (Trifoni) urging that *profitable* as well as jocosely lies (bugie avvantaggiose) are only venial sins—and therefore not to be accounted of.—He 'fouls his own nest', like Pugin, not a little.—I can't make up my mind whether to be civil or rude to him—so alternate between the two, and catch it from my conscience both ways. However such as he is he took us to Albano and got us the abovementioned dinner and a very respectable one it was—we dined in the refectory with them sitting all round the room with our backs to the wall—3 plates of meat—(one being added on account of a feast day)—soup—cheese and fruit. I can't say much for their polish or devotion (at grace) but they seemed to be goodhumoured and to be good friends with one another, and it was quite edifying to see the energy with which the whole convent set to work, when they had finished their own dinner, trying to make one or two pet cats jump for the remainder; one very dirty old lay brother apparently the porter:—to the infinite amusement of the unsuccessful aspirants.—

But far the best form[?] (for it is neither more nor less) I have yet come across has been an interview we had on Friday with an Irish Jesuit named Father *Esmonde*. I think I told you that Hope had been much offended at being handed over by the Father General to a Father Glover (also Irish) whom he described as simply a smooth old humbug: and he had shewn his view of the said G. to one or two R. Cs. who expressed great anxiety that he should become acquainted with Father *Esmond*[*Esmonde*], which eventually led to our calling on him on Friday. He had [paper torn] been informed that smoothness was not the line and accordingly he set to work and kept us laughing for 2 hours and a half [.]. Partly in controversy, but principally by accounts of his own proceedings at [a] dinner with Mr *Rogers of Wadham*, at a meeting of the Reformation Society etc. etc.—I never saw or conceived anyone so unscrupulously bold in stating facts—as e.g. he unhesitatingly fathered on Pusey (professing to have it in the Tracts for the Times of which he is taking notes, and which he gives in a lump to P.) the unqualified Protestant doctrine of Private Judgment.—And it was quite a lesson in diplomacy to see the dashing way in which he used his mi[s-] statements in order to elicit from us any truth which he wanted to get at; and the keen way in which he fixed us when he saw an approach towards *letting out* anything—generally taking for granted, as if he knew all about it, about 6 times as much as we gave him reason to suspect, and leaving us to contradict as much as we could. The only fault was failing '*celam artem*.'—As for detection, it did not seem to occur to him as an evil—so long as he gained his point. His style of controversy was what you would expect from this and from a clever Irishman—a good exhibition but not much tending to convince an opponent. He sends his compliments to Oxford and wishes you all to know that it quite distresses him to see you take such a mint of trouble all to no purpose. The '*morceau*' however of the interview was his account of having floored Captain Gordon and Mr Baptist Noel at a Reformation meeting—which began with no small selfcomplacency—but which upon reflection I give up in despair of doing justice to it—which is humiliating as I intended it for the pith of my letter. Captain Gordon he did not much relish—but he was quite '*affectionate upon*' B. Noel—'*D'ye know little Noel?—augh! dear little Noel—nice little man—I should like to have given him a bit of plum cake*'. However I am afraid I am losing you by a prose which is only amusing to me from my recollection of the live man;—whom to tell the truth I look upon with some little terror from the intention which he plainly manifested of fixing himself upon us to our infinite discredit with all good Anglicans, and the certainty which I enjoy that if he catches me alone, without Hope (on whose skill with just that kind of person I place nearly unbounded reliance) he will suck my brains to precisely the extent which he thinks advisable. I should strongly suspect that he sees already that I am the leaky vessel and am quite prepared for any degree of personal attention with which he may think it desirable to honor me

¹ Juvenal, *Satires*, I, ii, 78.

11 JANUARY 1841

in consequence. I suspect from what I hear said of 'Puseyites' that we are in bad odour already for mixing so much as we do with R. Cs: and so little with respectable English clergymen—In gay English parties I grieve to state we are plunged up to our necks. I cannot say how I shall rejoice over a little quiet when I get home again.

I am very much obliged to you for your kind letter to my Father about Edward of which I heard from home. It was evidently greatly satisfactory to them. Also thank Church for his kindness to E.—I never dreamt that he would doubt about doing so else I should have expressly told him to do it [several words erased] my Oxford correspondents have been good enough always to keep me in their debt. Remember me most kindly to [name erased], Johnson and all other near friends.

Ever yrs affly Fredc. Rogers.

MONDAY 11 JANUARY 1841 letters from Jemima and Mr J. Walter frost and thaw thro' the week dined with Eden in Common Room? wrote to Rogers

TUESDAY 12 JANUARY C.M. came Ward, Oakeley <?> to dine with me—Pattison with Eden—C.M. Church to come but unwell—did not. wrote to R W and Bohn King Wm Street[,] Pusey and Straker

FROM E. B. PUSEY

Jan. 8. 1841

My dear Newman,

The inclosed letters are from Mr Hawkins of the Brit. Mus. [British Museum] that marked (1) forwarded to me by Palmer of Worc. [Worcester] the other an answer to myself. Whether we produce 3 or 6 volumes in a year,¹ is, I suppose [a] matter of indifference, Parker was for the 6; I answered that we were rather in the predicament of the persons, who ended up by carrying their cross[?].

The other two points are graver; I said, that I had been of the same mind once about limiting the works, having only certain definite authors, but that I had given it up, thinking it unadvisable and impracticable. For I doubt whether any of us, are sufficiently acquainted with our divines to be able to fix definitively upon the list of what it would be advisable to publish; for simply to say that the works of certain *authors* only would be published, would be nothing; since one might have Catholic and unCatholic works from the same writer[,] as Hall, Usher [Ussher,] Beveridge, I suppose; this then would be nugatory; but who could decide at once what of Hammond[']s in folio volumes is worth reprinting[.] This might be obviated in some degree by Mr H's 2nd proposal to publish a 1st prospectus for a *first series*, and so not pledging the Committee ultimately to limit themselves to the works specified. Could Copeland, or Audland or E Churton make such a list, if thought advisable[.] On the other point, I thought it would be unjust to our Divines, not to reserve to the editor, the right of explaining ambiguous phrases in a Catholic sense, with a benigna interpretatio[.]

What think you? Altogether, as the thing goes on, I share Copeland's misgivings about it. I thought in the 1st instance, that it would be a good occupation for him, and would bind him to Oxf.[ord] and that he would be a good person for it. But now, if books are to be taken out, as they are reprinted by others (e.g. Saunderson)² and others hereafter, and some are taken up already (as Hooker[,] Bull[,] Pearson[.] Jackson)³ I fear that our AngloCatholic Library will look very meagre, and very sadly compared to the Gallo-Catholic⁴ of which Williams speaks[.] But this

¹ In the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. See Appendix 2 for details of its publications for 1841–5, and of its officers and committee. Edward Hawkins was the Keeper of Antiquities at the British Museum.

² R. Montgomery was bringing out an edition of *Sermons, of the Right Reverend Robert Sanderson . . .*, two volumes, London 1841.

³ Keble's three volume edition of the *Works* of Hooker had been published in 1836. A second edition came out in 1841, and a third in 1845. A further two-volume edition appeared in 1850. Edward Burton's edition of Bull's *Works* in seven volumes of 1827 went to a second edition in 1846, though three individual works were included in the Library. See letter of 14 Jan. to C. Crawley on Pearson. A twelve volume edition of the *Works* of Thomas Jackson was published at Oxford in 1844, including Vaughan's *Life* of him.

⁴ See first note to letter of 6 Jan. 1842 to S. F. Wood.

12 JANUARY 1841

may be my ignorance of our divines, which is very great. Perhaps the name AngloCatholic Library is too high-sounding, as it is rather a supplement to the reprints of the University press[.]

I should hardly be sorry, if the whole thing came to nothing; I never had any great affection for it, except as far as it would give the opportunity of bringing out two or 3 sets of works, as Laud, Bramhall; but this again may be ignorance and impatience, and one ought to consider the object of bringing out the works more cheaply than a bookseller for the poorer Clergy[.]

I am glad that you have thought of applying to Mr Dyce professionally; pray do so.¹ I hope that there is less fear of schismatical proceeding in the Mediterranean, than there would have been 2 or 3 years ago, and that the new Bishop would be more likely to be a medium of communication with the Eastern Bishops than against them.² I hope that Tomlinson's mission has opened people's eyes at the S. P. C. K. and that their leaders will be more cautious.

I wrote to the Bishop of O.[Oxford], (as K.[Keble] proposed to the Bishop of W[Winchester]) stating objections to the plan of state nomination, but saying that if he, as my Diocesan recommended me or if the whole body of Bishops agreed upon the plan, I would do on their responsibility what I should think it wrong to do on my own, contribute to it. He forwarded my letter to the Archbishop and Bishop of L.[London; C. J. Blomfield,] agreed with my objection, but thought it could not be avoided, as no Ministry would give up the nomination. I urged in reply, that when the matter was brought before the Bishops they would consider whether the state-patent might not be dispensed with altogether, subscriptions be formed in England for the support of the Bishops, but they themselves be consecrated the North American or East Indian Bishops respectively[.]

I was going, for once, to print a sermon without consulting you; it is one which I preached at Bristol for a new Church there, and which I was asked to print with a view of stimulating to Church-building[.]³

I have found my children better than I could hope. Even of poor Ph.[Philip] the opinions seem changed, since he has been brought so marvellously through the whooping cough as well as the measles, and they think here he will grow up, as an ordinary person. It is thought too that dear Lucy will do for the present, though the period from 17 to 25 will be an anxious one for those who live to witness it[.]

I have not done any thing since I have been away, and know not when I shall do any thing.
ever yr very affecte friend E B Pusey

I tried to see you the day before I left, but rather to receive your vale- or bene- diction than for any thing definite[.]

I heard of two good persons at Clifton wanting curacies 1) Walsh, a predecessor of J. Marriott at Buckland, Cambridge but sound. 2) Stonehouse[.] a neighbour of T. Mozley's who gave up a living for his wife's health. Both married, so would need houses not lodgings.

Also Mr Dowding of Merton is disappointed of the Curacy here.

TO E. B. PUSEY

Oriel, Jan 12/41

My dear Pusey

In haste. I am truly glad you are idle, but I don't believe it. As to the Anglo-Catholic Library, with you I never have been for it—under the circumstances, the Parker Society urging, the subscriptions being collected, and the first volume coming out, I suppose it must go on. I have long been urging strongly Copeland to make out a list, and we have now put down the following, which requires of course some finishing off, but which Mr Hawkins might have a sight of. viz

¹ See note to diary entry for 24 Oct.

² See fifth note to letter of 24 Oct. to J. Keble.

³ *Christ, the Source and Rule of Christian Love; a Sermon, preached on the Feast of St John the Evangelist, MDCCCXL, at St Paul's Church, Bristol . . .*, Oxford 1841.

13 JANUARY 1841

First Series

Andrew[e]s' *Works*¹
Bramhall's *Works*
Montague's *Works*²
Laud's *Works*³
Kettlewell's *Works*⁴
Bull's *Harmonia* translated
Courayer's *Defence*⁵
Cave's *Primitive Christianity*⁶
Johnson's *θυσία ἀναίμακτος*⁷
Marshall's penitential discipline
Thorndyke's Religious assemblies
Weights and Measures
View of true Reformation
L'Estrange's Alliance
Sage's *Works*⁸
Overall's Convocation Book

I feel, what you say, about the absurdity of calling it AngloCatholic Library when you leave out many of our first writers.⁹

As to the notes, I agree with Mr Hawkins. I take his view, and always have—we are purveyors, not commentators.

Thank you of your account of the children—my love to Philip
In great haste,

Ever Yrs affly J H N

R. Wilberforce is *Archdeacon* of the East Riding. Would Luxmoore's friend do for a Curate for him? Cornish of Exeter is going to be married—and Claughton of Trinity. Anxious accounts of Rogers, but *keep it secret*.

WEDNESDAY 13 JANUARY 1841 letter from Church first day of term—Sacrament in chancel dined with Jelf (first time) wrote to Kerslake and Willis, Booksellers

¹ See Appendix 2 for details of these and other works which were published in the Library during 1841–5.

² These did not appear in the Library, though a new edition of Montagu's *Articles of Inquiry put forth at his Primary Visitation as Bishop of Norwich (Unauthorised)* was published at Cambridge during the year.

³ Laud's *Works* were published in the Library in seven volumes between 1847 and 1860. The first two volumes were edited by William Scott, and the remainder by James Bliss.

⁴ An edition of Kettlewell did not appear in the Library, but a small volume containing *Some Account of the Life and Death of . . . J. K. . . . To which are added Directions for a Holy and Happy Death* was published in 1844.

⁵ Though advertised as 'in course of publication' for the Library for two years, an edition and translation of P. F. Le Courayer, *A Dissertation on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English . . .*, which appeared in 1844 was an independent production, even though J. H. Parker was the publisher.

⁶ In 1836, William Trollope had produced a popular two-volume edition of William Cave's *Primitive Christianity; or, the Religion of the Ancient Christians . . . to which are added, the Lives of Justin Martyr and St Cyprian*.

⁷ John Johnson's *Theological Works . . .*, edited by R. Owen, appeared in the Library in two volumes in 1847–8. *The Unbloody Sacrifice* was included in the first.

⁸ The *Works* of the Scottish Non-Juring Bishop William Sage were published in three volumes by the Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, in 1846–8.

⁹ Pusey replied on 15 Jan.: 'I have forwarded your list to Churton (asking him to shew it to Hook) and Mr Hawkins. This plan seems the best get off, but will involve I suppose a good deal of change in details. Fewer hands would be employed, and so, I suppose, the 6 volumes per annum would not come out.'

14 JANUARY 1841

THURSDAY 14 JANUARY letters from Crawley and Oxenham snow drifting deeply dined with Ward, Oakeley, J Morris, Tickell etc wrote to Mr Crawley and Oxenham, Bohn and Berkeley

TO CHARLES CRAWLEY

Oriel Jan 14/41

My dear Sir,

I do trust we are getting out of our perplexities about the Anglo Catholic Library, but I will tell you all my thoughts about it, and if I have not gone into the matter before, it has been because, with many various things to think of, it has been a difficult thing to understand what one's own thoughts were.

When I first heard Mr Evans's¹ plan I liked it very much—understanding it to be the publication of books *wanting* publication—and the one he especially mentioned was Johnson's *θυσία ἀναμνος*—but how it got changed into Anglo Catholic Library or what hand I had nominally in it I do not know. Certainly I have never fancied the change, and, when one comes to think, there is this plain reason against it—that so many of our writers, nay those in which one should find a chief interest, are forestalled. It seems an absurdity to publish a Library without Hooker, Jackson, Barrow, Taylor, Leslie, Jewell, Field, Wall, Bull, Waterland, Hall, Beveridge, Saunderson, and Wilson. This in fact has driven Copeland from the Editorship—the books he took pleasure in were for the most part gone—and he was forced upon such as he did not merely not like, but could not tolerate. At the same time I certainly think myself he still might have found enough for his purpose—as I will say presently.

I would suggest then that the title of Anglo-catholic Library be not introduced in the title page, on the back, or in any other part of these volumes—as being a misnomer. As they have been so advertised, I suppose they must be still called so in the Subscription List etc.

Next I have often wished Copeland to write down a list of works—and I think if it were done it would satisfy all parties—at least it would bring things to an issue. There are works I would not consent in any way to publish—but I should hope the Committee could be brought to agree together. Several days ago I got Copeland to draw up a list and have sent it to Pusey. I will give it you as far as I can recollect with the addition of Pearson, as Churton suggests.²

Another point, which persons writing to Pusey have stickled for, is that there should be no notes. This I have ever wished myself—and am quite sure that it is

¹ See Volume VII, 190–1.

² In reply to Pusey's note sending Newman's list of 12 Jan., Edward Churton wrote on 17 Jan.: 'I have written, from some communication held with Dr Wordsworth and Archdeacon Todd, to C. Crawley, to propose, D. V. towards the latter part of the present year to edit for the Anglo Catholic Library a complete collection of Bishop Pearson's Miscellaneous Works, exclusive of the work on the Creed, with a Memoir of his Life prefixed. This is a publication I have had some time in view, and have made some collections for it, but should be glad of any information of stray pieces. . . .' Churton's two volume *The Minor Theological Works of John Pearson . . . Now first collected, with a Memoir of the Author, Notes and Index*, Oxford 1844, was not part of the Library.

14 JANUARY 1841

more scholarlike and dignified to put no notes. For myself, I have never had any desire, or made any effort to *manage* our divines—I do not want to make them better than they are—I do not wish to bring the early Church to their judgment seat—Really I think one can bear to differ from them. The idea of our wishing to stand or fall by Jewell, Hicks, or Waterland! nay or by Jeremy Taylor, or Jackson or Laud themselves.

All such suspicions then on the part of people at a distance, whoever they are, are dreams and theories, from their not knowing the men they have to deal with. *You* know how little Pusey or I have interfered with the plan from the first in any way.

Now all that I have said I was going to write to you some days since—I have written down what I then should have written and you see I agree in great measure with E. Churton.

As however to *his* plan, I agree with you in thinking it capital—but it is a *different* plan—and one might as well apropos of Church building hold a S. P. G. meeting.

I suppose it is impossible to drop our plan altogether—first because subscriptions are paid—next because books are printed and printing—and lastly because the Parker Society will else inundate us with Protestantism pure and undiluted.

Yours very truly John H Newman

P.S. Of course Churton's proposal about Pearson is *most* acceptable.

To publish, *say*, the following:

Andrew[e]s's Works

Laud's Works

Pearson's Works

Bramhall's Works

Montague's Works

Kettlewell's Works

Thorndike's Religious assemblies

Weights and Measures

View of true Reformation

Bull's Harmonia translated

Cave's Primitive Christianity

Overall's Convocation Book

Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice.

Gunning on the Lent Fast

L'Estrange's Alliance Courayer[Courayer]'s Defence

Heylyn (some works of)¹ Marshall's penitential Discipline

Sage's Works

¹ A new edition of Peter Heylyn's *Ecclesia Restaurata; or, the History of the Reformation of the Church of England* appeared in 1849, published by the Ecclesiastical History Society.

14 JANUARY 1841

FROM CHARLES CRAWLEY

Fitzroy Farm 16 Jan'y 1841

My dear Sir

I am much obliged to you for giving me your thoughts so fully about the Anglo Catholic Library. The character of the undertaking has not been changed in any respect that I know of since Mr Evans first saw you on the subject—tho its Title was certainly adopted some time after and how it came to be adopted I can scarcely recollect tho' I am afraid I had some hand in it—probably it had many Fathers and none will be found to own it—anyhow it seems to be an unhappy production, and I cannot help feeling the force of your objection to it—still this objection lies mainly against the *Title* without affecting the intrinsic merit of the undertaking; for as to the works which it proposed to republish, its position is very little if at all changed since its first commencement—and the only question seems to be whether there is not enough still left of such scarce standard works as to make it worth while to continue the machinery we have set at work for their reproduction?—Then, in the progress of time many of the works in which you say we have been forestalled will probably become scarce again either in the whole or in parts, and these may be gradually introduced into our Library, as is now proposed in the case of Bishop Beveridge[']s Works, H Home[']s edition of which is out of print,¹ and Parker is negotiating with the Publisher for the Copyright.

Thus our Library tho' deficient in some of the greatest Authors for the first few years will gradually lose this defect, and in the end perhaps fully justify the Title which it assumes—. Does not this seem to you to be a fair prospective view of the case both as regards the Title and the intrinsic merits of our undertaking?

The objection to the Title however may still hold good for the present, because few perhaps comparatively will stop to take the above view of the case, and to those who do not it will appear absurd—but one must sometimes be content to appear absurd for a time when one sees a fair prospect of justifying one[']s proceedings hereafter—.

I think Copeland forgets when he attributes his discontent to the circumstance you mention; for that was known to him from the beginning when he first undertook the Editorship—: He saw the list of Authors which was nearly the same then as now—he knew that the great names you mention were excluded because the chief part of their works had been republished already—: but the fact is, I believe, that the deeper study of the works in which his Editorial office engaged him made him acquainted with some objectionable features in them which he had overlooked before and which were too much for his sensitive mind to tolerate—and he could not bear the idea of lending a helping hand towards bringing such offensive matter into broader daylight. He told me as much when I last saw him at Oxford, and I could not but respect his scruples and agree with him in opinion as to the character of some passages which he pointed out to me in Bramhall[']s works for instance[.] Yet at the same time I argued that the question was not whether Bramhall[']s works or others were free from defects, but whether in spite of their defects it would be advisable to republish them—This had been already decided in the affirmative, under the persuasion that the good they contained very far outweighed the evil; and therefore that we had nothing now to do but to bring them forth as they were and let them speak for themselves²—.

I have long been wishing for the list of names you now send me—I quite think with you that such a list should be put forth as it will tend very much to satisfy people, and allay suspicions—or at least, as you say, to bring things to an issue—: But such list should be well considered (don[']t you think so?) before it is submitted to the Committee generally, both as to the Authors and the order in which they are set down for Publication—. Will you be so good as to consider this with Copeland and let me know your decision.

I observe you omit Hammond altogether—His Commentary on the New Testament I know is doing at the University Press; but are there not other works of his which it would be well to bring forward? E.g. his Commentary on the Psalms—Catechism and Resolutions³—In the

¹ T. Hartwell Home (ed.), *The Theological Works of William Beveridge, with Memoir . . .*, nine volumes, London 1824. The Library was to include a twelve-volume edition which appeared between 1842 and 1848, the last two volumes being edited by James Bliss.

² Bramhall's *Works* were included in the Library in five volumes, 1842–5, edited by A. W. Haddan.

³ The Library included an edition by N. Pocock of Hammond's *Miscellaneous Theological Works . . .*, three volumes, 1847–50.

15 JANUARY 1841

latter the question of marrying a wife[']s sister would come in well at the present moment, when an attempt is making to legalise such marriages—

Do you think it will be prudent to put Montague[']s works so forward in the list?¹

Mr Norris strongly objects to the publication of Marshall[']s Pen. Dis. [Penitential Discipline] and Gunning[']s Paschall at this early stage of our proceedings²—as tending to give a party character to the undertaking—I suppose therefore these works had better be postponed which will occasion no inconvenience I should think as we have work in progress sufficient for the next five years—viz. Andrew[e]s's Works—Bramhall[']s—Courayer['] Beveridge and Pearson which will make altogether I suppose nearly 30 Volumes—

As to Notes—indeed I am quite disposed to think with you—tho' it is not for me to give an opinion on such a point—I cannot help saying however that the high ground you take in your observations on this subject entirely accords with my sentiments, and I read that part of your letter with peculiar satisfaction—. I think I told you that Churton proposed adding a few Notes and a Memoir to Pearson[']s Works—. To the latter I presume there can be no objection, and one feels loth to relinquish the benefit of Notes from such a man as Churton—but if the rule is made against them it must of course be absolute.

As to the idle dreams and theories of people at a distance to which you allude I think they may safely be left to die away and evaporate of themselves and the less is said and thought about them the sooner they they [sic] will come to this proper conclusion—.

I am glad you like Churton[']s Plan, and I hope he won[']t lose sight of it—. The reasons you give for not dropping ours seem quite conclusive; and the last especially I think imperatively calls upon us to continue it—for tho' Churton holds the Parker Society so cheap, it might do much mischief in the way you apprehend if left to walk over the course without an antagonist.—

I have troubled you at too great a length which I hope you will excuse and believe me

ever most sincerely yours C. Crawley—

The Church has lost a sound and excellent member by the sudden death of Mr Dowling of Gloucester—. And we also lose a valuable member of our Committee.—It is a singular fact that three such eminent men in their way as Whitfield, the present Bishop of Exeter and Mr Dowling should all have been sons of Innkeepers at Gloucester.³

Do you know whether Copeland is coming into this neighbourhood soon? I hope he is for I want to see him. Is it settled that Audland is to take his place as Editor? I fear we shall get into a scrape about Bramhall—so many people have been anxiously waiting for the appearance of this which was to have been our first production. Mr Spranger talked of taking the Editorship of this work off Copeland[']s hands, but I don[']t know whether he has done so,—

Do you think the question of the Title is one to submit to the Committee?⁴

FRIDAY 15 JANUARY 1841 f d wrote to J.

TO MRS JOHN MOZLEY

Oriel Jan. 15 1841.

My dear J

I think it very hard you have not sent me the rest of the *Fairy Bower*.⁵ I can only say that I have waited for it with exemplary patience. As to what I have had,

¹ See second note to letter of 12 Jan. to E. B. Pusey.

² The works appeared in 1844 and 1845 respectively. See Appendix 2 for details of works mentioned below.

³ Though J. G. Dowling's father was an innkeeper, he was an alderman of Gloucester. George Whitefield had been born at the Bell Inn in 1714. Though born at Bridgwater in 1778, Henry Phillpotts's family moved to Gloucester four years later when his father became landlord of the Bell Inn.

⁴ See Crawley's letter of 1 Feb. placed, together with E. Churton's letter of 30 Jan. to him, before letter of 3 March.

⁵ Harriett Mozley's recently completed *The Fairy Bower, or the History of a Month. A Tale for Young People*, London 1841. The novel was being printed by the Mozley family at Derby.

16 JANUARY 1841

I can but repeat what I already have said that I have seen down to a few sheets after p. 128.

Thanks for your letter.

Ever Yrs affly J H N

SATURDAY 16 JANUARY 1841 letter from Wood with account of his Mother's death, Mr Radcliffe, M R G, Pusey, Mr Bohn, Mr Willis. Bloxam returned dined in Common Room with C M and Eden? wrote to M R G, Mr Willis, Radcliffe, Bohn sent to Messrs Roworth Archdeacon Parry's article¹ wrote to Wood (twice) E G F [?] Mr Addison, Mr King, Messrs Roworth

TO MISS M. R. GIBERNE

[Oriell Jan 16/41¹

My dear Miss Giberne,

You do not annoy or trouble me at all with any questions you ask me—nor have ever.

[The writers of the last B. C. are 1. Rogers (the deepest article we have had) 2. Oakeley. 3. JHN. 4. Manning; 5. R. Palmer. 6. HWW. 7. T. M. *but this is quite in confidence.*

Your story is very amusing.² As to the question of the Breviary, I must think a while about it.

I cannot help fearing that a most intimate friend of mine is in a dangerous way—and I want all the prayers I can get. Indeed I number up one, two, three, six intimate friends about whom I am uneasy on the same score, their lungs. What a climate ours is in that respect! We have just buried at Magdalen a young and very dear friend who died at Guernsey under consumption—*requiescas carissime.*³

One of Froude's brothers (not my friend)⁴ is now in a very serious way with it.¹

Yours most sincerely John H Newman

SUNDAY 17 JANUARY 1841⁵ letters from G. Williams⁶ and Pearson breakfasted with C M to

¹ 'The Church in the West Indies', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (April), 249–79, seems to have been at least based on material sent by Parry, though some evidence (e.g. letter of 25 March to Keble) suggests that R. F. Wilson may have been responsible for the final article.

² For the story, see Volume VII, 466–7. See Appendix 1 for details of the articles in *Brit. Crit.*

³ [[This was [Henry] Balston, originally of Oriell. JHN.]] Earlier Newman could be referring to either Henry Wilberforce or Frederic Rogers, both of whose health was causing Newman concern.

⁴ [[viz John Froude]] John Spedding Froude died on 22 Jan. There is no evidence of any cool feelings, and so Newman's phrase most likely means 'not William'.

⁵ Newman's record at the back of his diary of numbers present and the amount of the collections at Early Communion at St Mary's (cf. Volume VI, 52, and Volume VII, 193 and 462) ceases after this day; five persons were present on 10 Jan. and six on 17 Jan., the collections amounting to £1 12s. *od.* and £1 8s. *od.* Newman continued with the practice three or four times a month for the period covered by this volume, but did not usually officiate after moving to Littlemore in late April 1842.

⁶ George Williams wrote from King's College, Cambridge, on 15 Jan. that the Syrian Bishop of Malabar, Mar Athanasius, who was poor himself and was very poorly lodged, was visiting Cambridge, and proposed going on to Oxford. Williams sent some papers relating to the Bishop's visit, asking Newman to read them and send them on to C. J. Abraham at Eton College. Williams added, 'I am sure that distress of any kind would meet with sincere sympathy at Oxford, and I believe you will feel more than common interest in this case; having learned to regard the Office of Bishop more than the ornaments which are usually attached to it among us.'

22 JANUARY 1841

meet F Balston and Coffin did duty morning and afternoon preached Number 574¹ John-son and Lewis to dinner with me—with Marriott, Eden.

MONDAY 18 JANUARY letters from H and Miss Wilmer dined in Common Room with C M and Eden? wrote to Pearson, Pusey, Rivington, H, R Wilberforce, Miss Wilmer, Mr Keats[?] Walter.

TUESDAY 19 JANUARY letters from J.[.] Mr Kerslake and Church with one from Rogers—Crawley and Berkeley and Tarbutt went over with Copeland to dine at Woodperry—where a large party *went over to a large dinner party at Wilson's Woodperry. (At this time I was hard at Number go. and went over to him forgetting to shave.)*

WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY letters from Kent and H. Cornish frost again Mr Williams, Bloxam and Oakeley to dine with me in Common Room. Spranger and Tickell with C.M.—and Eden.

THURSDAY 21 JANUARY letters from Beaven, Mr Knight, Mr Russell, W. Pusey. dined at Trinity wrote to Dukes, Beaven, Bowden, Mr Rodd, Mr Knight, Mr Abrahams[.] G. Williams

FRIDAY 22 JANUARY letters from R Wilberforce, Straker, and Mr Belaney wrote to W Pusey, Russell, Tarbutt

TO A. C. TARBUTT

Oriel College. January 22, 1841

My dear Tarbutt

I am very glad to answer, to the best of my knowledge, any question you choose to ask me. As to the particular one about which you write, I should say this:—‘Grace’ is in Scripture a word confined to Christianity—other dispensations contain a grant or at least a presence of God’s *favor* and *aid*, but the peculiar acceptance and will and power, granted in the gospel, high above all gifts of other covenants, is Grace. Thus St John says ‘The Law was given by Moses, but *grace* and truth came etc’. And St Paul ‘where sin abounded *grace* did much more abound.’²

I think then a state of grace is that state ‘in which we stand by faith’³ by the mercy of God in Christ—and that it was not vouchsafed to the world till Christ came; and that all those words grace, life, righteousness, truth, light, etc. do, not indeed mean the same things, but all coincide in one and the same subject. I mean that there is one *certain* state, and that it, viewed on different sides of it, is in one aspect grace, in another truth, in another salvation etc.—just as you would say that God is One, and in one view of Him eternal, in another Almighty etc. etc. by which you do not mean to say that eternity is the same as omnipotence, but that the two coincide in one and the same subject.

I think then that a person who falls from the state of salvation, falls from the state

Newman’s reply of 21 Jan. is no longer extant, but Williams replied in turn on 23 Jan., ‘I received your kind note this morning while Dr Mill was breakfasting with me. He was anxious that you should be undeceived as to our friend Mar Athanasius who is not a Nestorian, as I fear some error in my statement may have made it appear. The Patriarch of *Babylon* is the head of the Nestorian Church, if I rightly understand Dr Mill. The Church of Malabar is subject to the Patriarchate of *Antioch*; and that Church, it appears, is rather Eutichian [sic] than Nestorian. Indeed they plainly condemn the Nestorian heresy; and Dr Mill informs me, that all the expressions which appear to have a *Monophysite* tendency, in their Offices etc. are yet capable of a good construction.

‘As to the Bishop’s claims on our liberality, I will not presume to dispute your judgement; I will merely venture to suggest that he is a Bishop, and in distress, and reduced to this state by the act of some of our brethren . . .’ Newman sent £5 for Mar Athanasius through Pusey. See note of 18 March 1842.

¹ P.S. VII, 6, ‘The Season of Epiphany’.

² John 1: 17; Rom. 5: 20.

³ Cf. Rom. 5: 2.

22 JANUARY 1841

of grace, that state which ‘the glory of the Lamb enlightens’¹ whether for peace, acceptance, holiness, love etc, etc. But in saying this, it is plain I do not intend to say any thing so extreme as that a person who falls from a state of grace is therefore left without God’s aids and providential leadings. How do men (adults) originally come for baptism? they are not yet justified or in a state of grace—they are heathen—but God whose mercies are over all His works draws them on to a state of grace by assistances which He gives apart from that state—thus whom He *called* them He also *justified*—that is, a state in which a man is helped is prior to that which is the state of grace. When a man falls from grace he relapses into some such state.

If I understand you, the question turns on the *meaning* of the word, ‘grace’—whether it stands for *any* divine help, or the help through the Spirit of Christ. Yet I do not think it is an indifferent question—first because *Scripture* seems to confine ‘grace’ to the Christian covenant—next because grace conveys the *two* ideas of acceptance *and* spiritual aid—whereas the deeds done by unjustified man, even through God’s sacred aid, are not pleasing to God on account of original corruption, which is imparted to them till they come within the Covenant.

Yours very truly John H. Newman.

P.S. As to your case of the Prodigal Son, I quite agree with what you say. He who has once been God’s Son, never can be such as he was before it. His privileges are not *forfeited* (except he commit the sin against the Holy Ghost about which we know nothing) but *suspended*. He falls out of grace, but not into the *same* state as he was in before he came into it. The analogy of friendship will explain what I mean. A person whom we have loved and who turns out ill and broken from us, is not our *friend*, but he is not what he was when a stranger. We have deep feelings about him which towards strangers we have not. We have kinder and yet severer feelings—we are angry yet we love, feel resentment yet affection—or rather resentment *because* we feel affection. The Prodigal left the state of grace when he left his father’s house—The father’s going out after him when a great way off means no more than, what I have said above, that God’s love extends *beyond* the Home of His Saints and the Church of His Elect—He went out to recover, as originally Christ came to ‘seek and save those who were lost’²—to ‘seek’ them in order to bring them into a state of grace to ‘save’ them. So the householder, as we have read this morning, went out to hire labourers and bring them into his Vineyard.³

TO JOHN WILLIAMS (?)

Oriel Jan 22. 1841

My dear Mr Williams

It is very kind of Mrs Williams and you, and I will gladly obey by coming to you, as you propose, at nine o'clock tomorrow morning

Yours very truly John H Newman

¹ Cf. Rev. 21: 23.

² Luke 19: 10.

³ Matt. 20: 1–16.

25 JANUARY 1841

SATURDAY 23 JANUARY 1841 letters from Dowding, Bridges and Pope

SUNDAY 24 JANUARY did duty morning and afternoon preached Number 575¹ dined at Trinity

MONDAY 25 JANUARY Conversion of St Paul letters from G Williams and C M prayers in forenoon read Number 55 Berkeley in Oxford dined with Greenhill to meet Berkeley etc. wrote to J and Lethbridge

TO ROBERT BELANEY

Oriel College Jan 25, 1841

Dear Sir,

Your letter was very considerate and I thank you for it. I had taken up Mr Scholefield's pamphlet at the Bookseller's and looked at some of the pages of it; but did not come across the place which you say contains some bad insinuations, nor have I heard what they are. Certainly I do not feel inclined to answer it.² I have great confidence in the maxim, *Magna est veritas et praevallebit*, where the incipient flame is not blown out at once. The one thing I feared and deprecated years ago, when we began the Tracts for the Times, was utter neglect of us on the part of the Church. I was not afraid of being misrepresented, censured or illtreated—and certainly hitherto it has done no harm. Every attack hitherto has turned to good, or at least is dying a natural death. But *Controversy* does but delay the sure victory of truth by making people angry. When they find out they are wrong of *themselves*, a generous feeling rises in their minds towards the persons and things they have abused and resisted. Much of this reaction has already taken place. Controversy too is a waste of time—one has other things to do. Truth can fight its own battle. It has a reality in it, which shivers to pieces swords of earth. As far as we are not on the side of truth, *we* shall shiver to bits, and I am willing it should be so. The only cause of the prevalence of fallacies for the last 300 years has been the strong arm of the civil power countenancing them. This can hardly continue now. I see too that in the rising generation the most influential and stirring men in Church and State have in them a root of Catholic principles. All this is so hopeful, that (whether any thing is to come of it or not) I do not think it can be made *more* hopeful by controversy. It is very painful certainly to find individual instances in which fallacious arguments have told with effect—but I doubt whether they can well be met for the benefit of such persons, except by those who are acquainted with them and know how best to influence and persuade them.

¹ P.S. VI, 12, 'Faith the Title of Justification'.

² James Scholefield, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, and a Low Churchman, who had once been a curate to Charles Simeon, had recently published *Scriptural Grounds of Union considered in Five Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in November 1830*, Cambridge 1841. Belaney wrote on 20 Jan. that, 'the freedom with which he has indulged himself in censuring Dr Pusey Mr Keble and yourself was to be expected from a person of his vulgar turn of mind and meagre learning . . . I doubt not you will be led to take the course which shall be best for the Church, tho it may not so *appear*. Controversy upon religious matters, I begin to fear, is, in the hands of uninspired men, too much of a carnal instrument to avail greatly if even anything in the long run. It seems too much like proving a woman's chastity in a court of debauchees.'

25 JANUARY 1841

I am sorry to hear what you say of the British Magazine—I have heard nothing of it for a long while¹

Yours very truly John H Newman

TO EDWARD BUDGE

Oriel Jan 25/41

Dear Sir²

I beg to acknowledge your obliging letter. Mr Pearson was engaged for the work in question in March last at my instance. It was entirely my own thought. In writing to Mr Straker, I had no idea at all of hindering your publication; but I thought it civil to the parties concerned to let them know the fact directly I heard of their intention. In forming our Library of the Fathers we did not bind ourselves to translate nothing but what we originally mentioned; indeed it would be hard if promising to do one thing was promising not to do another. If so, those who do nothing at all for an object have the right and liberty to do most. (If we were silent those years ago, so were you—and now we have spoken before you.)³ We should readily have given any information, if application had been made to us

Pray let me assure you, My dear Sir, that your publication will not be viewed at all in an unfriendly light by Dr Pusey, Mr Keble, or myself—Depend upon it there is room enough in the Church for you and us. I beg you will do me the favor of putting down my name for a copy and to believe me

Yours faithfully John H Newman

TUESDAY 26 JANUARY 1841 letters from Dukes, Bowden, H W dined with Copeland to meet Mr Williams [?] and his mother wrote to Mr Budge, Mr Delaney [Belaney], Dowding, the Archdeacon, Mr Kent—to Kerslake, Willis and Rodd, 3 money letters.

WEDNESDAY 27 JANUARY letters breakfasted with Cornish to meet Bramston Bloxam dined with me, Berkeley with Church etc. wrote to H W

THURSDAY 28 JANUARY letters from Dowding, Mr Willis, J.[.] Beaven and W F with an account of J F's death last Friday Pusey returned dined with Spranger wrote to W F[.] Mr Baker[.] Dowding

FRIDAY 29 JANUARY letters from Mrs W F[Froude], T.M.[.] Kerslake, H W, Mr Radcliffe, Mr Kent f d wrote to H W, Manning

¹ Belaney wrote: 'I wrote to Mr Manning, a day or two ago, to let him know there is a great desire on the part of the editor of the British Magazine to give it up to other hands. I think the cause of Christ's kingdom might derive some benefit if a man of sound principles and good talents could be induced to offer his services to Mr Maitland the present Editor, or to the publishers . . . I am very sorry Rivington has ceased to be the publisher. I fear it is a token of its failing to profit trade. . . .' *Brit. Mag.* continued until 1849. J. C. Cros-thwaite took over the editorship.

² Edward Budge had prepared for publication a translation of *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the Statues, or to the People of Antioch*. He was surprised to find that a recent prospectus of the Library of the Fathers advertised a translation by C. B. Pearson as in preparation, earlier ones having made no mention. He felt that his time and labour demanded that he should press ahead with having his own work published, even though he would have preferred it to be part of the Library. In the event, Pearson withdrew in Budge's favour.

I FEBRUARY 1841

SATURDAY 30 JANUARY King Charles Martyr letters from C. M.[.] Lethbridge[.] Mrs H Wilberforce, Bowden, and Rogers service at 8 o'clock fb fd f till 5 HW came Walter came down to Oxford and called (*about letters of Catholicus in the Times*)¹

SUNDAY 31 JANUARY 4th Epiphany letter from Mr Russell Haddan read prayers morning I preached Number 98 (first time in morning) [[there used to be no Sermon in Parish morning service]] last day of candles in morning I read in afternoon and preached for Queen's letter for National Society Number 576 Frost set in again severely. Williams dined with me, H W and A Christie in rooms

MONDAY 1 FEBRUARY Vigil fd walked with H W to Littlemore and read frost and severe weather this week wrote to T M?

TO THOMAS MOZLEY

Febr 1. 1841

My dear Mozley

In *great* haste. I am not *at all* in fault. I was thinking of you the morning your letter came. Copeland has it of his own accord to get subscriptions by, and (alas) he has run off to London with it; so I must answer from memory. I have in a bag £27 for you—and I will add £50 from H. Thornton, and £50 from myself—and on your saying to what banker you will have it paid, I will transfer it. As to the College, I cannot tell any thing about it.²

Ever Yrs affly J H N

H W is here.

TUESDAY 2 FEBRUARY 1841 Purification letters from Mr Crawley and F duty in forenoon read Number 37 Statutes read. Gaudy Frazer read Commemoration Speech wrote to F

WEDNESDAY 3 FEBRUARY letter from Walter. H W unwell Ward, Morris, Lewis, Dalgairns to dine with me in Common Room and H W wrote to Darling and Stubbs

FROM JOHN WALTER III

8. Charing Cross Tuesday—Feb 2. [1841]

My dear Sir,

I write to thank you most sincerely on my own behalf and on my Father's for having so kindly undertaken the subject on which we were speaking the other day. I think the letters should be about a column and a half in length each, and with regard to the number of them, your own judgment will be your best guide.

¹ 'Catholicus appeared in the Times in February 1841. Old Walter [John Walter II] called on me at Oriel, and pressed me several times to write against Peel's Address, before I consented. It was just when the Times took us up, and just as the publication of Number 90 (the *same month*) took us down. It was a false step in the Times—had it waited a month, it would not have made it.' Volume XIV, 52. See letter of 2 Feb. from John Walter III, placed at 3 Feb., and ensuing correspondence. The text of the letters, as they were first published, is given in Appendix 3.

² Subscriptions for the new church which Mozley was building at Cholderton. Newman had been trying to arrange for Oriel to subscribe, Cholderton being an Oriel living, but the Provost had been highly unsympathetic to the scheme from the outset. See Volume VII, 377, note 7.

3 FEBRUARY 1841

My Father will send you down the Pamphlet this evening—and will be glad of the MS. as soon as you can conveniently prepare them.

Believe me sincerely Yr obliged friend J. Walter

FROM JOHN WALTER III

8. Charing Cross Friday. Feb 5. [1841]

My dear Sir,

You will perceive by today[']s Paper, that no time has been lost in publishing your first letter, which is no less admirable as the most fitting introduction to the subject, than as presenting a striking instance of the similar effect produced on very different minds (if indeed they be different) by the false notions about education now so prevalent. I trust you will find it has been correctly printed, and that you will, ere long, favour us with your next.

Believe me my dear Sir Yours most truly J. Walter

TO MRS HENRY WILBERFORCE

Oriel College Febr. 3. 1841

My dear Mrs Wilberforce,

I fear you have thought me neglectful of your kind note, but Henry would not let me acknowledge it on his letter; so I have waited a day or two to tell you how he is. His appearance was an agreeable surprise to me—he seemed so much better than I had fancied he would be—and the change of air certainly seems to have done him good. He has no languor at all about him. At the same time he has caught a little cold by our in and out ways of going on here—the change from rooms to hall from hall to open quadrangle, from thence to hot common room, from Common Room to Chapel, always giving persons cold at first. I have heard too that change of air, while it invigorates, is apt to give cold.

I really do think him very prudent—he has been nursing this morning—and I have no fear of any one who acts as if there was cause of fear.

You will smile at a plan I have been trying to recommend to him—of course he tells me I must send to you and see what you think of it. A number of American Clergymen come here and are most eager that some one should go out to their Church from Oxford. It struck me that Henry was just the man for such a work—and his Father's name would carry such weight. And then I thought that it really might be of good service to his health—and possible now or never, when he is about to take a Curate and has not yet a living.¹ But this is too serious a thing to ask of you, for me to do more than suggest the idea.

Many thanks for your kind notice of my fifth volume, and with best love to John, and kindest thoughts of the other children, I am

My dear Mrs Wilberforce, Most sincerely Yours

John H Newman

¹ Henry Wilberforce's church at Bransgore was a Perpetual Curacy of the parish of Christ-Church, Hants, with a net annual value of £73.00. Ambrose St John was about to become his curate. Later in the year, he took the living of Walmer, Kent, which, though also only a Perpetual Curacy, carried just over double the income.

4 FEBRUARY 1841

THURSDAY 4 FEBRUARY 1841 letters from Bowden, Berkeley, Mr Stewart H W unwell W. Pusey, Goldney, Ryder, Church and H W to dine with me in Common Room wrote to Stewart Bookseller

FRIDAY 5 FEBRUARY letter from Mrs Smalley f d J M came back wrote to Mrs Smalley

SATURDAY 6 FEBRUARY letters from Walter, M R G[,] Miss Holmes and Mr Darling Cornish and Williams to dine with H W and me in Church's rooms

TO J. R. BLOXAM¹

Febr. 6 1841

My dear B

N B.

1. About the B.C. perhaps it might be as well to state that the Editor is going to change, though not the principles.²
2. As to the instance of the Armenians at Venice, *they* act with *leave* of the Bishop of the place, and are in communion with him; but the R Cs in England are not acting with permission from our Bishops.³ However, I never have called the R Cs schismatical in England.
3. Mr P. does not notice the difficulty of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

¹ Bloxam had received the first long letter on reunion of what was to be a very lengthy correspondence on the subject with A. L. Phillippis, into which Newman was to be drawn. Bloxam later recalled the circumstances of his first meeting with Phillippis: 'In the autumn of 1840 I was visiting my Brother, the Revd Andrew Bloxam, at Twycross in Leicestershire. I had previously expressed a wish to see St Bernard's Monastery, and had procured a Letter of Introduction (I think from Dr Rock) to Mr Ambrose Phillippis, the founder of the Monastery. Accordingly one day my brother and I started in his pony carriage to see the Monastery. As we passed out of the lane into the main road, Mr Phillippis himself passed us in his carriage, and I took the opportunity of handing the Letter of introduction to him. This was at the foot of a hill, so he got down from his carriage and we walked up the Hill together. In the course of a short conversation he learned that I had lately been Curate to Mr Newman. We parted and nothing more occurred between us till I received his first Letter, dated the Feast of the Conversion of St Paul. A.D. 1841.' R. D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam: An Oxford Friendship*, Oxford 1947, p. 101. All Newman's comments which follow refer to points raised by Phillippis in his letter.

² Phillippis wrote: 'I have been greatly edified and delighted with several articles in the last two numbers of the *British Critick* [sic]: the author of that on Antichrist deserves the thanks of the whole Church of God: it has been read by several learned Continental Theologians to whom I communicated it, and it is pronounced by them to be worthy of Bossuet. Nor do they at all object . . . to the very just castigation it bestows upon the English and Irish Roman Catholic body.'

³ 'It is no new thing for Catholics of *various rites* to dwell together in the same country, each being governed even by *Bishops in ordinary*. Thus at Venice the Armenian Catholics follow the rite of the Armenian Catholic Church and have a Bishop of their own to govern them, whose jurisdiction extends solely to those of their communion, who sojourn there, while it is perfectly independent of that of the Venetian Patriarch—and yet the Venetian Catholics live as Brothers with the Armenian Catholics, and both the one and the other recognize the primacy of the holy Apostolic See. I myself when at Venice frequently assisted at Mass in the Armenian Convent of St Lazarus and received the Holy Eucharist on several occasions from the hands of the Abbot, having previously received absolution according to the Armenian rite. If under the terrible circumstances of the times during the despotism, which for three centuries the state has here in England exercised over the English Church a vast number of the most antient and noble families of this Kingdom and their dependents have thought it right and the safer course to unite themselves to a foreign rite and to associate themselves to the Mother Church of Xtendom and to the immediate pastoral jurisdiction of Peter, we have only done that, which has done heretofore by others, without any condemnation on the part of the Church Catholic, and the Roman Church in taking us under Her immediate jurisdiction has only done that in our regard, which has not been refused for other Churches of far inferior rank to Her . . .'

Whether it be a large or a small difficulty is not the question, but whether I can subscribe that to be true for which I see no reason.¹

4. As to the approaching ruin of the English Church He who has preserved it so long in spite of isolation, will we trust preserve it still.² But if not, yet we must let it break in pieces rather than act with[out] the full testimony of our conscience.³

Febr. 23. Shrove Tuesday I think you should notice the above points among other things you say in your answer. I inclose a letter which you can send (if you choose to take the trouble to copy it) 'from an anonymous friend' to whom you have shown Mr P.'s letter.⁴ Of course you must say that it is *not from authority* and that though you may generally agree with it, you are *not answerable* for the contents. Let me have it back

Ever Yrs affly J H N

SUNDAY 7 FEBRUARY 1841 Septuagesima went up to Littlemore with H W and Church and took morning duty administering the Sacrament in afternoon read and preached Number 101 visited Quarterman, Miss Clark and Burrows. Haddan and Daman took mine—Williams the Sacrament and Daman preaching. J M to dine with H W and me in my rooms

MONDAY 8 FEBRUARY letters from T.M and Mr Jackson walked to Littlemore and read—visited Burrows and Quarterman dined with J. Mozley? with H W—where Sibthorp wrote to Stibbs and Stewart with money orders[,] to Walter, and Russell with money order.

TUESDAY 9 FEBRUARY Coffin and F. Balston to breakfast—R. Ryder with H W dined in hall? W W came.

WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY letter from Manning W W went walked to Littlemore—visited Quarterman back with Williams and Scott.

THURSDAY 11 FEBRUARY letters from H.[.] Walter, J[?] and Marriott the thaw. dined with Bloxam sent money letter to Darling wrote to Mrs C F. [Fourdrinier] and Walter

¹ Phillipps just wrote: 'On the Sacraments, barring the usurpations over the Church by State despotism in order to favour the Genevan Divines and their party for secular reasons, there is no difference that I could ever learn between the real Anglicans and ourselves.'

² With regard to his proposals, Phillipps thought that, 'no measure less than this can possibly save the Church of England much longer from total annihilation. Christ, who promised indefectibility to the Church Catholick, has made no such promise to the constituent parts of that Church taken singly and separately. So long as each part adheres to the Universal body, it partakes in common with the rest of the promises and privileges made for all, that is for *the great whole*.'

³ The practical measures which Phillipps suggested could be taken towards effecting reunion included: The Anglican Church laying aside 'your modern common Prayer, we our Roman rite, and let the antient rites of Sarum and of York resume their place.'

The Holy See giving, 'every *facility* for the restoration of Catholick Unity in England. Thus the present Bishops and Priests might retain their wives, and even certain relaxations of the antient Canons might be permitted in future for the Anglican Clergy, if they desired it before God.'

The Holy See possibly sanctioning, 'the suppression of the direct invocation of saints in the publick Liturgy . . . The Anglican Church having solemnly professed her union with the rest of the Church Catholick might regulate for herself the use of pictures and images.'

'My earnest hope and prayer is that *negociations* for this *reunion*, or rather for the solemn declaration of a union . . . should commence as soon as possible . . .'

⁴ See letter of 23 Feb. to Bloxam for the fuller reply to Phillipps which Newman drew up. The whole correspondence, including many letters from others, can be followed in *Purcell* I, 195–303.

11 FEBRUARY 1841

TO J. R. HOPE

Oriel. Febr. 11. 1841

My dear Hope,

I fear I am going to do nothing better than inflict commissions upon you—but there is the chance of this being too late for Rogers; so I write to you. But I heartily wish R. may be with you still—and I had intended to have written some time since, to urge him very earnestly to stay out. *We do not want him here at Easter at all.* Church, I believe, wrote to him to that effect. I wish to say the same as strongly as ever I can.

But now, as to the commissions. As far as mine goes, do it or not as you please, it does not matter. My only difficulty is, *how* I am to get money to you. But first as to Pusey's.¹ He says 'My want at Rome is the transcript of a fragment of Tertullian de Execrandis gentium diis from the Cod. Vat. 3852. It has been published, but is not in any English Library, nor to be had. The person whom M. Abiken employs will know about it, for he sent me word of it. Kindest thoughts of Hope and Rogers.'

My own commission is, if it falls in your way conveniently to order me £50 worth of divinity.² <£50 as it stands me in [sic] *in Italy.*> I should not like to have *much* to do in addition in the way of binding. I subjoin overleaf a specimen of the books I should like.

There is no news here of any consequence; except tell Rogers that our Provost's Lady has been safely delivered of a boy.³ The frost too, which has lasted strangely, has this day been delivered of a fine thaw.

Pusey, I am glad to say, is very fairly well—and so are his children.

Ever Yrs very sincerely John H Newman⁴

P.S. Church wants Rogers to bring him a number of Overbeck's etchings.⁵ Tell him that H. Wilberforce has been here for a fortnight and returns tomorrow.

¹ Hope reported on 6 March: 'Pray tell Dr Pusey that Anderdon (of University) will, in a week or so, take with him to England Dr Heyse's collation of the "Apologeticus". . . If I cannot get a printed copy of Cod. Vat. 3852, Heyse is to copy it; and I hope shortly to be able to arrange some general plan with him for collation in other parts of Italy. Pray tell Dr P. particularly that I have been at Monte Cas[s]ino, but nothing of Tertullian is there. Their best manuscript is of Origen.' See letter of 22 Feb. to Pusey for Rogers's account.

² The degree of success which Hope achieved in executing Newman's commissions can be seen in the letters to and from him between October and December.

³ Caesar Richard Hawkins, who was later to join the Bengal Civil Service.

⁴ Hope wrote: 'During the last week of the Carnival . . . I went into the mountains to see what I could of the monasteries and Clergy in general. I was tolerably successful, and the impression left by what I saw was decidedly favourable. The Benedictines I found are much what our Fellows of Colleges are, in the main—less general information—much more simplicity of life and manner, with far better notions of discipline—of the Carthusians I do not think much. The Trappists are very striking people—both in regard to the severity of their lives, and the sincere but cheerful spirit which seems to prevail among them—The secular clergy whom I saw and heard of, were far better than I was led to anticipate by accounts which I had received of them in Rome—I was obliged to be controversial more than once—but met with no great learning, and with no new arguments—The shrewdest encounter was with the old Trappist porter who came up to my room at night with Liguori's book upon the B. V. M. and exacted a promise from me that if I ever should become a R. C. I would write to tell him of my conversion—I hardly ever met with a more earnest affectionate creature. My whole journey afforded a pleasing contrast to what I had seen and heard in Rome.'

⁵ See Volume VII, 252.

11 FEBRUARY 1841

Books.

- (1) Bollandi Acta Sanctorum, 42 volumes Venice or Antwerp<?>
- (2) Muratori. Rerum Italicarum Scriptores.
- (3) S. Isidori Hispalensis Opera.
- (4) Bonaventuræ Opera. Ven. 1751–6 13 volumes
- (5) Salmeron Opera 1612 16 volumes
- (6) Nili Opera
- (7) Tostati Opera 27 vol. fol. Venet. 1728
- (8) Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum 1656
- (9) Zaccariae Bibliotheca Ritualis 3 vol 4to Romæ 1776
- (10) Ceillier. Auteurs Ecclesiastiques. Paris 1729–82. 4 to 24 vols
- (11) Justiniani Comm. in Epistolas N.T. 3 vol. fol.
- (12) Stapletoni Opera
- (13) Fabricii Bibliotheca Graeca 12 vol. 1796–1839.
- (14) S. Brunonis Opera.
- (15) Biographie Universelle 52 vol. 8vo Paris 1811–28
- (16) Vasquez in Summam S. Thomæ.
- (17) Suarez Opera—Venice.
- (18) Waddingi Annales Minorum 19 vol. fol. Romæ 1731–45
- (19) Asseman Codex Liturgicus 13 vol quarto

I set these down as specimens. As far as possible, I should like the best editions, and have specified certain editions above, merely as guides.

FROM JOHN WALTER III

8. Charing Cross Wednesday. [10 Feb. 1840]

My dear Sir,

I am sorry your note has not arrived in time to admit of the wrong expressions you mention being corrected, but they shall be mentioned as 'Errata' in tomorrow's paper.

Nothing can possibly be more convincing and satisfactory than the letters themselves, and I know they have made a great impression on many of the literati, but unfortunately we are so situated with reference to the political world, that [it] is thought dangerous to raise a question about the principles of the leader whose party we are supporting, even on the most independent subject, and people cannot be persuaded that the condemnation of certain principles when adopted by such a person does not imply an attack on his character, and a desertion of his cause. I am thus explicit with you my dear Sir, because I wish you fully to understand, that all here whose opinions I am bound to respect are perfectly satisfied themselves with the opinions you have expressed on Sir R. P's conduct, but yet think it would hardly be *discreet* to pursue the subject at present, when a change in the Government is contemplated as likely, and Conservatives however much they may disapprove of Sir R. P. for this and many reasons, have yet no one else to look to as a leader. If however you should have finished a fourth letter, we shall doubtless be able to make use of it, if you please, in some other way.

The three other papers shall be forwarded to you, but I am not aware of any thing worth sending from any other.

Believe me my dear Sir Yours most truly J. Walter

P.S. I hear the Chronicle has been attacking your letter.¹ It shall be sent with the rest.

¹ See letter of 22 Feb. to H. Wilberforce and third note.

11 FEBRUARY 1841

TO JOHN WALTER III

Febr 11/41

My dear W

I had your kind note this morning and thank you for it. I quite acquiesce in it and enter into your reasons, and am content with such opportunity as I have had of putting out views which I think important through so influential a medium—though of course I should not have begun unless I had expected to finish. Do what you will with Number 4¹—perhaps you had better burn it

Yrs very truly J H N

FROM JOHN WALTER III

8. Charing Cross Feb 12. [1841]

My dear Sir,

You will perceive that your fourth letter has been inserted in today's paper, and also that some remarks have been made on the former ones in the leading Article, which it is hoped will have the effect of satisfying people's minds that they were not intended to serve political purposes, nor to create any personal animosity towards the subject of them.

I should be sorry indeed, that any difficulties on our part should prevent you from completing the task you have so kindly undertaken, or defeat the good ends that we all anticipate from it; but the materials we have to deal with are so various that it is difficult, as you may suppose, to please all. I am very glad however to find that persons who were alarmed, on the grounds I mentioned, at the two first letters, are now becoming wiser, and we therefore hope that if you can sum up in one or perhaps two letters more what you have to say you will let us have them, and they shall appear immediately. We then propose with your leave, to publish the whole series in a pamphlet, and if you will state any thing you may have omitted, or may wish to add, in the form of a preface, it shall be published in the Paper likewise. I hope to be in Oxford next Wednesday and to have the opportunity of explaining personally what cannot be so well stated in a letter.

Believe me my dear Sir Yours most truly J. Walter

FRIDAY 12 FEBRUARY 1841 HW went. fd wrote to H.[.] J.[.] Bowden, Walter, Miss Holmes[.] Mr Jackson[.] Sherlock[.] Dyce[.] Mrs Kilvert[?] Hope

TO J. W. BOWDEN

¹[[Oriell]] Febr 12. 1841¹

My dear Bowden

I have not been unmindful of you and yours, though, owing to most urgent work, I have not written. Lewis gives me a good account of you—which is the more acceptable, because last Summer the scarlet fever was very violent in the Isle of Wight. I suppose the season makes a difference—and rejoice to find, through God's mercy, that you have got through it.

¹ See the letter from Walter printed below. A further three letters beyond this were to be published on 20, 22 and 26 Feb. See Appendix 3.

‘Should not the Record take to the Archbishop for baptizing in water brought from Jordan?’¹ What would be said if Pusey had done so, asks Williams?

As to Rome, I never heard any one who did not speak against what it was possible to *get at* of its state. I suppose it is what Oxford was some 60 or 70 years ago. Rogers was pleased with the Ecclesiastics of Milan.²

In the letters I send there are allusions to a plan of Mr Bowyer’s which must not be mentioned, but which I believe has come to nothing.³

H. Willberforce has been here for a fortnight making acquaintance with <Young> New Oxford.¹

I am sorry to say I have forgotten about last Febr. 2. being *the* grand Feast.⁴

Rogers spit blood. I have written to him to stay longer.

Ever Yrs affly John H Newman.

P.S. Johnson is away, I have seen very little of him lately through my fault. I was much concerned indeed to hear your Aunt was so indisposed.

‘I think an Anti-papal feeling *is* rising among the English R C’s I have lately seen a deeply interesting letter from Mr Philips [sic] of Leicestershire (though chimerical) who has also written to the *Tablet*.⁵ Pugin too is very strong on our side. The *British Critic* is said to have done good service, particularly the article on Antichrist.¹⁶

¹ Two days earlier, Queen Victoria’s first child had been christened Victoria Adelaide Mary Louisa in the Chapel Royal, St James’s. ‘The water in the font, and wherewith the royal child was christened, came from the River Jordan, having been sent to Her Majesty as a present for this especial purpose.’ *The Times*, No. 17591, 11 Feb., p. 5.

² See Rogers’s letter of 9 Dec. 1840 placed before that of 10 Jan. to Rogers.

³ See Volume VII, 226, n. 3, and 236, n. 4. Bowden had asked: ‘What are Mr Bowyer’s letters?—a printed work? or MS.? I should much like to look at them, when you have an opportunity of letting me do so.’

⁴ The allusion is unclear but it could be to the anniversary of the day in 1819 when Newman and Bowden completed their undergraduate poem, *St Bartholomew’s Eve*. See Volume I, 61; *A.W.*, pp. 40–2.

⁵ Bowden wrote: ‘As to the good you anticipate from a “collision”—I dare say you would convince me of your point if we had the opportunity of talking it over—but your notion goes against my present theories which are that, if things go on smoothly, a response or counterpart to the Oxford movement of the last few years will show itself within the Roman communion—an Anti-Tridentine feeling there meeting the Anti-Protestant feeling here.—My policy therefore would be to disseminate as widely as one could, by means of travelling friends, etc. the knowledge of what has been doing, and let it work;—urging on, of course, the progress of catholicity at home, and endeavouring to illustrate it, as far as possible, in the foreign portions of our Church; but avoiding with care all collisions which might add any unnecessary bitterness to the difference between us and our brethren, or otherwise confuse the main question at issue.’

On the position A. L. Philipps held regarding the Oxford Movement and the Roman Catholic Church, see letter of 6 Feb. and subsequent correspondence. The letter mentioned here appeared in the *Tablet*, 6 Feb., 83–4, and, ‘was greeted, to use Philipps’s own phrase, with “an explosion of vulgarity and bitterness of ignorance and shallow reasoning”. The *Tablet*, however, went some way towards making amends for its attack by publishing a long letter of protest from Philipps. The editorial pen, however, was unwilling to withdraw the offensive term “Puseyites” and “a new sect” as descriptive of the Tractarians . . .’, R. D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam: An Oxford Friendship*, Oxford 1947, pp. 113–14.

⁶ Newman’s ‘Todd’s Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist’, *Brit. Crit.*, 28, 1840 (Oct.), 391–440; *Ess.* II, 112–85. In his letter of 25 Jan. to Bloxam, Philipps expressed his great delight ‘with several articles in the last two numbers’ of *Brit. Crit.*

12 FEBRUARY 1841

TO MISS HOLMES

Oriel College Febr 12. 1841

Dear Madam,

So far from being concerned with the Parker Society,¹ I have given my name to a project *against which* the Parker Society has been set up.

I think you will be much disappointed by that Society—or in other words that the subscription will be thrown away. You will have on your shelves a number of dry technical controversial works into which you will never look.

The scheme, which I as well as some others have advocated, is called ‘the Anglo catholic Library;’—but I very much doubt whether it will be advisable for you to give your name to it. To call it an Angl. Libr. is a misnomer, inasmuch as, a great many of our chief divines having been already published by the Universities etc, it will only contain a portion of our divines. Even that portion will take many years in publishing by which time they think the others will be out of print. As to the Parker Society, I do not know enough to talk confidently—but I should not wonder if its publications lasted the lives of its subscribers.

But, any how, I would not advise you to engage in periodical *subscriptions*, as a general rule. As to our Anglo Catholic Library some books, as Andrew[e]s’ Sermons and Bull’s *Harmonia* (translated) would be very useful to you²—but you would find not much to repay in some others. I do not recollect what the advantages are offered to subscribers, but think it would answer your purpose better to buy such as you wish separately

I am, Dear Madam, Yours faithfully John H Newman

TO MRS T. MOZLEY

Oriel Febr. 12/41

My dear H,

Of course your news shocked me a good deal—Let me know from time to time how my Aunt and Cousins are.³ How are they left?

Some time since T. Keble send me a huge lot of scraps, some of which may be turned into something for *your* purpose, which you ask me about. Let Tom see them too, in case he thinks they would turn into a B.C. Article. Any how they must

¹ See third note to letter of 10 Jan. to F. Rogers. On the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, see letter of 14 Jan. to C. Crawley.

² See fourth note to letter of 10 Jan. to F. Rogers. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology included a translation of George Bull’s *Harmonia Apostolica: or, Two Dissertations . . .*, Oxford 1842. The editor remained anonymous, but explained in the Advertisement that the translation was based on an incomplete one of Thomas Wilkinson of 1801.

³ Newman’s Uncle Charles Fourdrinier, his mother’s second eldest brother, had died on 7 Feb. There had been eight children from his marriage. Three had died at birth or in infancy, three had married, and two of the younger daughters, Anna Maria and Eliza, had remained at home.

12 FEBRUARY 1841

come back to me. And make up your mind pretty soon—else I will try to use them in some other way. The Records you spoke of have been destroyed long and long ago.¹

I have paid in to T's account at Salisbury £127.2 and wish it was more—Did I tell him the sum?²

Henry Thornton	50.
J H N	50
Church	10
I. Williams	10
Rogers	5
C.L. Cornish	2.2
	<hr/>
	127.2
	<hr/>

Ever Yrs affly J H N

TO MRS JOHN MOZLEY

Oriel Febr 12/41

My dear Jemima

Thank you for your note though it contained very sad news indeed. I hope they are left tolerably off—let me know.

Henry Wilberforce has been here for a fortnight, going this morning. He had a very serious cold before he came, and on getting better had been sent here for change of air. He fell upon the second winter, and was confined to his bed for a day or two. However, on the whole he has passed a pleasant time, and got some fresh ideas.

The Fairy Bower³ is making a sensation here—I have given away my editorial copy—but no matter.

I am buying a lot of books, for it is a good investment. If I sold them next year, I should gain rather than lose.⁴ Meanwhile if I wait, the chance is, they will get so dear than [that] I shall never be able to buy them. In a little time I shall be sore put to it for room.

You will be pleased to see on the other side a transcript of an anonymous letter I have had[,] signed Paterfamilias

Ever Yrs affly J H N

You do not say how Aunt is.

¹ *Records of the Church*, I–XXV, which were edited translations from the Fathers, published as a series uniformly with the *Tracts for the Times* in 1834–5.

² For the rebuilding of Cholderton Church.

³ See letter of 15 Jan. and note.

⁴ See Volume VII, 231, n. 4. Newman's account books show that he spent £858 on books during the course of this year.

13 FEBRUARY 1841

‘Sir

I have very lately met with an excellent little book of which you are the publisher—and as it is put forth without the author’s name, I take the liberty etc etc. The book to which I allude is “Little Mary.”¹ I have already said it is an excellent book, and I deem it to be so because it inculcates right principles in a right manner. The characters are well drawn, the conversations natural, the incidents interesting, and the style plain and simple. I have *read* it (with some few omissions) to a child of my own; who is about five years and a half old, and I can speak therefore from experience of its great simplicity and intelligibility, and of the great interest it can excite, etc.’ It is signed Paterfamilias, and goes on to criticize (and I think justly) some parts.

SATURDAY 13 FEBRUARY 1841 letters from Walter and M A F² dined in hall? wrote to Acland

SUNDAY 14 FEBRUARY Sexagesima letter from Lord J. Manners I read prayers and Had-dan preached in morning I read prayers and preached in evening Number 577 dined in rooms? wrote to Pope, Berkeley, Hook and Mrs Combe

MONDAY 15 FEBRUARY dined in hall wrote to Lord J Manners

FROM LORD JOHN MANNERS

Albany. London. Feb. 13th 1841.

My dear Sir,

It is not without considerable hesitation that I venture, on so slight an acquaintance as ours is, to intrude upon your attention, but as Faber has left Oxford, there is no one to whom I can apply save yourself; neither am I at all sanguine that my application will meet with your approbation.

The facts of the case are these.

Mr Follett, the proprietor of the Courier Newspaper, being tired of a losing concern, has determined to part with it, and has received an offer for the purchase of it, from the Radicals; but a liberal friend of mine, conceiving that no little good might result from such an undertaking, has offered Mr Follett £200 per annum for the management of the paper on what Mr Gladstone would call ‘Church Principles’; but, in order to set it going, Mr Follett demands that we should shew him a list of 350 or 400 pledged subscribers for at least 1 year to the paper, otherwise he will close with the Radicals; now, for reasons which you will easily perceive, it would be useless for us to attempt to procure those subscribers among what are called ‘Conservatives’—Oxford and Cambridge must furnish them, if they are to be furnished at all, and this necessity obliges me to apply to you. I need not tell you that when I talk of a paper being conducted on ‘Church Principles’ I am far from intending to bring things holy into the columns of a paper, but simply that on all public measures affecting the Church, the Universities, or the character of the country—a right, Christian, Church course should be pointed out to our Statesmen, and that in every case the supremacy of Right over Expediency should be inculcated. Should you be willing to further these views, am I asking too much in requesting you to procure what subscribers you may to the paper, and to send me a list of their names, and of the names, if possible, of their *newsmen*, in 10 day’s time? Should you however object to the scheme, and I am aware there must be many objections against it, I can only assure you that your opinion will have great weight with us—

I remain, my dear Sir, Very faithfully Your’s John Manners.

¹ M. R. Giberne’s story for children which had been published at Oxford by J. H. Parker towards the end of the previous year.

² Probably Newman’s Aunt Mary Fourdrinier (née Jenkin), widow of his Uncle Charles.

15 FEBRUARY 1841

TO LORD JOHN MANNERS

[15 February 1841]

My dear Lord,

The only difficulty I find in the proposal¹ with an account of which you have favored me is that of finding an editor who will satisfy the view which your letter so truly takes of his duties—I suppose it would be worse than useless to have set a paper going in which either sacred subjects were introduced or right objects advocated in violent or abusive language or by unfair weapons. A paper is a political instrument, and so should continue; all one wants is that it should profess to advocate right politics in a right way.

I will do what I can to get names <subscribers> and you shall hear from me as soon as I am able to say with what success,² though I fear I must say I am not sanguine of doing much, as very few persons care to take in a daily paper. And it is some expence. The more obvious way is to try to get a few to give large sums.

After all, though it is certainly a point to secure a paper to the Church, yet I do not think it is at the present moment an object of first importance. Editors, who profess the Conservative side, will find in time as others, that Church principles are the only ones which have reality and life in them; and the general growth of this conviction, nay a sincere sympathy with those principles themselves, will gradually show itself in the Newspapers as elsewhere. Perhaps it is better to avoid making a *great* effort to press them forward instead of leaving them to develop naturally. However, of course, it is worth a moderate effort.

I hope I am not presuming on the future which certainly it is not very safe to anticipate

Yours very faithfully J H N.

FROM LORD JOHN MANNERS

London. Febr 22nd 1841. A S.

My dear Sir,

I have to announce to you that owing to the impossibility of securing to Mr Follett the annual sum he desired, we have put an end to the Courier negotiation altogether, and I confess that on considering what you say as to the tone which in all human probability—Tory newspapers and Politicians will be almost forced to adopt e'er long—I regret this the less; besides there were many subordinate difficulties which began to suggest themselves, as the affair seemed to approach its culminating point. With many thanks for your prompt and kind assistance.

I remain, my dear Sir, Very faithfully Your's John Manners—

TUESDAY 16 FEBRUARY 1841 letters from C.[.] Bishop of Nova Scotia, Mr Griffith and anonymous M with £5, dined in hall Williams and Mr Eccleston with me (? or tomorrow?) wrote to Hook, R W and H W

¹ Some account of this in the context of Manners's life and career is given in Charles Whibley, *Lord John Manners and his Friends*, London 1925, I, 110–11.

² Newman was true to his word and among those he secured as prospective subscribers, who in turn sought to recruit others, were Keble, W. F. Hook, Charles Miller, W. B. Heathcote, R. I. Wilberforce, E. Churton, Charles Marriott, and George Chandler.

16 FEBRUARY 1841

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

Oriel Febr 16/41

My dear H

When you have enjoyed the inclosed send it on to Tom Mozley begging him to return it to *me*

Ever Yrs J H N.

WEDNESDAY 17 FEBRUARY 1841 letters from H.[.] Dodsworth, Acland, R Wilberforce, Bowden, Straker Southouse, J. M.[.] Mant and Ryder to breakfast with me in Common Room dined in hall wrote to Keble[.] H W[.] Dodsworth

THURSDAY 18 FEBRUARY Ward [of] Queen's, D. Chase, Scott [of] Trin[ity] and Wood [of] Ch Ch to breakfast in my rooms. walked to Littlemore with Church and Ward—dined with Lewis visited Miss Hurst wrote to Walter

FRIDAY 19 FEBRUARY letters from Mrs Field[.] Rogers and C M. f d walked with Pusey and Williams wrote to Acland[.] Mrs Field and Messrs Walton

SATURDAY 20 FEBRUARY letters from Berkeley, Rivington's Bill, Hook, Keble, and H W dined in hall wrote to Rivington, Strong [of] Bristol.

FROM W. F. HOOK

Vicarage Leeds 17 Feby 1841

My dear Newman

I would gladly be of assistance to Mrs Smalley whose Husband was at a private school with me before I went to Winchester, if I could. But I know no one who has any interest at Christ's Hospital except Sir Matthew Wood and he, of course, is *bound* to bestow his Patronage on those who support him in politics and in his Election.

It is curious that Wilberforce's Book¹ occurred to my mind. It is I think rather deficient than objectionable. And I have no doubt its re-publication would be advantageous. If ever I am in a humour I will send Mr Parker a Preface for Law.²

It is curious that a few months ago, I indirectly made an offer to the *Courier* i e I requested a young Clergyman to write and ascertain whether the Editor would permit Ecclesiastical matters to be managed by a Clergyman whose Principles would accord with those of the Oxford Tracts. The Editor politely declined. You may at once put down my name for 3 copies—i. e. one for myself and two for two other Persons whose names I will hereafter send. I will beat up, meantime, for subscribers.

I am sorry that my having gone for two days to breathe a little fresh Country air prevented my receiving your Letter till today.

Yours affectionately W F Hook

What a beautiful Tract is the one just published.³ I presume it is Isaac Williams's

The Bishop of New Jersey (Dr Doane) has promised to come over for the express purpose of preaching my Consecration Sermon.⁴ 'This' says he 'is a Catholic occasion and I accept your

¹ Presumably, William Wilberforce's *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians, in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country, contrasted with Real Christianity*, which was first published in 1797 and went through countless editions. For the impression the work made on Newman when he first read it in 1822, see *A.W.*, p. 181.

² See Volume VII, 199.

³ Keble's *Tract* 89, 'On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church' (First Part).

⁴ The Consecration of Hook's new Church at Leeds took place on 2 Sept. (see third note to letter of 17 Oct. to M. R. Giberne). G. W. Doane did attend and preach.

21 FEBRUARY 1841

Invitation.¹ I enclose a Copy from a portion of his Letter which I wish you would forward to Mr Keble. How I do wish that you and Pusey and Keble would come to my Consecration and preach either on that day or the Sunday. In primitive times there were a succession of short sermons on such occasions. I intend to follow the example. We can have only one at a time but we can have many sermons

SUNDAY 21 FEBRUARY 1841 Quinquagesima letters from R W and C. Miller Haddan read in morning I read in afternoon and preached Number 578¹ dined with Bloxam, where J M and Pugin—Ryder and Ward in evening

MONDAY 22 FEBRUARY letters from Kilvert, J. [.] A. [.] and E. Churton. Forbes [of] B N C, Portal, W Wilberforce and Abbott to breakfast wrote to Lord J Manners, Keble, Hook, C M and Berkeley, R W and H W

FROM JOHN KEBLE (I)

Hursley Feb. 19. 1841.

[[this was on sight of the *Proof* of No 90]]

My dear N.

These are all the notes which occur to me, except one or two errata which I have marked in the sheets.² I am much obliged to you for the Tract [[Tract 90]], and should think it very likely to answer its purpose with such as can be content to take what is given when they cannot have the best.

I was much concerned to hear of Rogers and shall be glad to have a line from some one when you hear again. I trust he is in the right climate. How *very* good that paper of his in the last B.C. is.³

Rivingtons have sent me a bill of very near £100 for the printing of that Tract. Are the others generally as costly? It seems to me a great deal, considering the cheapness of the paper and comparing it to other Printers' charges. Not but that I can pay it very well, having just got a pocket full of money for the reprint of the Hooker⁴—but I wished you to know the amount.

Ever yours affectionately JK.

Has Pusey put me down for this day fortnight or 3 weeks?—because I must try and fix with the V.C. accordingly.⁵

p. 16. line 5. 'Of Jews or of Heathens *beginning to consider*'. (?) vel tale aliquid.

[p.] 62. Is it worth while to quote the part from Burnet about the right of *retaining*[?] what had been given for masses?

FROM JOHN KEBLE (II)

[19 Feb. 1841]

My dear N.

After I had sealed and sent my other note, Charlotte put me in mind of Lord J. M.⁶ [John Manners] whom I had clean forgotten—I will certainly mention the matter to Heathcote—but I know he is out of pocket just at the present—and I dare say he would rather subscribe and get rid of the Standard than give a large sum. I would do it for a year, for I think this experiment worth making, though I am not sanguine on the result: I mean on the possibility of keeping up the tone of the

¹ *P.S.* VI, 13, 'Judaism of the Present Day'.

² Newman seems to have followed Keble's suggestions. See relevant pages of *Tract* 90, first and second editions.

³ 'Utilitarian Moral Philosophy', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (Jan.), 1–44.

⁴ *The Works of . . . Mr. Richard Hooker . . .*, arranged by the Revd John Keble, M.A., second edition, three volumes, Oxford 1841.

⁵ See first note to letter of 22 Feb. to Pusey.

⁶ See letter of 15 Feb. to Lord J. Manners and second note.

22 FEBRUARY 1841

thing—for as to getting subscribers I should not much fear. I remember once that Pusey seemed to think that *my* friend Bosanquet would perhaps be useful in such a concern.

Ever yours affly J K.

TO JOHN KEBLE

Oriel [Febr 22/41]

My dear Keble

‘I agree with you quite, I think, about the Courier—it is just worth the trial. Since you say names can be got, will you please try and send me some?’¹

Hook begs me to send you the inclosure.

Rivington has made a *great* mistake—You are to pay *nothing*.¹ As to the expence, I suppose the paper is the cause—2000 copies are printed. [The Tract account for *last* year has come in and I am £600 *minus* upon the year.]¹ I think of contracting the after editions.

I shall hear from P. [Pusey] before I close this

Ever Yrs affly J H N

P. S. Rogers stays out till after Easter. He says nothing of himself. Nothing bad has happened but quite enough to make us think about it.

TO E. B. PUSEY

Feb. 22/41.

My dear P.

Keble asks, ‘Has Pusey put me down for this day fortnight or three weeks? because I must try and fix with the Vice Chancellor accordingly.’²

From Rogers,³

‘Will you thank Pusey from Hope for his letter to him? and say that H. will write to him when any thing is settled; from what he hears here, he thinks it will be difficult to get a good travelling collator—perhaps it will be necessary to get one from Germany. I have heard from Abeken that a certain Dr Huysse (?) who has done some collations from Tert. Apol. would be a good and likely man to be travelling rummager, and that being a R. C. would not be any advantage except in Rome—

¹ Francis Rivington wrote on 23 Feb. to explain that the ‘difference in the account for printing the Tracts and our sale arises evidently from the great number of Tracts which have been reprinted during the year. . . . You will observe that 1,838 copies of the recently published Tract No. 88 are accounted for as sold and delivered in our statement, so that 2,500 (the number which I directed to be printed of any new Tract) is a very safe quantity for *new* Tracts. . . .’ On the business relationship between Newman and Rivingtons, see Lawrence N. Crumb, ‘Publishing the Oxford Movement: Francis Rivington’s Letters to Newman’, *Publishing History*, 28 (1990), 5–53.

² Keble wished to take in on the one visit to Oxford both the reading of a paper to the Theological Society and his next lecture as Professor of Poetry.

³ For Hope’s report see first note to letter of 11 Feb. to him.

and not very material here. I will bring home the collation of the Apologeticus. Will you thank Pusey for writing to Edward and for his message to me in H's letter.

Hope asks whether you know that they are bringing out here from the Vatican (a German Protestant named Dressell) MSS (part of which only it is said Jacobson saw) a new edition of the Apostolical Fathers. The said Dressell has also taken a great deal of pains with collations of an edition of Prudentius, which he wants to bring out;¹ but it is questionable whether he has money enough to publish it himself. He is a man well thought of here for character and accuracy by those who speak of him; and has worked his eyes out and is in distress.²

Ever Yrs affly J H N

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

Oriel¹ Febr 22/41¹

My dear H W

As I have no wish that the Printers should *work through the Sunday*, I shall send you the F. B. [Fairy Bower] at once paying the carriage and intreating you, Carissime, to be *quick*.²

'I fear I shall be, or am, found out in that matter [[Catholicus]]. London people say they come from Oxford—and Ryder saw Walter coming into and going out of Oxford in the course of a few hours, and knew that I saw him.³ And then comes internal evidence.¹

The Article in the M Chr. [Morning Chronicle] was not at all in Carlile's [sic] style. I thought of Macaulay.⁴

¹ A. Dressell's edition of *Aurelii Prudentii quae exstant Carmina* was eventually published in Leipzig in 1860.

² Harriett Mozley's *The Fairy Bower, or the History of a Month*, London 1841, was one of the works reviewed by Wilberforce in his article 'Story Books for Children', *Brit. Crit.*, 30, 1841 (July), 164–96. See first note to second letter of 1 March to Wilberforce.

³ See diary entry for 30 Jan. and letter of 11 Feb. to John Walter III.

⁴ 'The growing spirit of Puseyism in the Church appears thus far to have worked tolerably well in harness with Toryism. But symptoms of restiveness are beginning to show themselves, which plainly indicate that such will not be the case long. Nor is it difficult to foresee that eventually this Popish heresy in a Protestant Establishment will split the Tory faction into fragments incapable of any future reunion.

'With the Toryism of two centuries ago, Puseyism might have permanently amalgamated. But it has come too late into the world. Modern Toryism is quite a different affair from the absolutism and Jacobitism to which it has succeeded. The vitality of principle has gone; and the carcass is only animated by the demonism of expediency. . . . It temporises and accommodates. It dabbles and traffics in reforms and emancipations. It is great in tricks and tactics. It is a thing of shreds and patches.

'Not so Puseyism. That is earnest and uncompromising. It disclaims and disdains expediency . . . The union of Puseyism and Toryism is that of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza rolled into one fat single gentleman. The particles must fly off. Else there is no such power in the nature of things as repulsion.

'The columns of the *Times* itself are thrown open to this sect for attacks upon SIR ROBERT PEEL. We don't say the attacks are not well founded . . . His philosophy is shown to be superficial. The low-toned character of his morality is exposed. His shiftings, turnings, and inconsistencies, to catch this or that class, are laid bare unmercifully. The conviction of his thorough want of mental honesty is enforced. Now this is all very sound and true . . . The sect speaks out; while other Tories conceal their want of respect, because they think PEEL convenient. The Puseyites work out their morality into politics and practice. They do not play at religion and righteousness according to the good old conventional ways of the Church. They are all for realities. We like their spirit . . . By its [Toryism's] unprincipledness it has fished for the alliance of Puseyism, and Puseyism comes into the alliance to denounce its unprincipledness. The incongruous compound cannot long hold together; but its momentary existence is one of the strangest novelties of the nineteenth century.' *The Morning Chronicle*, No. 22,220, 12 Feb. 1841, pp. 2–3.

23 FEBRUARY 1841

All the books came to me safely and the cloke. ¹T. Morris does good service with his pupils. I never heard of St John's name before. ¹Does not all this plainly show for Dr Faussett's satisfaction that it is no *party*. ¹Pugin has been here, and I cannot help liking him, though he is an immense talker. ²You should have seen a late article in the *Globe*, silently alluding to Catholicus. It seems as if hitherto they had thought Puseyism a thing of copes and lighted tapers. ¹Geese, they never read a word, till the fist is shaken in their face. ³

Ever Yrs affly J H N

TUESDAY 23 FEBRUARY 1841 Vigil and Shrove Tuesday letters from H W[.] Johnson (with account of his Aunt's death) Lord J. Manners and Bowden walked to Littlemore and read f d wrote to Bowden and Johnson—letter for Bloxam to Mr Ph. [Phillipps]

TO J. R. BLOXAM

[23 February 1841]

My dear B.

It is impossible to read Mr P's ⁴letter without the deepest interest. Where our sympathies are so much the same, why should we be separated, except that there is a strong body in both Churches whose antipathies are more powerful still, and because this body has the governing authorities on its side. I cannot wonder that

Isaac Williams wrote to Thomas Keble on 20 Feb.: 'Morning Chronicle with an extraordinary article about Puseyism . . . , and N. tells me today there is another in the *Globe*—indeed all these papers from time to time have some Article about the power of what they call Puseyism, and the Times seems writing down Peel on the strength of it. It is very curious as signs of things—but one does not see what will come of it.' (Lambeth Palace Library MSS.)

¹ This is the first time that Newman himself mentions Ambrose St John's name in the correspondence. See note to letter of 3 Feb. to Wilberforce.

² Pugin had visited Oxford several times over these months, 'full of a project for new Gothic buildings for Balliol College. Bloxam introduced him to Ward, taking him to his rooms at Balliol. Pugin, with his love of mediaevalism, saw with satisfaction on Ward's table the *Summa* of St Thomas and the works of St Buonaventure, in huge folio volumes; and their student's enthusiasm for the Church of the Middle Ages struck a chord of common sympathy. To Pugin this signified the existence of that devotion to Gothic architecture which was in his eyes a necessary corollary following from the true Catholic spirit. They soon became friends, and the visit was returned and repeated. After a talk with Ward one day Pugin went to see Bloxam, and said to him, "What an extraordinary thing that so glorious a man as Ward should be living in a room without mullions to the windows." Next time they met Pugin taxed him with this deficiency, and received a rude shock from Ward's reply: "What are mullions? I never heard of them." Pugin was, however, incredulous, but on receiving a second assurance: "I haven't the most distant idea what they are like," he retired discomfited. A few fresh tokens of "invincible ignorance" in architecture so shocked Pugin, that he entirely refused to believe that Ward meant what he said. "I see how it is, my dear sir," he said, "you conceal your graces." ' W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, London 1889, p. 154.

³ 'We leave to more expert theologians the task of deciding whether the Puseyites are heretics or schismatics, and take the humbler course of occasionally directing public attention to their doctrines, and the effect produced upon their followers . . . The age is unfavourable to clerical assumption . . . A procession round the church with "bell, book, and candle," splendid dresses and a goodly train of choristers may produce reverence; but a man in a simple surplice, folding his arms, and making unusual bows and genuflections, is likely to produce tedium or ridicule.

'Though Puseyism may have made progress in the clergy, we do not hear that it has taken root in the congregations. When, however, it does get hold of a layman, we its symptoms in increased dogmatism and intolerance. . . . LAY PUSEYISM—that fine assertion of infallibility and scorn of public opinion . . .', *Globe and Traveller*, No. 12,087, 22 Feb. 1841, p. 2.

⁴ A. L. Phillipps. See letter of 6 Feb. to Bloxam and notes concerning Phillipps's letter of 25 Jan.

our authorities should feel as they do, considering what the Church of Rome practically is—nor can I wonder that the Church or Rome should feel as it does considering what we are and have been, at least the majority of us.

This I feel most strongly and cannot conceal it, viz. that, while Rome is what she is, union is impossible—that we too must change I do not deny.

Rome must change first of all in her spirit. I must see more sanctity in her than I do at present. Alas! I see no marks of sanctity—or if any, they are chiefly confined to converts from us. ‘By their fruits ye shall know them’¹, is the main canon our Lord gives us, to know true pastors from false. I do verily think that, with all our sins, there is more sanctity in the Church of England and Ireland, than in the Roman Catholic bodies in the same countries.

I say not all this in reproach, but in great sorrow. Indeed I am ever making the best of things before others, when the R Cs are attacked—but I cannot deny this great lack. What Hildebrand did by faith and holiness, they do by political intrigue. Their great object is to pull down the English Church. They join with those who are *further* from them in creed to oppose those who are *nearer* to them. They have to do with such a man as O Connell. Never can I think such ways the footsteps of Christ. If they want to convert England, let them go barefooted into our manufacturing towns, let them preach to the people, like St Francis Xavier, let them be pelted and trampled on—and I will own that they can do what we cannot; I will confess that they are our betters far—I will (though I could not on that ground join them) I would gladly incur their reproach. This is to be Catholics; this is to secure a triumph. Let them use the proper arms of the Church, and they will prove that they are the Church by using them.

I can feel nothing but distrust and aversion towards those who offer peace yet carry on war;—this I have felt and expressed before this—but what gives me an interest in Mr P. and makes me feel grateful to him is that he has taken the opposite course, and in taking it has exposed himself to obloquy from those whom he is opposing. He is doing as much as one man can do; but nothing is really done till much more is done. What a day it will be, if God ever again raises up holy men, Bernards or Bor[r]omeos, in their communion!²

But even if this were done, difficulties would not be at an end, though I think sanctity being secured, every thing would ultimately follow. This is not the place to go into controversial matters—nor is it necessary since the *previous* difficulty of the sadly degenerate state of Rome, is first to be removed. But were it removed, they still would have to explain authoritatively many portions of their formularies, which they at present interpret in a sense which seems to us very uncatholic.

And then after all, I see nothing to make me think it would be other than a sin

¹ Matthew 7: 20.

² In his reply to Bloxam on being shown this letter, Phillipps wrote that he agreed, ‘that what we want is really apostolick Men . . . To raise up such as these must be God’s work . . . let me add, Oxford contains many such Men, when once a reunion shall have put them in possession of the *inconceivable grace* of Catholick Communion. Yes, all Christendom needs regener-ation. I firmly believe that God has raised you and your friends at Oxford for this very purpose; reunite yourselves to us and you shall reform not only us but the whole Universe.’

23 FEBRUARY 1841

for any of us to *leave* our Church. We must make our Church move. If indeed, so far from moving, she rushed (which God forbid and which it is profane even to suppose) into open heresy instead, and the Church of Rome on the other hand had cleansed herself of her present faults, in such a state of things I can conceive its being a duty to leave our own Church and join the Roman. I do not feel it a duty on any other hypothesis.

Now these contingencies being so remote, or rather impossible at least in our day, it would seem that nothing is left for pious Roman Catholics and ourselves to do in the way of *direct* union. Our duty seems rather to lie in trying to be one with each other in heart, and doing what we can to improve our own bodies respectively. No one can say that much has not been done on the part of many of our members to improve the state of the English Communion—let Roman Catholics do as much. I hail Mr P.'s late conduct as a proof that they will do as much—but they have much to do—they have much to do before they will have done as much as some of us have done. I long to see them begin the work of Christian charity. I wish I could see a movement on the part of their *clergy*. I earnestly wait for the time when men of learning and ability will come forward, not to advocate any recognition of our Church,—I am not asking for that,—but to speak and act kindly towards a body which has done much to repress many heresies (as they must confess) and is nearer them than any other Christian communion. I would call upon them to break their connections with those who agree with them in no one principle; to influence the tone of their periodical publications; to give up the uncatholic proceedings which disgrace their worship so commonly, (such as music meetings in Chapels¹—); to be preachers of sanctity and to raise a feeling of the necessity of a moral reformation. Their success rests with themselves. The English never will be favorably inclined to a plotting intriguing party—but faith and holiness are irresistible

Ever Yrs xxx²

TO MANUEL JOHNSON

Oriel Febr 23/41

My dear Johnson

I feel for you with all my heart and I pray God to support all of you. My kindest remembrances to Henry Bowden. The tenderest thoughts will ever accompany in my mind the memory of one whom I have known, respected and admired for so long a time. It has happened too on a day which, being what it is to John B and myself, will make me remember it with special feelings.³

¹ Phillipps wrote: 'I entirely agree with him [Newman] in reprobating the disgusting figured Musick, which is in general use amongst English Catholics, and which is put forward in so offensive a manner as a motive of profane attraction on occasions when God's glory ought alone to be thought of.'

² Regarding the continuation of the exchange, see letters of 2 and 3 March to Bloxam.

³ Mrs Jane Roberts had died on 21 Feb., at 10 a.m. (according to Newman's Book of Anniversaries). She was an Aunt to J. W. Bowden on his mother's side, and also to Manuel Johnson, and was spoken of as an Anglican of constant faithfulness and goodness of life. 21 Feb. was the birthday of both Bowden and Newman.

24 FEBRUARY 1841

But I will not obtrude upon you my own sorrow, My dear Johnson, and if I attempted it, no words could lessen yours so Believe me

Yrs affectionately John H Newman

WEDNESDAY 24 FEBRUARY 1841 Ash Wednesday and St Matthias letters from Rivington, Strong, Sir W. Heathcote and Hook, and Bowden service for Ash Wednesday after University Sermon with Athanasian Creed and Collect St Matthias after Ash W Collect f b f d f till 7 in evening went up to Giles's with G. D. [[(Rogers's boy) George Dean]] wrote to J.[.] G. Williams, Sir W. Heathcote and Lord J. Manners and paid Walton by post office order

TO MRS JOHN MOZLEY

Oriel¹ Febr 24¹ Ashwednesday¹ 1841¹

My dear J

You and my Aunt will be much shocked to hear of Mrs Roberts' death—She died on the 21st unexpectedly—she had been some time under the dropsy. Johnson went up but was too late to see her. This will be a blow to the Bowdens

Ever Yrs affly J H N

Thanks to you and Aunt for your kind letters. ¹I never had such dreary dismal thoughts as on finding myself 40. 21 was bad enough.¹ Send *at once* any suggestions you have to make about the Fairy Bower.

THURSDAY 25 FEBRUARY 1841 letters from R Williams with parcel¹ and Roundell Palmer read prayers to Miss Clarke The Bishop and party came to see the Chapel

TO MISS M. R. GIBERNE

Littlemore Febr 25/41

My dear Miss Giberne

I waited to answer your questions till I got a friend to give me the inclosed to send you—and now it has just come, and I have not in my head what exactly I would say, so I send it off without it, and you shall hear again

Yours most sincerely John H Newman

FRIDAY 26 FEBRUARY 1841 letters from Sir W Heathcote, Lord J Manners, Keble, Dean of Chichester [G. Chandler], C M² and J read to Miss Clarke f b f d f till 7 walked in to

¹ Williams had written on 8 Feb.: 'Wood tells me you would be glad to have two or three copies of the Breviary. I have sent you four copies, also some copies of Psalms I have had printed, which I forgot whether you have [*sic*] some before or not. I can let you have as many more copies of *any* of them as you want—for if ever the Breviary is completed I am satisfied it must be printed according to the 4 volume arrangement—which will make the present impression useless.' On the early history of the Breviary translation project, see Volume VI, xviii–xix, 192, and 210. On its suggested revival later in this year, see letter of 8 May from Williams placed at 9 May, and Newman's letter of 14 July.

² Charles Marriott wrote on 24 Feb. to assure Newman of his support for the *Courier*, and to confirm his now complete determination of resigning from the Principalship of Chichester Theological College. Manning had written to Pusey on 3 Feb.: 'For the present Marriott is able to continue, and we may trust his continuing until the Summer—we are therefore most anxious that the idea of his resigning may not get abroad

Oxford in evening Morris read at Theological—Pusey (in bed) not well enough to attend. wrote to Hook, R. Palmer, M R G.[.] R Williams[.] Dean of Chichester, Lord J. Manners, Sir W Heathcote, Keble, E. Churton, H W[.] C Miller

SATURDAY 27 FEBRUARY letters from A. Acland, J.[.] E. Churton, Sackville Lee, H[.] and proof from Roworth and H W (*this was the first day of the Number 90 row*)¹ Pusey in bed dined in hall wrote to H W.[.] Oakeley, and proof to Roworth.

SUNDAY 28 FEBRUARY 1st in Lent letters from R Williams, Bowden, R Wilberforce and Dear Haddan assisted at Communion Ward and Marriott to breakfast Assize Sermon Haddan in morning I in afternoon preached Number 492² saw Pusey in bed Williams dined with me in rooms wrote to Bowden

MONDAY 1 MARCH letter from H W called on Pusey, who was up. dined in hall, (without going to Common Room and so on) wrote to A. Acland. Dear. H W[.] R W and Sackville Lee.

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

Oriel March 1. 1841

My dear H W.

Thanks for the sight of the note which I return. It does one's heart good to see such nature and warmth—and on the strength of it I shall allow you, if *you choose*, as you said, to send the writer Mr P.'s [Phillipps] letter, which I have had copied and will some fine day send you. He has sent another which lies before me, and the correspondence thickens.³

[. . .] one ought to prepare for every thing. *I* did not [. . .] if that step is taken, it will be done [. . .]⁴

I have burnt the letter you sent me today. It certainly is characteristic.

again as before: and I am very truly obliged to you for saying that your communication with [C. L.] Cornish was of a general kind. Also the Bishop [P. N. Shuttleworth] might feel, if he heard some misrepresentation of your words that somebody wished to anticipate his choice.

I have to thank you also for giving me an opportunity of contradicting the silly, and false report about myself. It is absolutely untrue. It is extraordinary that even to the present time there has been a reserve on the Bishop[.]s part I believe from delicacy, and on my part from duty on all subjects even bearing on opinions such as I hold. I do not think N. or yourself have been even named more than once, and most casually, and that since my appointment; and never that I remember before it: for until that time almost all my intercourse with the Bishop was on business of the Diocese. But I have said enough when I have said that it is merely groundless.⁵ (Pusey House Papers.)

¹ Written by Newman in his *Chronological Notes* in the mid-1870s, though in 1841 he could have had little idea of the chain of events that was beginning to unfold.

² On the morning of the 27th of February, [W. G.] Ward burst excitedly into [A. C.] Tait's rooms. "Here," he cried, "is something worth reading," and threw No. 90 on the table. Tait described to [A. P.] Stanley how he "sate, half-asleep," over the pamphlet, "rather disturbed from time to time" by sentences about "working in chains," and "stammering lips," till, on turning over the pages, he was suddenly awakened by lighting on the commentary on the Twenty-second Article. He immediately rushed to Ward's rooms to know whether he had rightly understood it; and from that moment the sensation began. He showed No. 90 to one person after another; the excitement increased, but still unknown to Newman . . ., R. E. Prothero, *The Life and Correspondence of A. P. Stanley* . . ., London 1893, I, 292. See note to diary entry for 7 March and letter of same day to T. Mozley.

³ P.S. VI, 1, 'Fasting a Source of Trial'.

⁴ See Newman's letter of the following day to J. R. Bloxam.

⁵ Some words erased in these three places, and below.

I MARCH 1841

How long do you want before you turn R.C.? will two years do? Let me know this important point.

Kindest remembrances to your wife whom you wish to make me call Mary.

Ever Yrs affly J H N

P.S. You did not say if it was [. . .]

I have forgotten to say that *I* don't object to the Prayers¹ being reprinted, except that they might be improved much.

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

[[After Feb 25 March 1 <?> 1841]]

My dear H

In one place, I forget where, the author *accuses* Grace² of fidgetting—some where towards the end—this I think is what Jemima means—her mind works on itself—she does not take things simply enough—every thing makes an impression—she is over sensitive.

Yes, by all means review Sam's books as you will. I shall add nothing to what you say

Ever Yrs affly J H N

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

[[Febr or March 1841]]

My dear H W

It strikes me that you should caution Harriett, if she writes a *continuation* of the F.B. [Fairy Bower] against supposing other readers have read the F.B. She ought not to allude to it at all—but begin anew though the *characters* are the same—There are many reasons for this. First of all it is a great nuisance to have to read one book in order to read another.³

Tell me if this be common or coarse as a motto to my letters to Sir R P [Peel] which are to be published separate

¹ The *Prayers for Unity*. See fourth note to letter of 13 Sept. to A. H. D. Acland, and second note to letter of this day to R. I. Wilberforce.

² Grace Leslie, only child of a widowed mother, was the central character in Harriett Mozley's *The Fairy Bower, or the History of a Month. A Tale for Young People*, London 1841. It was among the works reviewed by Wilberforce in his article 'Story Books for Children', *Brit. Crit.*, 30, 1841 (July), 164–96. Also included for review was Samuel Wilberforce's *Agathos, and other Sunday Stories*, London 1840.

³ Wilberforce had reported on 20 Feb. that Marianne Dyson had asked: 'Have you seen F.B.? who wrote it? and much more pressingly, if you have any influence over the writer thereof or any connection with her, would you have let her know that you know there [are] those who ardently wish for the continuation which seems to be promised[.] Setting aside the 5th volume of sermons [P.S. V] I do not know when a book has taken such hold of me or when I have felt so much impressed and reproved as by its deep tone of underground Catholicity, with such a surface of nature and cleverness as reminds me of Miss Austin'[.]

'You know this last was exactly my own remark about it. I *believe* she got it at my recommendation but I only told her to get it and tell me what she thought of it for I thought the authorship a secret.'

I MARCH 1841

Away went Gilpin neck or nought,
Away went hat and wig
He little thought when he set out
Of running such a rig

I want a second *opinion*—and *quick*¹

Ever Yrs affly J H N

TO R. I. WILBERFORCE

Oriel March 1/41

My dear Wilberforce,

As to the separation of the Litany from the Morning Service I should think it in itself a *great* improvement.² One point however is worth ascertaining, whether the *people* would like it. At Bisley Thomas Keble began it and found it so unpopular that he went back to the usual plan. You see we have got out of the habit of many Services—and in the country people come from a *distance* to Church—and do not know what to do between whiles.

Pusey tells me you are still turning the subject of united prayer in your mind If you wish to see my *meaning*, you will find it in pp 1–3 of Tract 90 just published.³

I hope Mr Read [Reed] will turn out all you wish.⁴

Yours affly John H Newman

P.S. You have heard either through me or Churton that the Courier affair is at an end.⁵ Yet I am not sorry for the stir.

¹ William Cowper, *The Diverting History of John Gilpin; showing how he went farther than he intended, and came safe home again*. Wilberforce replied on 26 Feb.: ‘Given, that the letters [[of “Catholicus”]] are to be published—and that it is intended to hit Peel hard;—I think the Gilpin verses will make a capital motto[.]’

² ‘But you know you never asked me anything about it till you had resolved to write and had written the first 2 letters. Else I confess I should have hesitated whether it is politic to pull Peel[’s] tail at all. Won[’]t it prevent Pusey being a Bishop perhaps. Also, I never thought of any one dreaming that *you* wrote anything in the *Times*. So that I never thought what the effect might be if it were discovered.’

³ ‘However all this is only to the point of your publishing the letters *at all* for certainly they must be regarded as an attack on Peel. Now if they are to be so published I don’t see that the motto is much worse than the letters (or indeed so bad) and it [is] certainly capital.’

Though the letters were published in pamphlet form as *The Tamworth Reading Room*, the motto was not used.

² The ‘Litany, or General Supplication, to be sung or said after Morning Prayer upon Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the Ordinary’ from the *Book of Common Prayer*. Until the revisions of 1661–2, the Litany was designed as a distinct service, to be used some time after Morning Prayer.

³ On the *Prayers for Unity* and Wilberforce’s apparent interest, see Volume VII, 295–7, 332–3, and 347–8. In *Tract 90*, Newman urged: ‘We can do nothing well till we act “with one accord;” we can have no accord in action till we agree together in heart; we cannot agree without a supernatural influence; we cannot have a supernatural influence unless we pray for it; we cannot pray acceptably without repentance and confession. Our Church’s strength would be irresistible, humanly speaking, were it but at unity with itself. . . .’, *V.M.* II, 270–1.

⁴ Wilberforce had earlier consulted Newman about the suitability of William Reed, of Queen’s College, for the post of Principal of the York and Ripon Diocesan Training School. Reed was appointed and remained there until 1848.

⁵ See letter of 15 Feb. to Lord John Manners and that of 22 Feb. from him placed after it. Wilberforce had written on 19 Feb. to say that he was willing to subscribe, ‘but I think a daily paper too large a dose, and

2 MARCH 1841

TUESDAY 2 MARCH 1841 letters from Christie, Dyer, and F.[.] Manning[.] T M and H W wrote my second letter to Bloxam about Mr Philli[p]ps. dined in hall walked over to Littlemore in evening with George [Dean]. visited Mr Dover wrote to F and T M and to Strong [of] Bristol with Post Office order £2. 18.¹

TO J. R. BLOXAM

Oriel. March 2/41

My dear Bloxam,

Thank you for the sight of Mr Philli[p]ps's letters—of course it is needless to enlarge upon the beautiful spirit which they breathe. No one could desire better for himself than that he might have such zeal, such love as they exhibit. While I feel this, nevertheless I cannot concur with him in thinking that 'the time is arrived for the holy endeavour to effect the reunion of the Churches.' And as unadvisable attempts tend to defeat their object, the more fervently he in his charity desires it, the more resolutely he should refrain from urging it, at least upon our members.

To any one who comes to me with a proposal of negociations for the reconciliation of the Church of England to the Holy See, what is my simple answer?² is it not 'Address my Bishop, not me'? Mr Phillips in his kind and warm feeling makes much more of two or three people in our Church and University than he has any right to do. He much exaggerates our importance and influence. Some of us are not even in authority, nor are likely to be. To ask us to propose terms of negociation, is to invite us to forget our place and to take on us the duties of our rulers. Let him go to them; they have the care and oversight of the Churches, and none but they. Others than they have no right to take the initiative, except when the essential truth of the gospel is in jeopardy. If the Tracts for the Times took on them to speak first, it was because their authors felt that heresy was stealing all around their Church, if it had not already entered it. They were put forth by the right on which the laymen Flavian and Diodorus³ formed choirs at Antioch during the ascendancy of Arianism. But for laymen or clergymen to take steps preliminary to so extraordinary and so great an act as the re-union of the Churches without their Bishop, would be a sin, while he is their Bishop.

would rather it were 3 week infliction. A daily paper consumes so much time. I think I can get you one or two contributors, and if you find it material I will be answerable for 3 copies, hoping to dispose of them.'

¹ W. Strong was a bookseller, and this was in payment for *Codex Theodosianus* . . . , six volumes in three, Lyons 1665.

² Phillipps replied: 'Let me endeavour to explain myself, if my last letter has not already done so. If in any of my letters I have used the expressions *negociator* or *negociation*, I never meant them in the sense, in which it would seem they have been understood: if Mr Newman, a Priest of the Church of England, has no authority to negotiate, still less can a simple Lay Member of the Catholic Church have any such authority. If therefore such a word as *negociator*, *negociation*, escaped my pen, it was meant only in a sense which implied no such authority either on the part of any individuals I might meet at Oxford or of myself. Once more I repeat what I said in my last, both I and those who act with me put ourselves unreservedly in the hands of the *friends of Catholic Unity* at Oxford . . . but *we do so only* on the understanding *that they really are before God*, what they profess to be, *the friends of Catholic Unity*.'

³ See *Art.*, pp. 361 ff.

I feel this so strongly that, to speak for myself, though I know I should thereby lose the satisfaction of meeting persons I wish to know and cannot but admire and respect, yet I have made up my mind that it would be wrong in me to hold intercourse with any one who comes hither on such an understanding.

But surely we have enough to do, both they and we, in the way of mutual charity, without hastening forward to acts which should be its close, and not its beginning. I do not suppose there is a single member of our communion, of any religious feeling, but would, *abstractedly*, wish a re-union between them and us; but what we are all deeply impressed with, for one reason or other, is its hopelessness. This the Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed in his late Charge. ‘The dissensions’ he says ‘which separated the Churches of the East and the West, and the corruptions and intolerance which drove the Protestants from the communion of Rome, have been most injurious to the Catholic Church. A reconciliation *would indeed be desirable*; but re-union with Rome has been rendered *impossible* by the sinister policy of the Council of Trent.’¹ I quote this for the single purpose of showing by it what is at once the wish and the despair of the Church of England.

And even in the *grounds* of that despair we should differ among ourselves more in expression than in real feeling; or at least if we differed in detail, in one point at least we should all agree, and that so prominent a point as to put other differences almost into the shade. We are all agreed, if Mr Phillips will excuse me in saying it, in *distrusting* Rome, as hollow, insincere, political, ambitious, and unscrupulous. I am not saying whether or not we exaggerate, but this would be our common impression; and I think it is founded on this undeniable truth, that Rome has not upon her at this day, at least to our view, the Note of Sanctity. We see much of her gaining power by political party, intrigue, and tumult; we hear much of disputations; much of societies, publications and tracts; but very little of inward religion. We find her authors of this day able controversialists; but how very few can be pointed out who have written any work which evidences any heart, any depth of spiritual experience, or fulness of faith and love? Let them put into our hands the hymns, or the meditations, or the prayers, or the essays, or the sermons which argue the man of God. We cannot but judge of them by what comes before us. Mr Phillips speaks, with the sympathy which such a person would feel, of Dr Puseys Sermon on St John’s Day; in which of his four Vicariates can he show us such a Roman Catholic?² how many of his own divines or bishops can he show

¹ W. Howley, *A Charge delivered at his Ordinary Visitation in September 1840* . . . , London 1840, p. 32. Phillips commented: ‘The expression, which he [Newman] quotes from the Archbishop of Canterbury’s late charge, is certainly very discouraging . . . to Members of our Church, who might be disposed to come forwards to advocate a more friendly feeling towards the Church of England . . . Is the present Archbishop Howley wiser than his predecessor Archbishop Wake? or are the times less favourable now for attempting what Archbishop Wake attempted even in his day, than they were then? I do not think even Mr Newman would answer in the affirmative.’

² Phillips answered: ‘With regard to the supposed absence of the mark of sanctity in the Catholic Church at the present day, of which Mr Newman complains, in my last letter I have already said enough. He mistakes my reason for sympathizing with Dr Pusey, and for admiring his beautiful sermon on St John’s Day. I sympathize with Dr Pusey not because I think we have no Men like him in our Church, but because I think he is so like the men in our Church.’ The sermon in question was published as *Christ, the Source and Rule of Christian Love. A Sermon preached on the Feast of St John the Evangelist, MDCCCXL, at St Paul’s Church, Bristol* . . . , Oxford 1841.

2 MARCH 1841

us with so much of the spirit of St Francis de Sales or of Pascal as Dr Pusey? Or if there are individuals who manifest life, is it not chiefly among converts from our Church? persons who bring life to Rome not draw it from her?

This is the ground of our deep suspicion and distrust of the Church of Rome; and till it is removed, not a single step can be made towards entertaining the very idea of a re-union between it and the English Church. Mr Phillips has been drawn by sympathy to Dr Pusey; let his divines draw us by sympathy towards them. The wisdom that is from above is *first* pure, *then* peaceable. Faith is but the expression of love. If they and we were animated by one spirit, we *should* unite in one Church. The belief of the heart would lead to the confession of the lips. Reverse the process, and you but sew a new piece into an old garment.

That there are zealous and devoted persons in his communion I rejoice to believe; let them employ their exertions, not in attempting us, but in improving their own people. If a foreign Order is to come into this country, let it employ itself on the English and Irish Roman Catholics. Let it break off their active co-operation with the political party with which they are at present identified.¹ Let it promote a real reformation of life and conduct. Let its members even do as much, and incur as much odium, in their own communion, for what they know to be truth, as Dr Pusey has done and incurred among ourselves for what they allow to be the same truth. Let them and us rival each other in preaching and practising righteousness. And then let us see *where* such a course leaves us in the end. Then will be time for negotiations.

Yours ever affectionately John H Newman

March 2/41

My dear Bloxam

You may *send* the above in autograph to Mr Phillips but my *former* letter I want back.

Ever Yrs J.H.N.

TO THOMAS MOZLEY

Oriel March 2/41

My dear M

I have found a letter from poor Archdeacon Wilkins which, being written *prior* to his work, makes our cut more cruel.² But it is nihil ad rem of course, except from curiosity.

¹ Phillipps entirely agreed 'with Mr Newman in regretting the *political* connection between the IRISH R. Catholic body and the English Dissenting Body, but I cannot hope to possess any influence among the Irish R. Catholics, but I certainly do use what little I possess amongst the English Catholics to deter them from such a connection; let Mr Newman in return endeavour to break up the Political connection between the High Church Party in England and the Manichean Orangemen of Ireland . . . ?.

² See Volume VII, 415 and 456.

3 MARCH 1841

I fear I shall be *much* pressed for the B.C. this time. When will your first article come? and do be quick, there's a good fellow; for at the end of September the printers *worked thro'* Sunday

Ever Yrs affly J H N

in great haste

P.S. Your letter just come. Yes please, give me the article on Advertisements.¹ I could send you plenty more but suppose you have enough.

WEDNESDAY 3 MARCH 1841 Ember called on Mr Dover read prayers morning and afternoon fb fd f till 6 Bloxam and J M came over wrote to Crawley, Mrs Smalley[,] Christie

TO J. R. BLOXAM

Littlemore March 3/41

My dear B.

You may, if you please, *without mentioning my name*, give the following message to Mr P. as from a friend:

'If Mr P. wishes to *extinguish* the Catholic movement among us, he cannot take a better way than by introducing foreign divines to Oxford. Whether what he aims at is what persons in Oxford are promoting is another matter—I only mean that I am sure Oxford men would feel he was most considerably imperilling what they are doing. I mean no disrespect to foreign divines.'

You see I have written it in an offhand way, in order to convey to him vividly one's feeling²

Ever Yrs affly J H N

P.S. *How* have Oxford men sanctioned Perceval's Roman Schism?³ I never read

¹ 'Clerical and Religious Advertisements', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (April), 388–410. Mozley also contributed 'Open Roofs' to the same volume (pp. 441–89).

² Bloxam forwarded Newman's letter of the previous day to Phillipps, admitting that while he felt 'much gratified by your acceptance of my invitation for Easter week', that he was 'afraid you will not derive so much satisfaction in the visit, as you have anticipated, when you have read the enclosed Letter . . . The contents are certainly upon the whole painful to read. Let them however not prevent your coming here at the appointed Time. We must not say in the character of a negociator, but in that of one with whom we have much sympathy, and whom we greatly respect and admire for his exertions. My dear friend, Mr Newman, I regret to say, thinks it not prudent to meet you.' R. D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam: An Oxford Friendship*, Oxford 1947, p. 124.

When he sent this letter to Phillipps, Bloxam added: 'It will be far better . . . if you will kindly visit me *alone*, and in the most quiet way, at the time proposed.' To alleviate the effect of 'this douche of cold water from Newman', Bloxam also enclosed a note 'from Frederick Oakeley expressing appreciation at Phillipps's efforts'. And: 'With this small crumb of comfort Phillipps's ardent spirit was instantly refreshed, and leapt up again to buoyant hope' (*op. cit.*, pp. 128–9).

Phillipps's visit was postponed, largely due to the furore over *Tract* 90, but he did turn up in Oxford on 30 April. Phillipps began to correspond directly with Newman when he sent a copy of his published *Remarks on the Letter to Jelf*. See Newman's reply of 5 April.

³ A. P. Perceval, *The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church*, London 1836. In his letter of 28 Feb., Phillipps had written, 'I think the Oxford men ought not give publicity to such tracts as

3 MARCH 1841

the book. If Mr Ph. will send or refer to any passages I will read them. Perhaps, however, they are [it is] advertised on the back of the Tracts.

FROM CHARLES CRAWLEY

Fitzroy Farm 1 Feb./41.

My dear Sir

I have just received the enclosed from Churton; when you have considered its contents be so good as to return it to me as I wish to send it to Mr Norris—. I am very anxious to hear what is to be done about Bramhall, but I can hear nothing from Copeland.¹

Some people are a good deal annoyed at the delay of this which was to have been the first Book, and I know not what excuse to give to those who apply to me about it. I hope you received my last of the 16th ult-

ever most sincerely yours C Crawley.

FROM EDWARD CHURTON TO CHARLES CRAWLEY

Crayke. King Charles the Martyr. [30 Jan.] 1841.

My dear Crawley,

There seems to be some misapprehension of my purpose in regard to Pearson. People seem to think I purpose to *improve* upon him, by adding remarks of my own in the notes. I am as averse from any such perpetration, and any man can be. But Pearson's Miscellaneous Works² are almost all controversial. The two Tracts in answer to Burges are scarcely to be understood without appending in the notes some extracts from the pamphlets which they were intended to answer. I am ready to enter upon any pledge, that there shall not be a word of my own in any notes appended. But to exclude such extracts, as are necessary to the exhibition of the author's argument and reasonings, is not fairly to *edit* Pearson. There are two ways of proceeding; either to print Burges's pamphlets at length, which will be a great deal too much, or to make extracts from them, where Pearson's text requires it, as for instance, Keble prints extracts from Cartwright to illustrate Hooker.

In other parts of these Tracts he quotes words from other contemporary writings, without naming the book, as from 'Ikon Basilike'³ etc. Will it be forbidden to append a reference to the work from which he quotes?

In regard to a Memoir, my kind friend Archdeacon Todd has consigned to me all his scarce pamphlets and MSS Collections on the subject, having himself long intended to do this same duty to the memory of Bishop Pearson. Must we then only prefix an article from the Biog. Britannica⁴, or may we make the Life and Literary notice as complete as possible?

There is another question I want answered. Is it desirable that the Latin Works should be printed as they are, or in an *English Translation*? I am inclined to think English will be preferable.

Our only object is to make *Pearson* as accessible as we can to English readers. I scarcely know any name in English Theology, with whom it is more important that they should be well acquainted. But the end will not be accomplished without great Editorial pains.

Mr Perceval's *Roman Schism*. It is in vain that I call upon our Men to conciliate, when they can retort upon me such violations of a conciliatory course on the part of the Anglicans at Oxford.' Perceval's work was included in a list at the end of the collected volumes of *Tracts*, which went under the heading: '*The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets . . . will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts*'.

¹ See second note to letter of 16 Jan. from Crawley placed after that of 14 Jan. to him.

² See second note to letter of 14 Jan. to C. Crawley.

³ 'The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings: Together with His Private Prayers, used in the time of his Restraint . . . immediately before his death.' Published secretly just before Charles I's death in 1649, this influential work was highly popular among royalists.

⁴ *Biographia Britannica: Or, The Lives of the most eminent Persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland . . .*, London 1760, V, 3309-12.

As you mean to give Bull's *Harmonia in a Translation*, I should think the same rule may apply to Pearson.

As to the List, I think it is generally a good one. I do not see the use of reprinting Courayer, as I said before. What is the particular object in reprinting L'Estrange's *Alliance*?¹ I would also suggest for consideration that there are too many controversial Treatises.

If you wish to propitiate, and avoid suspicion, why do you insert such names as Montague [Montagu] and Heylin [Heylyn]?

You have left out my friend Dr Edw. Hyde.² Take my word for him, he is worth more than either of the two last.

I do not think dry disputatious Tracts, such as Heylin's and Montague's, have much *Theology* in them.

Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice* is a book, for which only persons of very extreme opinions will thank you.

Look through the list, as it stands, and you will not see more than two or three names, whose works contain any thing to assist the *preacher*. This is very important, and ought to be considered. While I do not dispute the value of such works as Bishop Sage's,³ Thorndike's, and some others, it is plain that they are for the few, not for the many, and not on topics of general interest. Beveridge has been so lately published by Hartwell Horne, that I should think there is no great demand for him at present.

What I wish to see either substituted or added is, some volumes of good Catholic Didactic Theology. Are not Farington's [Farindon] Sermons, Bishop P. Browne's, Bishop R. Brownrigge's of this character? Mr Norris will be able to tell of these and of more.

On controversial subjects should not the rule be to take the best writers only? Ergo, Bramhall, and not Courayer, etc, on the English Succession. To take writers of less name only on subjects of a unique character, as Bishop Gunning on the Paschal Fast? Not to admit writers, whose works, though scarce and valuable, are not of general interest? Ergo, not Brevint.⁴

I do not wish to make difficulties, but I wish for a full consideration of the question, before a *final* list is published. I will therefore send you my list, only premising that my alterations are only suggested on the score of expediency, not on principle.

Yours very sincerely, E. Churton.

Bishop Andrewes's Works.

Archbishop Laud's. (of course including the History of his Troubles and Trials published by H. Wharton.)

Archbishop Bramhall's

Bishop Pearson's Works, (exclusive of the Work on the Creed, that being generally accessible.)

Kettlewell's. (qu^o whether all, or select?)

Thorndike's Select Treatises.

Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica* translated.

Gunning on the Lent Fast.

Hyde's *Christ and His Church*.

Cave's *Primitive Christianity*.

Some writers of good Catholic Sermons, or Didactic Theology, to be recommended by Mr Norris, as suggested in my note.

¹ Hamon L'Estrange's *Alliance of Divine Offices, exhibiting all the Liturgies of the Church of England since the Reformation* was published in the Library in 1846. See Appendix 2 for details of those works mentioned below which were published between 1841 and 1845.

² None of Hyde's *Works* were included in the Library.

³ See eighth note to letter of 12 Jan. to Pusey. See same letter on other works mentioned below which did not appear in the Library before 1845.

⁴ No edition of Daniel Brevint's *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* was included in the Library, but W. Gresley published an abridgement in 1856.

3 MARCH 1841

TO CHARLES CRAWLEY

Littlemore March 3. 1841

My dear Mr Crawley

I did not answer your note of some weeks since because I had no answer to make at the moment and hoped soon to have—and I knew you were on the point of seeing Copeland who would explain the state of the case. Copeland is employed in making selections from the works of Hammond and Heylin [Heylyn]¹ which may be submitted to the Committee. I do not know any one who would do this job so well as he, though he does not get on very quickly. He has been very much out of health, and, poor fellow, his sister is ill now. And this is the reason I now write, because it is likely to be a longer piece of business than I had hoped.

I never meant to give in to Churton's supposition that conciliation was the order of the day. If I am interested in the Library, it is in order to get certain books reprinted, and whether this raises a clamour or not I really do not care. I do not say that I agree with Montague [Montagu] or Johnson—but if their works are not published,² and Johnson's with no great delay, I shall lose great part of the interest I have in the plan—nay I do not think I should care to promote it. Faringdon's [Farindon] works I have added to the list.³ By the bye I have given away all copies I had of it—and must rely on others for the names.

As Courrayer [Courayer]⁴ is in progress, Andrew[e]s in press, and the Translation of Bull's *Harmonia* under revision, I suppose we are pretty well off for the moment.

I am, My dear Mr Crawley⁵

THURSDAY 4 MARCH 1841 letters from Mr Thompson, H W, M R G, Strong with receipt, Walter with $\frac{1}{2}$ notes, and Oakeley and Hook read prayers to Miss Clark. Williams, Copeland, Church and Ryder came over. called on Mrs Tom[b]s, Mrs Thorp, Mr Dover. read prayers in afternoon in Chapel practised singing with children in evening wrote to Rivington

FRIDAY 5 MARCH Ember letters from C.[.] Bowden and Mr Banister fb fd f till 6 read morning and afternoon read visitation service to Miss Clark. wrote to Walter, Mr Thompson, H.W.[.] F., T.M.[.] Wood, Bowden

TO J. W. BOWDEN

Littlemore March 5/41¹

My dear Bowden

I am glad you are all together at Roehampton; people say we shall not have much severe weather this spring. A few weeks, I trust, will set you quite right. You must not be surprised that so much trial and exertion should overset you.

¹ See fourth note to letter of 16 Jan. from Crawley placed after that of 14 Jan. to him, and third note to letter of 14 Jan.

² See second and seventh notes to letter of 12 Jan. to E. B. Pusey.

³ Though not part of the Library, a complete edition of Anthony Farindon's *Sermons* was published in four volumes in 1849.

⁴ See fifth note to letter of 12 Jan. to Pusey. See Appendix 2 for details of works mentioned following.

⁵ 'The Order for the Visitation of the Sick' in *The Book of Common Prayer*.

5 MARCH 1841

If your article *only* wants copying out, send it to me, and I have an expert little boy in a corner of my rooms who will do it.¹

¹I am in Oxford from Saturday morning till Tuesday evening of a week.¹

Ever Yrs affly J H N

P.S. I am reading your Hildebrand carefully and am quite in admiration of your great skill in composing.²

TO THOMAS MOZLEY

Littlemore March 5 [1841]

My dear T

I am sorry to hoist out signals of distress, but I have just had a letter from Bowden who is knocked up with his trial and cannot finish his article.

I have one in type—one coming—one offered but which I fear I shall have to pluck—one promised—I am writing one myself; and perhaps a second. Under these circumstances I think I must have the face to ask you for *three*. But you shall know in time. Send up something to Roworth at once, please;—the printers want pabulum.

My brother Charles has joined the Socialists and has written to me for money with a view of establishing himself in their territory near you in Hampshire.³

Ever Yrs affly J H N.

I am in Oxford of a week from Saturday morning till Tuesday evening.

TO EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON

Littlemore March 5, 1841

My dear Sir

I am very much obliged by your kind and friendly letter—and assure you I am only pleased and flattered by the circumstance which you have thought it necessary to explain. Indeed I ought to be very thankful if what I have written has been found serviceable to you or to any one else.⁴

¹ Bowden's article was 'The Anglican Church in the Mediterranean', *Brit. Crit.*, 30, 1841 (July), 135–63. George Dean was acting regularly as Newman's secretary. Bowden's aunt, Jane Roberts, had died on 21 Feb., and as her executor, Bowden had been caught up in London for some while, sorting out her affairs.

² *The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh*, two volumes, London 1840. Newman was reviewing the work in his 'Reformation of the Eleventh Century', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (April), 280–331; *Ess.* II, 249–317.

³ The Owenite community 'Harmony Hall' at Queenwood, near East Tytherley, Hants. See Volume VII, 244, n. 2.

⁴ Thompson had been acting as curate at Calne, Wilts., but was now residing at '19 Beaumont Street—St Marylebone', presumably about to take up duties as curate to J. G. Ward at St James, Westminster, where he was to remain until 1845. He was a friend of Hope and Badeley, and the latter wrote to Newman on 3 April 1846, when Thompson was on the verge of conversion to Roman Catholicism: 'He is really almost a Pupil of your's, having been tutored and instructed mainly by your writings.'

5 MARCH 1841

It is a great undertaking to furnish a Divinity List, and at this moment and writing from this place I could not attempt it.¹ But I will give thought to the subject and you shall hear again from me. I write on the receipt of yours lest I should seem wanting in attention

I am, My dear Sir, Yours faithfully John H Newman

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

Littlemore [March 5/41]¹

My dear H

I wanted you to give not above two lines to the two works I sent you. They seemed to me books which should be *encouraged*, nothing more. One sentence would really do. But since I have written notices for them in the Summary at the End of the Review, you can leave them out, if you like, quite well.

My idea certainly was to make the Review one of *children's books*. Still qu. *is the Fairy Bower* such?—Favorable opinions of that work flow in—the general opinion seems to be that it is of the school of Miss Austen—as occurred to you, and to me before you when I read it.

I suppose you quote two or three little pretty bits from 'Little Mary';² such as question a little queen etc.

Ever Yrs J H N

[The *Globe*³ says that the letters of Catholicus are written by an Oxford Dignitary—Faussett? it is a fit occasion for such a *Malleus Hæreticorum*.]⁴

SATURDAY 6 MARCH 1841 Ember letters from H W.[.] Mrs Smalley[.] C Miller and Walter's packet walked in early to church 8 A M dined in hall sent parcels to Oakeley, Walter, and Roworth with part of review of Hildebrand

SUNDAY 7 MARCH 2 Lent Notice of Confirmation came Haddan did duty in morning He, Ward and C M assisting me in Sacrament I read in afternoon and preached Number 551⁵ Ward[.] I Williams and J M to dinner in my rooms⁶

¹ Badeley explained that Thompson's views had been, 'materially strengthened by the perusal of some of the writings of the more prominent English Theologians, such as Bramhall, Laud, etc!'

² M. R. Giberne's story for children which was reviewed by Wilberforce in the article which is the subject of the above. See second and third letters to Wilberforce placed at 1 March.

³ See *Globe and Traveller*, No. 12, 095, 3 March 1841, which continued, '... "Catholicus" of the *Times* declares the blindness of Sir R. PEEL to the fact that, like a body without a soul, a party without an idea can have no unity, his policy had an idea in it, which, however, is now no longer held by his party.'

⁴ 'Hammer of Heretics', an anti-Lutheran work by Johann Faber (1478–1541), published in Cologne in 1524. The title was applied to various figures, including St Anthony of Padua (1195–1231) and St Peter Canisius (1521–97).

⁵ P.S. VI, 2, 'Life the Season of Repentance'.

⁶ '... on the second Sunday after the Tract had appeared, Ward, who had predicted that it would arouse a tumult, was dining with Newman, and Newman said, "You see, Ward, you are a false prophet." When Ward returned that night to Balliol, he found that the Protest of the Four Tutors was already prepared. It appeared the next day; by the end of the week came down, like a clap of thunder, the Protest of the Heads, and instantly the silence was broken by its being reverberated through every paper in the country.' R. E. Prothero, *The Life and Correspondence of A. P. Stanley* . . ., London 1893, I, 292.

7 MARCH 1841

TO THOMAS MOZLEY

Oriel March 7/41

My dear T

I have long wished to write to you on one subject connected with the Editorship of the B.C. on which I don't know whether you will agree with me but I give you my view. There is a small but rising party among the R C.s who are taking a far more Church line than the body and who in fact give up as a bad job their co-religionists in England and Ireland. Pugin is especially one of them, and (in spite of his vulgar letter about the Cranmer Memorial)¹ is a very good fellow, I do think. It is edifying to hear the way in which he abuses the common run of Romanists. Mr Ambrose Phillip[p]s is another. He has been writing to the Tablet in defence of the English Church and us in particular²—and is so attacked by his own party as to be a sort of Confessor. On the other hand Bishop Baines at Rome speaks to Rogers and Hope against 'converts who have the remains of private judgment' etc.³ Now I think these men are to be encouraged on every account—first for truth's sake, secondly for themselves—thirdly from policy, for it would be *politically* to get up a split in the R C. body—and I do think things tend that way. I say all this that you may understand how it will bear upon the treatment of Romanism in the B.C. Pugin is much hurt and I really think with reason at the *mode* in which you spoke of him in your article—and, to tell the truth, though I let your explanation last November in the Notices of Books go to press as you sent it me, I thought the tone of it rather ungracious and the spirit grudging and surlyish.⁴

Well, that you may be au courant you must know that Mr Phillip[p]s has addressed two (very wild) letters to Bloxam—yet with so much of earnest feeling that I have had them copied out—As to his notion of bringing foreigners here, it is preposterous—We have written to protest, and if he does so, I shall go up to Littlemore and hide myself. I send you the letters and my answer to the second, not that it is worth much.⁵ Pray send them me back.

Do you see what a turn the Times is taking? You should read yesterday's (March 6) paper—to me who recollect the whole history of the Movement it is

¹ *A Letter on the proposed Protestant Memorial to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, addressed to the Subscribers to and Promoters of that Undertaking*, London 1839. The strength of Pugin's fury can be seen in his designation of the Reformers as 'vile, blasphemous impostors pretending inspiration while setting forth false doctrines'. Subscribers and promoters were described as 'foul revilers, tyrants, usurpers, extortioners and liars'.

² See fifth note to letter of 12 Feb. to J. W. Bowden.

³ See letter of 29 Jan. from F. Rogers placed after that of 10 Jan. to him.

⁴ In his article on 'New Churches', Mozley included a reproduction of an engraving of Pugin's St Mary's Church, Derby, together with some remarks of restrained admiration. However, he made great play of the original engraving having carried the caption 'Cathedral' rather than 'Catholic' Church, suggesting that this reflected Roman Catholic ecclesiastical aspirations (*Brit. Crit.*, 28, 1840 (Oct.), 513–14). The following issue reported Pugin's explanation of the mistake, but also carried comments by Mozley which in no way withdrew his earlier imputation (op. cit., 29, 1841 (Jan.), 248).

⁵ A. L. Phillipp[s] had written in his letter of 28 Feb. to J. R. Bloxam: 'I hope myself to be the means of introducing to Oxford some foreign Theologians who, I assure you, thoroughly appreciate the Catholic movement there. . . .' Newman's discouragement did not prevail. See note to diary for 28 Sept.

almost affecting.¹ What would Froude have said! but perhaps he is in good measure the hidden cause.

On the other hand I have just published a Tract No 90 which people fear will get me into a scrape—it is on the Articles.² It has been sent off by enemies to various Bishops, and is selling very fast here. *I* think people are *sick* of the subject, and will in weariness let us rest. They have cried wolf till they have no voice. The Tract was necessary to keep our young friends etc from stumbling at the Articles³ and going to Rome

Ever Yrs affly J H N

¹ A leading article of Saturday 6 March's issue declared that: 'Several journals have laboured very perseveringly for some time to connect *The Times* with what they are pleased to call "Puseyism;" and the fact of our having on Thursday last expressed a feeling of regret that we had formerly spoken in terms of unmerited harshness of the author[s] of the Oxford Tracts is declared to be "ominous," by a contemporary, whose qualifications for deciding upon questions relating to the doctrine of the Church of England are tolerably notorious.' The article then went on to stoutly defend the paper's new position. It then traced the origins of the Oxford Movement to the controversy over the Irish Church Question, 'during the first three years of LORD GREY'S ministry.' Having drawn attention to Perceval's letter in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, the writer pointed out the importance of the Hadleigh Meeting of July 1833. An attack was directed at those who tinkered with the liturgy at whim, and at the same time attacked 'Puseyites' for supposedly deviating from Anglican doctrine and practice. And, finally, it put a question about Tractarians as individuals: 'And what is the character of their writings and their lives? No man, however widely differing from them, can open any of their publications, without perceiving that they write with learning, ability, calmness, seriousness, command of temper, a strong sense of responsibility, forbearance, and courtesy of language towards their adversaries. No man can know anything of their lives without being aware that they act consistently with their professions, that they are more than usually strict, circumspect, self-denying, and . . . pious.' *The Times*, No. 17,611, p. 5.

A further article on 9 March insisted that the paper was still 'very desirous of avoiding controversy on the subject of the Oxford Tracts' and while agreeing to publish a letter of protest received from 'A PROTESTANT', the writer repeated that the paper had not been delving into the merits of the theological controversy in its article of 6 March. It defended its description of the strength of Tractarianism, pointing out that its influence was much greater than the numbers attached to the immediate party. 'We are at a loss to account in any other way for the fact, that in 1832 and 1833 numerous pamphlets, advocating changes in the Liturgy, emanated from members of the church, of *Conservative politics*, and (chiefly) "*evangelical*" sentiments in religion; and that since the growth of the Oxford Theology attracted notice, nothing of the kind had emanated from any influential quarter within the church.' *The Times*, No. 17, 613, p. 5.

A brief article on Thursday March 11 announced that the Letter of the Four Tutors had been printed in the paper, adding, 'with respect to these four Tutors themselves, . . . we trust they do not instruct their pupils in the sort of English they appear to write.' *The Times*, No. 17, 615, p. 5.

² J. B. Mozley wrote to his sister Anne the next day:

'A new Tract has come out this last week, which is beginning to make a sensation. It is on the Articles, and shows that they bear a highly Catholic meaning; and that many doctrines, of which the Romanist are corruptions, may be held consistently with them. This is no more than what we know as a matter of history, for the Articles were expressly worded with a view to bring in R. Catholics. But people are astonished and confused at the idea now, as if it was quite new. And they have been so accustomed for a long time to look at the Articles as on a par with the Creed, that they think, I suppose, that if they subscribe to them they are bound to hold whatever doctrines are (not positively stated in them), but merely not condemned. So if they will bear a Tractarian sense, they are thereby all of them Tractarians. But whatever the view may be, there seems to be something brewing and a man of this College [Magdalen] told me just now that he had been canvassed to join in a public protest against the Tract. It is of course highly complimentary to the whole set of us to be so very much surprised that we should think what we hold to be consistent with the Articles which we have subscribed. Whether anything will really come of the matter I don't know. A hundred of the Tract sold in Oxford on Saturday. The Warden of Wadham is alarmed. . . .', *J. B. Mozley*, pp. 111–12.

³ From the time that I had entered upon the duties of Public Tutor at my College, when my doctrinal views were very different from what they were in 1841, I had meditated a comment upon the Articles. Then, when the Movement was in its swing, friends had said to me, "What will you make of the Articles?" but I did not share the apprehension which their question implied. Whether, as time went on, I should have been forced, by the necessities of the original theory of the Movement, to put on paper the speculations which I had about them, I am not able to conjecture. The actual cause of my doing so, in the beginning of 1841, was the restlessness, actual and prospective, of those who neither liked the *Via Media*, nor my strong judgment

8 MARCH 1841

MONDAY 8 MARCH 1841 letter to me from Churton, Wilson, Griffiths and Tate [Tait] *Letter to me of the 'Four Gentlemen.'* dined in hall sent copy of Hildebrand¹ to Roworth

FROM T. T. CHURTON AND OTHERS²

Oxford, March 8, 1841

To the Editor of the 'Tracts for the Times'.

Sir,

Our attention having been called to No. 90 in the series of 'Tracts for the Times by Members of the University of Oxford,' of which you are the Editor, the impression produced on our minds by its contents is of so painful a character that we feel it our duty to intrude ourselves briefly on your notice. This publication is entitled 'Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles'; and, as these Articles are appointed by the Statutes of the University to be the text-book for Tutors in their theological teaching, we hope that the situations we hold in our respective colleges will secure us from the charge of presumption in thus coming forward to address you.

The tract has, in our apprehension, a highly dangerous tendency, from its suggestion that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England: for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines,

1. Of Purgatory,
2. Of Pardons,
3. Of the Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics,
4. Of the Invocation of Saints,
5. Of the Mass,

against Rome. I had been enjoined, I think by my Bishop, to keep these men straight, and I wished to do so: but their tangible difficulty was subscription to the Articles; and thus the question of the Articles came before me. It was thrown in our teeth; "How can you manage to sign the Articles? they are directly against Rome." "Against Rome?" I made the answer, "What do you mean by 'Rome?'" and then I proceeded to make distinctions . . .', *Apo.*, pp. 77-8.

Newman was only too aware of the restlessness of Robert Williams. In the previous summer, he had written in despair to Pusey, 'what is to be done with a man who begins with assuming as a first principle which is incontrovertibly borne in upon his mind that the Roman is the Catholic Church, that therefore the Tridentine Decrees are eternal truth, that to oppose them is heresy, that all who sign the 39 articles do oppose them, and that it is a sin to be in communion with heretics?' Volume VII, 371-2. Twenty-five years later, Newman explained that *Tract 90* 'was published originally after the deliberation of a year', Volume XXII, 206.

¹ i.e. Newman's article 'Bowden's *Life of Gregory VII. Reformation of the Eleventh Century*', *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (April); *Ess.* II, 249-317.

² . . . in Oxford war had been declared against the Tractarians in good earnest. A meeting of their opponents was held in the rooms of the Rev. Edward Cockey, Fellow of Wadham College; it consisted of the Rev. C. P. Golightly, of Oriel College, who had been the most prominent in stirring up the agitation; the Rev. A. C. Tait, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College; the Rev. Thomas Brancker, Fellow and Divinity Lecturer of Wadham College; the Rev. T. T. Churton, Vice-Principal and Tutor of Brasenose College; the Rev. H. B. Wilson, Fellow and Senior Tutor of St John's College; and the Rev. John Griffiths, Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham College. At this meeting, a letter to the Editor of the Tracts, the draft of which was prepared by Mr Tait, was discussed, altered, and finally thrown into its existing form. Mr Cockey and Mr Brancker did not sign it, lest it should have the appearance of proceeding too largely from Wadham College. It was thought advisable that Mr Golightly should not sign because he held no office in his college or in the University. Some tutors in other colleges, "known to disapprove of the 'Tracts for the Times,' were asked to join in the letter, but declined." In the event it bore the signatures, as Pusey remarked, of two Latitudinarians and two Evangelicals. With Mr Wilson and Mr Tait were associated Mr Griffiths and Mr Churton.' Liddon's *Pusey* II, 167-8. It is doubtful whether Tait could be labelled a 'Latitudinarian', certainly at this time. The other Tutors approached seem to have been: C. P. Eden, of Oriel; G. H. S. Johnson of Queen's College; Travers Twiss of University College; E. H. Hansell of Magdalen College; and, R. Hussey of Christ Church.

'The letter was delivered in manuscript to Newman through Mr J. H. Parker on the evening of Monday, March 8th, the day on which it was written. Newman at once took it to Pusey, and they agreed upon a reply. It was not sent, however, until the following day.' Liddon's *Pusey* II, 169.

as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome; but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do. It is intimated, moreover, that the Declaration prefixed to the Articles, so far as it has any weight at all, sanctions this mode of interpreting them, as it is one which takes them in their 'literal and grammatical sense,' and does not 'affix any new sense' to them. The Tract would thus appear to us to have a tendency to mitigate, beyond what charity requires, and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own, and to shake the confidence of the less learned members of the Church of England in the Scriptural character of her formularies and teaching.

We readily admit the necessity of allowing that liberty in interpreting the formularies of the Church, which has been advocated by many of its most learned Bishops and other eminent divines; but this tract puts forward new and startling views as to the extent to which that liberty may be carried. For if we are right in our apprehension of the author's meaning, we are at a loss to see what security would remain, were his principles generally recognized, that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the lecture-rooms of the University and from the pulpits of our churches.

In conclusion, we venture to call your attention to the impropriety of such questions being treated in an anonymous publication, and to express an earnest hope that you may be authorized to make known the writer's name. Considering how very grave and solemn the whole subject is, we cannot help thinking that both the Church and the University are entitled to ask that some person, besides the printer and publisher of the tract, should acknowledge himself responsible for its contents.

We are, Sir, Your obedient humble servants,

T. T. Churton, M.A., Vice-Principal and Tutor of Brasenose College.

H. B. Wilson, B.D., Fellow and Senior Tutor of St John's College.

John Griffiths, M.A., Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham College.

A. C. Tait, M. A., Fellow and Senior Tutor of Balliol College.¹

TO THOMAS T. CHURTON AND OTHERS

March 8. 1841²

The Editor of The Tracts for the Times begs to acknowledge the receipt of the very courteous communication of Mr Churton, Mr Wilson, Mr Griffiths and Mr

¹ A. C. Tait seems to have taken the lead in preparing and drafting the letter: 'As soon as Tait had read the Tract he seems to have felt that the time had arrived when a public protest was called for. His first idea was to write himself to the Editor, and among his papers is the draft of a letter which was never sent. For he decided, after consideration, to invite the co-operation of others . . . Its [the letter's] authorship is placed beyond dispute by the fact that, with the exception of about three lines, every sentence it contains is to be found in one part or another of the original draft letter, which is considerably longer than the published Protest', R. T. Davidson and W. Benham, *The Life of A. C. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury*, London 1891, I, 80-1. While, as Newman put it, Golightly played the role of 'Tony Fire-the-faggot' in the episode: 'To the end of his life Archibald Tait used to be taunted with having "hounded Newman out of Oxford" . . .', op. cit., I, 83. It should be noted that Golightly acted as a curate to Tait in the parish of Baldon, just outside Oxford.

Some months later, Frederick Temple, who was on a study holiday at Robert Scott's Cornwall Rectory, wrote to J. D. Coleridge: 'What do you think I have been studying at Duloe?—the correspondence, upon No. 90, between Scott and his friends. One thing in the business reflects some credit on the "Canny Lion of the North" [Tait]; his three brethren, it appears, were anxious not only to protest against the false doctrine of the Tract, but wished also to insert a scheme of the Church's (*i.e.*, their) doctrine on the points in question; Tait, however, would not have anything to do with that. Just imagine what a glorious opportunity for Newman, if they had been fools enough to answer his Ultra High Church Tract by a scheme of Ultra Low Church doctrine! He would have smashed them so completely that nobody would have liked to attack No. 90 again. But it, certainly, would have been very unlike Tait to have placarded an express opinion in his own name to the walls of the University.' E. H. Coleridge, *The Life and Correspondence of John Duke Lord Coleridge* . . ., London 1904, I, 98-9.

² 'This answer reached Wadham College on Tuesday, the 9th, in the middle of the day, just as the printed letter of the Four Tutors was being circulated throughout Oxford.' Liddon's *Pusey II*, 170.

Tait, and receives it as expressing the opinion of persons for whom he has much respect and whose names carry great weight.

TUESDAY 9 MARCH 1841¹ letters from Oakeley, Roworth and F. and H. Copeland went to town dined in hall walked to Littlemore in the evening—Church part of the way with me wrote to Walter, Oakeley, H.[.] C.[.] F. and Mr Banister

FROM MRS T. MOZLEY

†March 8. 1841

I am full of your unhappy news of Charles . . . I would not have Aunt know any thing of this at present—it would quite upset her—it keeps *me* awake.

I hoped Tom would begin [[his editorship of the *British Critic*]] with a handfull of articles as a fund. He has too many things to think of at once. It does not worry him as it would most, but for *his* accurate and complete mode of doing things, he ought to have ample time, or he does not do himself justice. He cannot sit down at any moment, and pass from subject to subject as you can, and yet his versatility is as great as any one's, I know.¹

TO MRS T. MOZLEY

†March 9. 1841

I have got into what may prove a serious mess here. I have just published a Tract (90) which I did not feel likely to excite attention.

I sent it to Keble before publishing—he too made no remark upon it. But people are taking it up very warmly, thanks (I believe) entirely to Golightly.¹

¹ "Tacitus, as is well known, speaks severely of the busy people who were known in the Rome of his day as *delatores*, and he wishes that they could have been kept more in check than they were by the law. They are, as is to be feared, a natural product of the suspicion and panic which haunts all governments that have been tempted to substitute personal prejudice for resolute adherence to a rule of right. The same influence which had prompted the letter of the Four Tutors was already at work in higher quarters, and it impossible, in spite of his real virtues, to deny to Mr Golightly the merit which may attach to a pertinacity which resembled fanaticism. He sought and obtained an interview with the Vice-Chancellor, Dr Wynter, and urged upon him the duty of "bringing Tract 90 in a formal manner before the notice of the Heads of Houses, and eventually of the University at large." The Vice-Chancellor, thus urged, submitted the Tract to the Hebdomadal Council for discussion on March 10th.' Liddon's *Pusey*, II, 170. Liddon gives as the source of his account a 'MS. account by Dr Wynter kindly lent to the author'. For a clear account of the events of these days, see letter of 14 March from R. W. Church to F. Rogers placed at 21 March.

At the same time, Golightly began to write to all the Bishops, enclosing copies of *Tract 90*. 'The replies he got to the letters he distributed so widely, while in general sympathetic, were not always as enthusiastic for strong measures as he could wish. Dr. Blomfield, the bishop of London, deprecated any official action in the University, as likely to endanger yet more the peace of the Church. His advice was to leave it to the bishops. He wrote a second time to Golightly, to rebuke him for misusing his name and letter to agitate for official action against the Tract. Dr. Phillpotts, bishop of Exeter, was too busy to read the Tract, but wrote on 1 April, to say that he had heard enough of it to make him "deplore the rashness and culpable indiscretion of the Writer" . . . The bishop of Chichester [P. N. Shuttleworth] had to admit to Golightly that "Newman's remarks on the Homilies have unfortunately some truth. They were written before the old language of the Church had gone out of use: it is unfortunate that they should (unintentionally no doubt) have appeared now and then to insinuate the inspiration of the Apocrypha" . . .', R. W. Greaves, 'Golightly and Newman, 1824-1845', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, IX, 1, 1958 (Oct.), 222.

In a letter of 22 Oct., accompanying an inscribed copy of his *Brief Remarks upon No. 90, Second Edition, and some subsequent Publications in Defence of it*, Oxford 1841, Golightly wrote to Newman, '. . . to assure you that my hostility does not extend to yourself personally, but to your *opinions*, and, I may add, your *mode of advocating them*. Upon this as upon a former occasion [see Volume VII, 328-9] I have done nothing upon my own judgment, but have carefully consulted some of the most intelligent and rightminded friends I have, first, whether there was anything wrong in the temper and spirit of what I had written, and next whether there was anything incorrect in the argument. What could I have done more?'

9 MARCH 1841

FROM E. B. PUSEY

March 8 1841

My dear N.

I have just read thro' your tract; the whole object of it as well as particular parts will be starting to people who have not felt the need of such views of the articles, or met with those to whom they would be a comfort. People will be annoyed too at having their broad <i.e. vague> notions of what is Romish taken away from them. I suppose it will be a considerable trial for the time, tho' good in the end. We must bid our time with patience until the storm be over, and pray it damage not the truth. I should hardly have thought people in general ripe for it <tho' some may need it, and they ought to be regarded>; I hope this will not put you out of heart; I have an implicit confidence in all you do [.]

.....

ever yrs very affecte E B P.

TO E. B. PUSEY

Tuesday [9 March 1841]

My dear P

Have you anything to say about my *answer* which is not yet sent? If so, I will come to you.

Ought I to give my name? What advantage does it give them over me? On the other hand, if they print their letter, which they mean to do, will it not be a greater advantage over me, for me *to be known* yet *not* to say?

I thought I had better not go into the question with them

Ever Yrs affly J H N

FROM E. B. PUSEY

[9 March 1841]

My dear N.

I thought your answer had been sent. I am inclined to think it better, if you give your name, to add some little explanation at least, to shew for whom the tract is needed i.e. that you do not need such views yourself, but that they are for such as are in perplexity.

It seems to me that you can take the 2 lines, either not to regard yourself as accountable to these persons, and so only civilly acknowledge their letter (as you have done) or if you do give your name and so enter into communication personally with them that it would be best really to answer their, i.e. not the request only to know the name of the writer, (for they must already know both from internal evidence and from report that the tract is yours) but the *τοποι* of their letter. I should think it not a bad thing if you wrote an answer which they might also print; for the English always ask 'cui bono?' they dislike especially people's minds being unsettled without an adequate cause; and this seemed to me just what your tract wanted. It gives a latitude of construction to the articles which will be startling, and since it does not assign any motive for it, it seems unpractical. Whereas if it be stated, that there must be persons, who are afraid that the articles condemn more than they do, opinions which were held by some in early times as well as Romish errors, and that the tract is to meet a specific case, and retain such people in the Church, they will be satisfied. Again it is Palmer's view (or said to be) that the Council of Trent does not countenance all the error which it seems to do.

10 MARCH 1841

In a word, giving your name seems to me to be a half measure and only occasioning it to be bandied about, and disparaging use made of it, but I should like to see an explanation which I think should be given sooner or later, [to] accompany it.

yrs very affectely E B Pusey

I should like to see somewhere an explanation in your own words of your grounds for writing the tract; plain (perhaps over-cautious) persons, e.g. Jelf, are perplexed by your having done a startling thing without an apparent motive; on the other hand, people's confidence is won (whatever they think of the merits of the case) by a candid open exposition of motives[.]

WEDNESDAY 10 MARCH 1841¹ letters from Mr Talbot and Wood. visited Miss Clerk fb fd
f till 6 wrote to Mr Talbot

FROM WILLIAM PALMER (OF WORCESTER COLLEGE)

St Giles's Tuesday [9 March 1841]

My dear Newman

Though I have taken no part in the discussions relative to the Tracts, I yet feel it a duty to express to you, under present circumstances, the gratification which I have derived from Number 90 just published. While I should hesitate to commit myself to every statement contained in it, I have no hesitation in expressing an opinion that it is the *most valuable* of the series of Tracts that has come under my observation. It will tend to shake people out of their implicit reception of *traditionary interpretations* which impose human opinions as little less than articles of faith. It will lead to a really *critical* system of interpreting the Articles, and will ultimately produce more union on the articles of *Catholic faith*, and more toleration of *opinions*, which have been at all times tolerated in the Universal Church.

I may perhaps have seen a few expressions that I would have wished otherwise, but on the whole I most cordially thank you for this excellent Tract, and if my opinion can be of any use to you I do not wish to conceal it.

Ever Yours W. Palmer.

FROM W. G. WARD TO R. W. CHURCH

Wednesday [[March 10 [1841]]]

My dear Church

Both Tait and Woollcombe have been *extremely* struck by Palmer's letter; specially the latter, Tait says Twiss tells him there is a report of the heads meeting *to-day* on the subject: might it be

¹ For an account of the first meeting of the Hebdomadal Board see letter from R. W. Church placed at the following day. J. B. Mozley wrote to his sister on the Saturday: 'You have probably seen . . . the letter from the four tutors. This was followed up by meetings for two or three days running, of the Heads of Houses; the Warden of Wadham [B. P. Symons] being the chief, instigated they say by Golightly—not that the Tract itself is not sufficient reason to account for the row, for it certainly is bold in parts. Newman expected that it would create some disturbance, but not quite so much as it has. I believe, however, the main cause of alarm is not this or that thing in it, but the whole subject being brought to bear on the Articles. Those who have always thought the Articles ultra Protestant, and have been accustomed to think so ever since they were born, are naturally horrified at the idea that even their stronghold does not protect them, and that the wolf may come in and devour them any day. The Heads have accordingly met, and very furious they were. The first day, I hear on good authority, some of them could not condescend even to a regular discussion of the question, so entirely had their vague apprehensions overpowered their faculties. Dr Richards, the Rector of Exeter, who is a strong man on our side, had a letter from Palmer of Worcester, in his pocket, in which he (Palmer) declared his full approval of the Tract, in tending to lay it before them, in the hope that Palmer's known character as a theologian and a moderate man would have some effect on them; but they were in such commotion that the letter would have been lost upon them, and, he did not read it. Palmer sent this letter quite spontaneously, and it does him great credit, especially as he and Newman were rather on cool terms some time ago.' *J. B. Mozley*, pp. 112–13.

10 MARCH 1841

well to ask Cornish from you to shew Palmer's letter to his Rector [of Exeter College; J. L. Richards] if he possibly can in the course of the morning?

Yrs W G Ward¹

TO R. W. CHURCH

Littlemore March 10/41

My dear Church

[Of course nothing could be better than for Richards to be shown P's [[Palmer's]] letter. I hope indeed he will take it to the Board. By the bye will you let a *copy* of it be taken as soon as it can conveniently, lest the original should get mislaid¹

Ever Yrs affly J H N

TO E. B. PUSEY

[10 March 1841]

My dear P.

I have no collections on the subject of Muratori's statement, and have been and am so pressed with the B.C. that I do not know how at the moment to look about it—but I will soon.

As to the Tract, I felt it was necessary for others—else I should not have done it. I do think that an alternative is coming on when a Bishop must consent to allow what really does seem to me quite a legitimate interpretation, or to witness quasi secessions, if not real ones, from the Church I send a letter received last night

Ever Yrs affly J H N

Thank you for what you say.

THURSDAY 11 MARCH 1841 letters from Oakeley, Mrs Bowden, A. Watson, H W.[.] Wilson with article, C read prayers to Miss Clerk (Keble's Lecture) Bishop's family came to see the Chapel children singing with Copeland sent Roworth Wilson's article—wrote to Archdeacon[.] H W.[.] Bowden, Wilson, A. Watson.

TO J. W. BOWDEN

[Littlemore March 11/41¹

My dear Bowden,

I write to keep you from sending me your papers—i.e. I find I shall most likely be able to do without them—and therefore it would be a pity you should not revise

¹ Church forwarded Ward's note to Newman, adding his own:
My dear N.

I have said *yes*. I suppose I have done right.

11 MARCH 1841

them at your leisure. But my hope is that you have not thought of doing otherwise. My condition at present is this—other men have promised me articles since your letter about your own, which I must accept if they come. I believe they will come—but I have not got them yet.

‘I am writing a miserably prosy review of your Hildebrand—and quite feel I am not doing it justice.¹ It is merely [[nearly]] a cento of passages and sentences from you, spoiled.

Sibthorp has sent Henry Wilberforce the following remark which I send you.

‘Have you read Bowden’s Pontificate of Gregory 7. It is one of the most deeply interesting books I have read for some time, and his views respecting the papal office, and its utility in past times, very striking. What a fearful rent did the Reformation make! and which exasperated feelings on both sides have kept open!’¹

I hope you are recovering by this time. Wood gives a good account of you. You have said not a word of Johnson lately. Owing to my being up here so much I have not seen him since his return.

‘Do you know I am getting into a scrape about Tract 90? Yet it must be—I cannot repent it a bit—unless indeed it should get Pusey involved in it. Palmer of Worcester has written to me approving of it in very strong terms and telling me I may use his name. People are so angry, they will attempt to do any thing. The Heads of Houses are on the move, but I have not heard yet whether they mean to do any thing. I repeat, I cannot repent it.’¹

Kindest thoughts of Mrs J W B and all of you, not forgetting my godson.

Ever Yrs affly John H Newman

P.S. I have just had Mrs Bowden’s most kind letter. Pray thank her. I *hope* you are not ill. Wood says not. ‘I have just heard the Board of Heads of Houses is *most fierce* with the Tract, and Tracts generally, and means to do something.’¹ Wilson of Hursley has just sent me an article.

FROM R. W. CHURCH

Wedn. Evg. [[March 10[1841]]]

My dear Newman

The Heads had a meeting today, sure enough, to discuss No 90, and Cornish came to me after it was over, and reported what the Rector [of Exeter College; J. L. Richards] had said of it. It seems that nothing was done today for two reasons: 1. that they had a good deal of other business, and 2. that many, or most of the assembly had not yet read the said Tract. However they were very fierce against it, and against the Tracts in general, against which they seem to have declared ‘war to the knife.’² They are accordingly to meet again on Friday at 2. to determine on their measures, as by that time every body may be presumed ‘up’ in the Tract.

The feeling in the board is represented by the Rector as so strong, that he did not like to read P.’s [Palmer’s] letter, as it would have been like throwing ‘cold water on red-hot iron’. Cornish seemed to think that he would not read it, but he is to take it with him on Friday, to make

¹ ‘Bowden’s *Life of Gregory VII. Reformation of the Eleventh Century*’, *Brit. Crit.*, 29, 1841 (April), 280–331; *Ess.* II, 249–317.

² Byron, *Childe Harold*, I, lxxxvi.

11 MARCH 1841

what use he may of it according to circumstances. He has not read the Tract himself yet, but there is no doubt but that though he might differ, and perhaps strongly, with parts of it, he would be utterly opposed to any step against it. Daman seems to be of the same mind: I shewed him P.'s letter this evening,—which has reassured and comforted Cornish himself as far as he wanted comfort. Keble is here in my room writing his lecture. All well. He hangs out in Rogers' room.

Yours ever affectly R W C.

Golius [C. P. Golightly] in high glee: he ventured to join the $\rho\omicron\mu\pi\eta$ ¹ of the Provost, and actually took the condescending line about a paper which he had sent the Provost and which the latter had not yet looked at.

TO R. W. CHURCH

[Littlemore Thursday]¹ [11 March 1841]

My dear Church

[I wish Cornish, or some one else, would give me some idea whether I shall give up my name. <(I think the Vice Chancellor will *send* to me to ask, on common report; of course I shall give [[it]] then.)> I *do* want to know this.

My idea was to write a sort of explanation of the Tract at once—but if they are at *all* the Tracts, that is hardly worth while perhaps.

Could Keble think over it?

Pusey seemed to me to wish to me [sic] to give my name and defend it—I wish it. The only question is what will come of it as regards the Vice Chancellor.

I shall be in to Oxford tomorrow afternoon.¹

Ever Yrs affly J H N

Thank Marriott much for his kind note. I will have some talk with him about D.[Dalgairns?]

FROM R. W. CHURCH

Oriel. Thursday [[March 11. 1841]]

My dear Newman

I have shewn your note to Cornish, I. Williams, and Keble. They all agree that it is better to remain quiet, and not give up your name until it is officially called for. The Exeter Common Room according to Cornish, (i.e. Sewell, Daman, and Spranger) are all of this mind. Things might be said *out of* Oxford against an *anonymous* Tract, which would not be said against you, and I should have thought it desirable that your name should come out ultimately; but this it will in the course of things, I suppose, time enough to meet $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\epsilon\acute{\zeta}\omega$, while *in Oxford* to give it *now*, would be merely giving them a move.

People are still very angry. Golly has struck up a great intimacy with the Provost, whom he has propemped twice to his lodgings, and whom he patronizes most kindly. The first consequence to the Provost of his new alliance was the loss of his breakfast this morning owing to G.'s pertinacious prosing. There was a meeting from 9 to 1—but I don't know what about. The report is that V. C. [Vice Chancellor; Philip Wynter] has said he will not meddle: other people

¹ 'escort' or 'entourage'.

11 MARCH 1841

talk of an admonition to the Tutors—concerning *what?* Keble has written to V. C. saying that he had carefully read the Tract, and recommended its publication. He does not think that any thing will come of it. The Times is flinching, but at the same time kicks the IV [Tutors].

I have shewn P.'s [Palmer's] letter to Mules, Eden, and Dayman, and I. Williams shewed it to Short: I suppose I have not been too free with it. I let Mules take a copy.—

I am sorry to say that S. Wilberforce has just lost his wife. She died yesterday.

Ever yrs affectly R W C.

TO HENRY WILBERFORCE

Littlemore ¹March 11/41¹

My dear H

I return Sibthorp's letter with thanks.¹ It is very amusing. ¹Do you know I am in a regular scrape about that Tract 90?—*all* through Golius [Golightly]—who has solely proprio marte stirred up the world, who else would have slept. What is to come I know not. Heads of Houses are sitting upon it. Yet I cannot repent it a bit. People know me now. That's a comfort. I *trust* it won't involve Pusey—that is my only fear.¹ How long the suspence will last, I know not—but if you will think of me, I should feel obliged

Ever Yrs affly J H N

P.S. Since writing this, I have had your most distressing letter.² I will not forget it.

FRIDAY 12 MARCH 1841 letters from H W with Mrs S.W's death and C. Keble came up to morning service f b Keble read his Lecture wrote to S. Wilberforce, sent C's letters to H.

TO MRS T. MOZLEY

¹March 12. 1841

I fear I am clean dished. The Heads of Houses are at this very moment concocting a manifesto against me. Do not think I fear for my cause. We have had too great a run of luck.¹

FROM MRS T. MOZLEY

¹March 14. 1841¹

¹We hear nothing but ill news, I think, on all sides of us just now. I am glad to hear you are not annoyed at your affairs, but it sounds formidable at a distance . . . The tug of war must come some day; let it be now, *if you are* prepared. And that I hope is the case. *I trust to you*, as a thousand others will, and you will have their good wishes and prayers, like mine, only better. I look to your late answer to the Roman Catholic's letters,³ as a pledge for your being carried through

¹ See letter of this day to J. W. Bowden.

² See letter of following day to S. Wilberforce.

³ Apparently, those of A. L. Phillipps, which Newman had responded to through Bloxam. Harriett wrote to Jemima: 'J.H.N. has been writing privately a most triumphant and masterly answer to the Roman Catholic application . . . My feeling of the matter is that a "cardinal's hat" or rather more than that has been offered him direct from Rome, and I think he has looked upon it with an infinitely more single eye

12 MARCH 1841

this matter without harm. We shall get the Tract, and though I shall take a long breath before I read it, I will continue to believe that it does not go too far. We have been for some years being thrust down upon first principles, too deep for even respectable divines and theologians to penetrate. We must look to those who are fitted to make such studies their sole business, and all we have to give are our prayers, that the Truth may prosper, and that no bitter root may spring up in individuals or in the body who are labouring in its cause. Hitherto this has been singularly the case; and I trust the pending event, if it comes to any thing will serve to make every one more serious, and thin the ranks of those who otherwise might perhaps have eventually proved scandals in some way or other. . . .

. . . I do *now* so fear for C's [Charles's] mind. What is to be done with him, I cannot tell. I often think how exactly the case is, as I have heard my Father, alas, often and often predict.¹

FROM A. P. PERCEVAL

East Horsley March. 10. 1841

My dear Newman,

Pusey, whom pray thank for his letter received today, writes me word of some counter-movement in consequence of the last tract. This has led me to look it over more carefully than I had done before—and it seems to me both right to you and a satisfaction to myself to tell you, that though in my short sightedness I could have wished it at another time than just at present when men are perhaps less qualified to receive the statements calmly, than they were a little time back—or will be probably a little time hence—I mean from the *political* espousal of the questions pro and con by the state politicians. And though I should have been tempted to employ a little more of the wisdom of the serpent—e.g. not have unnecessarily quoted the passage from Estius which both from the matter and author must needs be very likely to raise a cry of war to the knife. Yet I think it one of the most important papers that has been put out, and calculated, under God's Blessing, to do much good. It's main object unexceptionable, and in details it's opponents must look sharp to ground a serious objection.

If I can do you any service, I will not fail you. But that can only be if good opportunity offers which does not depend upon myself.

Yours in heart and affection Arthur Perceval

TO A. P. PERCEVAL

Oriel March 12/41

My dear Perceval

Many thanks for your kind letter just received. I certainly am at this instant in a pretty considerable scrape, but am only surprised at the long run of luck we have had.

The Tract was necessary to keep people either from Rome or schism or an uncomfortable conscience. It was necessary for my own peace so much as this, that I felt people *did not know* me, and were trusting me when otherwise they would not. I really cannot repent of having done it. As to the newspapers, it is a curious coincidence—but all these things will turn to good. The Tract was in print, not to say published, before the Papers opened the subject.

I did not think it would have made a noise. I expected it to come in quietly—and it would, but for two things first Golightly who is *the* Tony Fire-the-Faggot¹ of

than did Laud. As simple as a child, and as bold as a lion, he has turned their inconsistency of principle upon themselves; in such a way as, I think, must make all ashamed who have had a hand in the application', D. Mozley (ed.), *Newman Family Letters*, London 1962, p. 101.

¹ In Scott's *Kenilworth* (it was the nickname of Tony Foster).

12 MARCH 1841

the affair, and who would be pleased to know I felt him to be so—and secondly Lord Morpeth's speech in the House the other night¹

Repeating my thanks I am My dear Perceval
Yrs affectly John H Newman

P.S. Mr Pauli is a Christian and has been Pusey's assistant in Hebrew—and takes Pupils here. He is well thought of, I believe.

Palmer, I am glad to say, quite sanctions the Tract.

TO E. B. PUSEY

[12 March 1841]

My dear P

You are most kind.² I assure you it was *very* great relief to my mind when I found what they meant to do. I am quite satisfied. I doubt whether any thing I could say would satisfy them. I am going to Littlemore tomorrow. On Monday I will have a talk—but they say that on Monday the Manifesto is to come out.

Ever Yrs affly J H N

Where is the passage in Bull?³

TO SAMUEL WILBERFORCE

Littlemore March 12/41

My dear Wilberforce,

I have just heard from Henry the dreadful blow with which it has pleased a good Providence to visit you⁴—and I hope you will not think a line or two intrusive merely to say that I very much wish to sympathise with you, though I know no one can,—except indeed He who has sent you the affliction. Depend upon it, He does nothing in vain—and He will enable you to bear what He puts upon you.

¹ Speaking in defence of the annual grant to Maynooth College, Lord Morpeth remarked, '... suppose it had been founded for the purpose of educating persons as ministers not of the Roman Catholic church, but of the Church established in these realms—and then, if it was alleged and could be proved by actual evidence, that some of the professors and lecturers in such an establishment, so far from pursuing its professed and avowed objects, were constantly disclaiming the distinctive Protestant character of the church, and denouncing what they were pleased to term the crimes of the reformation, and that it was notorious, that some of the pupils educated there were actually deserting the pale of the Establish Church, and embracing the doctrines of the Roman Catholic church—then it might be successfully contended, that such an institution did not answer the purposes for which it had been originally established, and that there was much in its management, much in the course of tuition pursued there, which might call for, and justify the interference of Parliament.' He then went on to quote at length from an anti-Tractarian article in the *Church of England Quarterly Review*. *Hansard*, third series, LVI, 1238–42 (March 2).

² Pusey had written himself to the Vice Chancellor. See letter placed before that of 14 March to Pusey.

³ A lengthy passage from Bull's *Vindication of the Church of England* which Newman included in his *Letter to Jelf*. See *V.M.* II, 380–3.

⁴ Samuel Wilberforce's wife, Emily, had died during the morning of 10 March after a brief illness, and less than a month after the birth of their fourth son.

13 MARCH 1841

I speak what I from my heart feel when I say that I do think it shows that you are an object of His special care and love. He lets the world go on in its course, and have every thing at its will. But He deals otherwise with you.

Since yesterday, when H. [Wilberforce] told me of his alarm, the subject has been continually in my thoughts, and shall not cease to be. I wish I could write you a note more expressive of what I feel,

Yours, My dear Wilberforce, Most sincerely John H Newman

FROM SAMUEL WILBERFORCE

The Close March 13. 1841.

My dear Newman

I cannot leave your very kind note just received by me without an answer. I most heartily thank you for it: for your kind sympathy and the help of your prayers. I cannot speak of myself: at such a moment all the natural flow of feelings is so shaken out of its course that one knows not one-self. I earnestly desire the blessing of affliction: as earnestly as I can, I ask for it: and I am most grateful to those who will ask for me this great blessing. I do not wish the deep wound healed: I wish to be sure it has not smitten through me in vain.

Believe me my dear Newman to be most truly yours

S Wilberforce.

SATURDAY 13 MARCH 1841 letters from Bowden, Mr Eccleston, Goldsmid, Henderson, 2 from Rickards and W. James Keble went wrote my Letter to Jelf

TO J. W. BOWDEN

[Oriol March 13/41]

My dear Bowden

[Any other remark you have to make on my Tract would be very acceptable since I am writing a pamphlet about it.

I expect the very worst, i.e. that a condemnation will be passed in Convocation upon the Tracts as a whole, by the non-resident Establishment men, Liberals and Peculiars.

Do not breathe this, lest it should suggest the idea. But I am making up my mind to it, and so is Keble. He saw the Tract before it was published. Perceval and Palmer approve it highly. That it will turn to good I doubt not—but we have been too prosperous. I am only sorry that my friends should suffer through me.¹

Ever Yrs affly J H N

FROM J. W. BOWDEN

Roehampton. March 15.—

My dear Newman,

It is not of much use my sending you suggestions, backed as you are by many better advisers—but I will say what I think—I approve of your *principle*—each branch of the Church

is bound to interpret its formularies as far as it may in, accordance with those of others.—The case of Church men (externally) is like that of the Babel-builders—they would have a central point on earth—a city and tower—and so they got divided—not by ceasing to mean the same thing, but by ceasing to understand their unanimity.—I have always thought this a striking parallel.—One thing, (candidly) I do *not* like in the tract is its vagueness—it does not clearly tell us what you *do* mean—what you really wish to say, and *what not*.—The impression on reading it is that ‘all which Rome teaches, authoritatively, might be taught under our articles—and that the more in all points we expound those articles in conformity with her authoritative teaching, the more catholic we make them.’ Now it seems to me that the *great* error of Rome has been that she has made (so to speak) *all* her teaching authoritative.—About Purgatory, I cannot go along with you in your facts—was the substantive ‘Purgatory’ ever applied to the Judgment fire?—Had the noun, in fact, been ever used, down to the Reformers’ time, to express anything but that for which it was (was it not?) invented?—the definitely taught and understood Roman Purgatory?—Again the date of the decrees of Trent surely does not prevent the possibility of the Tridentine doctrine being condemned by the Article—this depends on the fact whether the Trent Fathers confirmed, or not, the teaching before—And I do not suppose any Romish theologian will tell you that they in any way modified the teaching of the Church upon this point.—I think—(and this is an instance of the clearness I desiderate)—that if you maintain that by the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, the Article framers did not mean the doctrine commonly so known you should definitely, and in terms, tell us what they did mean; and not leave us to gather it from illustrations of a vague nature—

—I think, in p. 23, you take advantage of the reader’s probable ignorance of the fact that ‘pardons’—in *that* plural form had the definite meaning which we now attach in theological matters, to the word indulgences—you seem to talk of it as a general plural of pardon-forgiveness.—

Do you fairly get at the words ‘obtained on money payments’. Surely not from Burnet and Jer. [Jeremy] Taylor—nor can the ‘money payments’ be, any how, a part of the doctrine—the doctrine must be a certain free power of disposing of them—whether they are sold, or given for any service, or as an inducement to people to do any thing—to carry a candle—or come to a particular Church on a feast day, is a mere question of practice.—

About images.—You seem to say that we might do all that Rome authoritatively enjoins—e.g. offer to the image of Christ—*dulia* v. Deutero-Nicene decree—which would be evident blasphemy as Bellarmine says, if directed to the person represented—Could you not put in one or two string cautionary remarks *somewhere*, which would then carry off a great deal?

Is there not a distinction to be drawn between Rome teaching Purgatory etc etc. *authoritatively*, and her teaching them *at all*—Might we not say the articles protest against *the former*—for this was necessary v my last note—without going further—The Romish Doctrine thus would mean, ‘the doctrine that so and so etc are imperatively and de fide to be believed.’—I think there is some thing in this—A man tells me he has discovered a volcano in a certain *unknown* part of the South Sea—gives me the details of his voyage—testimonies of his crew, etc—I enquire into the matter—find he has in truth made no voyage at all and the testimonies are forgeries—I then declare his story a ‘fond thing, vainly invented.’—and with reason—but mind, I have not said that, in the said unknown place, there is *no* such volcano.—*That* is yet undecided.

In p. 44 you may be understood to imply that the Sacrament of the L. S. [Lord’s Supper] was appointed to be worshipped by the Apostles.—

I will now pause—I dare say I have written great nonsense—for in truth I am too heavy, with influenza, to hold up my head—But I am very glad to write to you, and will perhaps bore you again with a line tomorrow or next day—I have not ceased to think of you ever since you first told me of your troubles—God be with you—Remember how much depends upon your *prudence*, and check your zeal for martyrdom—A schism or rupture in our Church is to be avoided as a matter of duty, by any means which we may conscientiously use.—

You have so many good and true advisers—not to mention your own judgment,—that I must believe you to be right, even in some points where I cannot feel you to be so.—God bless, and guard, and guide you—

Your most affectionate J W Bowden

Don[?]t think I am seriously ill.

Of course I shall not breathe a word of any portion of your notes—or even of the fact that you have written.—

13 MARCH 1841

TO J. H. PARKER

Oriel March 13/41

My dear Mr Parker,

I am obliged by the Catalogue, which I have looked through—but considering I have already ordered some books in Germany I see nothing especially to tempt me.

I am very sorry you have not had your Cambridge letter back. The day you sent it I sent it to a friend without whose judgment I could not reply, begging it back forthwith—and he has not written to me. But, under the present unfortunate disturbance, I suppose the delay does not matter.

Also if you write to Mr T. Keble, will you say, what I dare say Mr Williams has told him, that it is his and my fault that you have not answered him about the Norris

Yours very truly John H Newman

SUNDAY 14 MARCH 1841 3rd Lent Haddan assisted at Communion and read morning prayers
I evening Provost baptized his child I. W. [Williams] preached I. W. and Church dined in
my rooms wrote to H?

TO EDWARD HAWKINS

Oriel March 14/41

Dear Mr Provost¹

I think it worth while that you should know that the Author of the Tract, which, I understand, is occupying the attention of your Board, has written a *short* explanation of it, which will appear on Tuesday or Wednesday next. Of course it would

¹ The content of this letter, and of Hawkins's reply which follows, was to cause some searching and querying of memories twenty-four years later. In 1865, Pusey republished *Tract 90* with a lengthy Historical Preface, in which he gave the following account of these days: 'Friday, March 12, the decision on Tract 90 was passed, and a committee was appointed to draw up formally the resolution in which (1) the "Tracts for the Times" should be disowned, (2) Tract 90 should be condemned, as "evading rather than explaining the Articles." On the next meeting of the Hebdomadal Board, the following Monday, March 15, the resolution, embodying those two points which had been agreed upon, was issued. On the following day, March 16, Newman's "Letter to Dr Jelf" appeared. His full explanation . . . was but a few hours too late. If the Heads had granted the respite of those few hours, which were needed in order to publish what, with his usual rapidity of execution, Newman had already in the press, it would have been impossible for them to condemn Tract 90 in the terms in which they did condemn it. For the ground of the censure was cut away. No one can tell how much of the subsequent history of the Church of England might not have been altered, had that respite of twelve hours been granted. The Hebdomadal Board had their own choice of time; no one awaited their decision for no one had asked for it. . . . It was precipitate. I do not mean to blame any one; especially since twenty-four years have removed from this world so many who took part in that decision.' (pp. xii–xiii.)

Edward Hawkins was one who had been present and who took objection to this among other points in Pusey's Historical Preface. He challenged Pusey concerning the notification of the Board of the forthcoming publication about the *Letter to Jelf*, with the suggested delay of the publication of their censure. Pusey had replied that 'an intimate friend, who was daily with Newman tells me that Newman asked for twelve hours to explain himself but was refused them.' Hawkins then wrote to Newman to see if he could shed light on the statement. Newman replied on 1 Jan. 1866: 'When I first saw Pusey's statement, about the 12 hours, it seemed to bring before me an old memory which I had quite forgotten. I had quite forgotten it—and yet I seemed to think it true, when I saw it. At the same time, I cannot at all confirm it on my own authority; and,

14 MARCH 1841

be more agreeable to him that it should be in your hands, before any opinion is publicly expressed on the subject by your Board—but he is quite contented to leave it to your judgment

Yours very truly John H Newman

FROM EDWARD HAWKINS

O. C. March 14. 1841

My dear Newman,

I am sorry to say it is quite true that No 90 of the Tracts has been brought under the notice of the Hebdomadal Board. I should have told you of it, but that I felt assured from what was said by Keble and Pusey that you were already aware of it.

I presume I am at liberty to shew your note to the Board, or at least to mention the fact which it states. Am I not?

What the Board may do, or whether they will do any thing at all, I cannot exactly tell. But perhaps you may like to know the line of objection taken to the Tract, which is in one word that it *explains away* the sense of the Articles—In short the censure passed upon it (in conversation I mean) is pretty much that expressed in the printed paper circulated last week. But I do not observe any desire on the part of the Board, such as the writers of that paper expressed, to get at the name of the author of the Tract.

If you think there is any other information which I can give the author of the Tract which will be of any use to him, pray tell me so freely.

Perhaps it may be as well that this note should not be shewn to any except the author of the Tract; or at least that you should regard it as a confidential communication.

Ever your's sincerely Edwd. Hawkins.

P.S. The College Meeting called for tomorrow morning will not last long, I apprehend; on subjects requiring answers, but not very important.

FROM E. B. PUSEY TO PHILIP WYNTER

Christ Church, March 12, 1841.

My dear Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

Writings often appear so different, according to the impression with which one first takes them up, that I hope I shall not appear presuming upon your kindness, if I write to you a few lines upon the Tract, which I understand has been the subject of discussion at your Board, knowing, as I do intimately, the mind of the writer.

His feelings were these; our Church has condemned nothing Catholic, but only Romish errors; yet there are certain opinions and practices, more or less prevailing in Catholic antiquity, having some relation to the later Romish error, which might seem to be condemned by our Articles, as they are often popularly understood.

supposing Pusey were to say that he was wrong and that he had found that 12 hours had not been asked, I should have nothing to say to the contrary. If, however, his statement is correct, it is not wonderful that I should have forgotten about it; because, at the time I thought myself harshly used, and for my own peace and comfort I drove the matter from my mind.' By the time that Hawkins wrote again (on 2 April), he had found this letter, and explained: 'You wrote to me on Sunday March 14, to say that the writer of the Tract had a short defence of it in the press, which he expected would be out on Tuesday or Wednesday. You allowed me to do what I pleased with the note. And I accordingly moved the Board on the 15th that every thing respecting the Tract should be suspended till the promised Defence appeared. My motion was not carried; and I would therefore not vote for the notice, tho' I thought it ought to be issued, if at least we should not be satisfied by the Defence.' See Volume XXII, 124-5, 206-7; and R. D. Middleton, *Newman at Oxford*, London 1850, 'An Echo of Tract Ninety', pp. 244-70.

14 MARCH 1841

This would be a subject of great perplexity to some minds, and tend to alienate them from their Church, if she have indeed condemned what is Catholic. Such persons might—not merely be unable to sign the Articles, but—doubt whether they ought to remain in lay-communion with the Church, if she have so done. (I happen to know one such case, which would, as far as an individual can be, be a great blow and shock, where a person's doubts, whether he will remain in communion with our Church, turn on this very point.) Thus, as he had noticed, there are several opinions of there being some Purgatorial process before or at the Day of Judgment, whereby those who departed out of this life in an imperfect state, would be fitted for the Presence of God. Are all these (such an one would ask) condemned by our Church? Again, it is very common to hear any high doctrine as to the Lord's Supper condemned as involving Transubstantiation, or Romanists enlist in support of their worship of saints all apostrophes which one may find to departed saints in the Fathers.

Now, of course, you feel that it is an act of charity and duty to facilitate in any lawful way persons remaining in their Church: on other points we are content (and I think rightly) to allow our formularies to be construed laxly (I can have no doubt contrary to the meaning of their writers). Were, e.g., the strict meaning of the Baptismal Service enforced at once, how many valuable persons would forsake the Church! In the imperfect state in which we are, they are patiently borne with. Why should we not deal equally patiently with another class, equally valuable? Why, if a person do not hold the 'Romish doctrine of Purgatory' to be Catholic, should he look upon himself as condemned by our Articles, if he hold the Greek view, or if he suppose that, at the Day of Judgment, those who are saved should pass through fire, in which those stained with much sin should suffer? Or (which is more likely) why should he be obliged to look on the Fathers who so hold as condemned by our Church? The rejection of the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration is tolerated; why may not the belief of some sort of Purgatorial process?

Forgive me troubling you at this length, but I wished to show how the Tract had a practical bearing in relieving persons, whose misgivings as to remaining in our Church, or even their scruples, every one would be glad to see removed.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Vice-Chancellor, With much respect,

Yours very faithfully, E. B. PUSEY.

FROM PHILIP WYNTER TO E. B. PUSEY

St John's College March 13. 1841.

My dear Dr Pusey,

I thank you much for your Letter and appreciate, as I trust, justly the motives which dictated it. No man can be more averse to controversy than I am; no man, I believe, more disposed to put the best construction upon the motives and acts of the writers of the Tracts; and what I deemed to be their object and purpose in commencing the work had my entire approval. Nevertheless I have witnessed with a severe pang and with a consciousness of being unable to defend it many a deviation from what I took to be the leading principle and have worried over the apparent recklessness with which they have risked the unsettling of the minds of young men especially—for the purpose of clearing or correcting their views of some truth by no means indispensable to a saving knowledge of God and of Christ, and the discussion of which, if it could be safely and in a Christian view wisely undertaken in ancient times could not be so conducted now. The mooted of such points has seemed to me to be something more, than a hundred declarations of the Truth as it is in Jesus: and though not intended so, seemed to carry with it the constant hazard of tempting God. But the danger arising from discussions such as these on particular points becomes the shadow of a shade when compared with that arising from the circulation of a principle which being applied to all the Doctrines of the Church suggests such a laxity and indefiniteness of interpretation as would speedily render men indifferent to religion itself. It was very much on this ground taken for a widely different purpose by him that I objected to Dr Hampden's Lectures—his principle of interpreting theological Terms scarcely differs in its character and probable effects from that proposed in no go for the interpretation of various clauses in the Articles; and in the latter case the danger would seem to be greater inasmuch as the circulation of the Tracts is infinitely more extensive and among a Class of persons more pliant than any who would be likely to read the Bampton Lectures and especially Dr Hampden's abstruse and obscure contribution to the Series. The impression made on my mind