

Piotr Musiewicz

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Introduction: Some aspects of the English reformation

To understand adequately the character of the Oxford Movement (Tractarianism)¹ and its perception of the American Church,² we need first to look back to the changes to the Church and State structure advanced by the English Reformation.

Even though it was an enduring political tendency in medieval England to minimize the power of the pope over the rulers, it was Henry VIII (1509–1547) who first announced the full independence of the Crown and the English Church from the bishop of Rome. By this independence a set of aspects was meant, the most important of which was the jurisdictional, doctrinal and financial primacy of

¹ The Oxford Movement (Tractarianism, Newmanism) was a Conservative movement in the 1830s and 1840s, founded at Oxford University by Anglican clergy – mostly the tutors of Oxford colleges. These tutors tried to oppose the liberal reform both in the Church and in the State. The name for this movement came from the “tracts” its leaders published, or from the city it started in, or from the name of one of its leaders – John Henry Newman (1801–1890). Newman was a fellow of Oriel College and the vicar of St Mary’s Oxford University Church. He was greatly appreciated as a scholar (interested especially in Christian antiquity) and preacher. As we shall see in this article, his research on the Church Fathers would bring him into the Catholic Church, which he would join in 1845. This date is usually marked as the end of the Oxford Movement, as it lost its radical impetus. However, the followers of the less radical Oxford Movement who did not convert to the Church of Rome were led by Regius Professor of Hebrew Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–1882), considered to be their leader. They were called “Puseyites” or Anglo-Catholics. The third (or in fact the first, as we shall see) leader of the movement was the churchman and poet John Keble (1792–1866).

² By “American Church” is meant the Church of England in America, which – after the Revolution and Independence – adopted the name “Protestant Episcopal Church”, also known as “Episcopal Church.” John Henry Newman would use the name “Anglo-American Church.”

the Crown. *The Act of Restraint of Appeals* (1533) declared that the supreme power of jurisdiction of the priests belonged not to the pope, but to the king of England. *The Submission of the Clergy Act* forced by the king on the Convocation in 1532 obliged all English clergy to recognize the king as the final authority in doctrinal matters. From then on it was the king who confirmed the canons of the Church of England. The *Act Concerning Ecclesiastical Appointments and Absolute Restraint of Annates* (1534) resolved two important issues: nomination of bishops and the problem of so-called annates. The act confirmed that the cathedrals electing bishops should accept candidates selected by the king and that all the payments made to the bishop of Rome from English bishops were illegal, as it was the king of England alone who had the right to collect them. In addition, the propriety of the Church was confiscated by the Crown, which was only to be the financial administrator of the realm. Therefore Henry VIII and his successors became the head of the English Church.³

Since England was thought to be a realm “regal and political”, the king was not supposed to make any important decision without the consent of the body of lords and commoners.⁴ On the other hand, the authority of the first Tudors was so great (as they managed to end the bloody conflict that was the War of the Roses) that parliament was quite reluctant to oppose their steps.⁵ This may have been one of the reasons why parliament accepted the king’s policy and agreed to his reforming acts. The consequences of these acts were far-reaching for both English and American religion and politics.

It is impossible to exaggerate the fundamental alteration in the idea and the structure of the Church. According to the thinkers supporting English reformation (starting with Christopher St. Germain), the Church was formed both by priests and laymen. As a result, each of these groups was given the right to participate in Church matters. This was a clear contradiction of Catholic theories, which held the idea of supremacy of the pope or bishops (priests) in that. The Henrician concept of the importance of the whole body of the Church allowed the king and his writers to highlight the role of Henry VIII and his successors in religious matters, despite the fact that the ruler was not a priest. Later development of this idea would be one of the crucial points for the Tractarians to oppose.

³ On Henry VIII and the English Reformation see: A. L. Cross, *A Shorter History of England and Great Britain*, pp. 208–212; H. M. Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation*, London 1948; R. Rex, *Henry VIII and his Church*, “History Review” 1997, Vol. 29; F. Hackett, *Henry the Eighth*, New York 1929.

⁴ On the “regal and political” character of the English realm see: W. Ullmann, *A History of Political Thought: The Middle Ages*, Harmondsworth 1968, pp. 145–159; J. Fortescue, *De laudibus legum Angliæ* (English translation: *Sir John Fortescue’s Commendation of the laws of England* by Francis Grigor), London 1917, p. 17 and following.

⁵ A. J. Slavin, *The New Monarchies and Representative Assemblies: Medieval Constitutionalism or Modern Absolutism?*, Lexington 1964, p. 3; G. R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII*, Cambridge 1962, p. 1–2. However a significant number of those who opposed the policy of forming the state Church in Tudor times were severely persecuted – see for example N. Fellows, *The Pilgrimage of Grace October – November 1536*, “History Review” 2000, No. 37, p. 23–27.

In support of the thesis of the Church's "national sovereignty", the ideas of Marsilius of Padua (c. 1275–1342) were appealed to. His ascending theory of government gave arguments for the Church of England being ruled by itself, without the "interference" of foreign powers such as the Papacy. Marsilius argued that the power of jurisdiction is given by "the human legislator of the province." This power is granted to the ruler by the whole people and neither a layman nor a priest could be excepted from it. The king's philosophers – St. Germain and Stephen Gardiner – could then say that there was no one universal power in the Church, but there exist many local Churches with their own governments. These local Churches are bound together only by the ideas found in the Scriptures and in the correct doctrine.⁶ The early Oxford Movement, as we shall see, would develop this idea into the "branch theory."

Nonetheless, the theories of Marsilius were not fully applied because these would undermine the position of the English king, whose authority was supposed to be growing. Marsilius might have been useful in arguing for a national Church, but not for the justification of the king's power. The English Reformation initiated a completely different, but not entirely new, theory for the king and his relation to the Church: divine rights of kings. Since then the king, vested with supernatural authority, was the one from whom all other authorities are derived. The king dominated not only over parliament, but also over the Church, so that the national Church could have no other justification of its prerogatives (with the exception of the sacraments, whose administration was not subjected to him).⁷ Erastianism would be strongly opposed by the Oxford Movement, but even more strongly and vividly in America.

In later Tudor times the Anglican theologian and philosopher Richard Hooker gave extensive justification to the Elizabethan settlement, arguing that the king's supremacy over the Church was both a biblical and a reasonable idea.⁸ Moreover, accepting Marsilius' ascending theory of government, Hooker argued that monarchy originated with the people's consent made in some ancient times; in a similar way he advocated episcopacy as the best form of Church government. Hooker stated that the episcopacy is justified not by Christ's commission, but by the people's consent, the reasonableness of this idea and long tradition. Christ himself did not choose any form of government to be legitimate, and apparently left this question open to be solved by people.⁹ Hooker's idea differed from both that

⁶ For more on Marsilius' theory see: J. Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300–1450*, p. 154–156; H. S Stout, *Marsilius and Henrician Reformation*, "Church History" 1974, Vol. 43, No. 3, p. 308–318. It is worth noting that ascending theory of government in the Church appeared before Marsilius: it was held in the 13th century by the Dominican John of Paris: W. Ullmann, *A History of Political Thought: The Middle Ages*, p. 203.

⁷ Cf. M. D. Chapman, *The Politics of Episcopacy*, "Anglican and Episcopal History" 2000, Vol. 69, is. 4, p. 475–477.

⁸ Hooker gave examples of the kings of Israel who legislated in ecclesiastical matters – see: R. Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity*, [in:] *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker*, ed. J. Keble, Vol. 2, New York–Philadelphia 1844, p. VIII.1.1.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. VII.9.7, VII.13.3.

of the Puritans (fighting against episcopacy on the grounds of the Scriptures) and that of the Catholics (justifying the episcopacy and the pope's power on the grounds of the Scriptures).¹⁰ The third thing Hooker declared was the identity of the English Church and State. English society, being fully Christian, did not need any separation of power – this proved useful only in countries ruled by non-Christian kings. Therefore a member of the English Church was at the same time a member of the English commonwealth and vice versa. Church and State differed only in their functions, not in their essence – they were just two aspects of one English, Christian society. This society had one ruler (the king) and one aim – seeking out the Kingdom of God first. Politics was religion and religion was politics: England was a confessional state.¹¹

The logical consequence of the concept of the identity of Church and State was the idea that only the faithful members of the Church could reliably serve the State (the society). This is the origin of various test acts imposed on the English officials. The most remarkable acts appeared in the second half of the 17th century. *The Test Act* (1673) declared that any Englishman has to attend the Lord's Supper sacrament (according to English rites) before taking public office. In other words active attendance at the Church of England was a fundamental condition for holding any public office in English society. Catholics, Protestants and Jews were then excluded from English offices. Their religions were barely tolerated, and they were usually forced to gather in small, private meetings.¹² Unlike England, the United States quickly dispensed with this idea.

The Oxford Movement in the English context

The Oxford Movement remains in close connection to the theme outlined above. The aim of Tractarianism was in fact to overturn many aspects of the English Reformation:¹³ especially to limit the state interference in Church matters which be-

¹⁰ N. Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, Carlisle 1997, p. 53–55.

¹¹ R. Hooker, *Of the Lawes...*, p. VIII.1.2. See also: P. Collinson, *The Politics of Religion and the Religion of Politics in Elizabethan England*, "Historical Research" 2009, Vol. 82, No. 215, p. 76–77.

¹² *The Test Act, A.D 1673*, [in:] *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, ed. H. Gee, W. J. Hardy, New York 1896, p. 633–637.

¹³ This statement might be disputable. There were Tractarian leaders who were very cautious in declaring the "reformation of the reformation" and who warned against condemning the 16th-century reformers. One of them was Edward Bouverie Pusey, called very "moderate" (see: W. Ward, *The Oxford Movement*, London 1912, p. 20–22). However Pusey's "moderate" approach allowed him to state the Catholic doctrine of the True Presence of Christ's Body and Blood (a sermon: *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*) and to regard it as a natural doctrine for the Church of England, as well as for Fathers of the Church – see H. P. Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, Vol. 1, London 1894, p. 308. Pusey and Keble did not follow Newman and the "Romish direction" of the Movement. He stayed in the Church of England and tried to introduce mostly liturgical reforms that would make it more "Catholic." It might then be useful to distinguish two "parties" in the Oxford Movement: first – a "moderate" one led by Keble and, from 1835 especially, by Pusey – that saw the Church of

came troublesome, to abandon the ascending theory of government in the Church, to point out the crucial role of the bishops and their succession (and to emphasize the supernatural character of the Church), and to restate Catholic doctrines and the Catholic character¹⁴ of the Church of England.¹⁵

John Henry Newman¹⁶ noticed that the movement had commenced in 1833 at St Mary's University Church in Oxford, when Rev. John Keble preached a political sermon entitled "National Apostasy".¹⁷ Keble preached against the existing type of union of Church and State, for he saw the State violating "sacred Church prerogatives." Keble was in favor of Hooker's concept of Christian society (political and religious at the same time); however, he regarded 19th-century English politics as being hostile towards the English Church. For Keble the hostility was an application of the principles of Erastianism¹⁸ by the British parliament: the thing that most angered him was the Irish Church Bill, which set the administrative reforms to the Irish dioceses (reducing their number) "without the Church being consulte-

England as a proper – but in need of reform – branch of the Catholic Church; second – one led by Richard Hurrell Froude, John Henry Newman and William George Ward – that would assert that the Church of England was too corrupt to be a proper branch of the Catholic Church and that the ideal of the Church was in fact Rome (see for example: W. G. Ward, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, London 1844, p. 53–54). The Tractarians' "branch theory" fully depicted by William Palmer in his *Treatise on the Church of Christ* (1838), saying that the Church of Christ is basically every Church that has Apostolical Succession, was then no longer valid for Newman, Ward and other Tractarians who converted to the Church of Rome.

¹⁴ It is important to understand what Tractarians and Anglicans meant by "Catholic": this term did not have the same meaning as "Roman Catholic Church" (which was referred to as "Church of Rome" or "Romanish Church", and whose followers were "Romanists" or "Papists"). Catholic Church meant, according to the Tractarians, the universal Church, whose doctrines are "held at all times, in all places, and by all believers" – the principle formulated by Vincent of Lérins in the fifth century – cf. U. M. Lang, *Newman and the Fathers of the Church*, "New Blackfriars" 2011, Vol. 92, is. 1038, p. 152.

¹⁵ An aspect the Tractarians did not want to fully overturn was especially the role of the laity in the Church. They held that the Church is made both of clergy and of lay people (Keble defined the Church as "the whole body of Christians" formed of clergy and laity in his sermon – see J. Keble, *National Apostasy*, p. 21). They not only kept this idea within the Church of England, but in fact influenced the Catholic Church with it as John Henry Newman advocated this notion after his conversion to Rome. The role of the laity was marked by the Second Vatican Council, of which Newman is thought to have been a predecessor (see: W. Casper, *The Timeless of Speaking about God (The inaugural John Henry Newman Lecture delivered by His Eminence Cardinal Walter Kasper in May 2008)* published on the Oxford Blackfriars website: www.blackfriars.ox.ac.uk/resources.php?category=5 (15.04.2011). However, the limitation of parliament's (and consequently the king's) power over the Church was in fact the limitation of the role of the laity: the main functions – such as shaping the doctrine of faith, worship and administering of the dioceses – should be the functions of the clergy, who had a sort of divine commission for it (see: M. D. Chapman, *The Politics of Episcopacy*, "Anglican and Episcopal History" 2000, Vol. 69, is. 4, p. 476).

¹⁶ The ideas of John Henry Newman presented in this essay will mostly come from his "Anglican period" (before 1845) as this was the period of his reflection on the English and American (Anglican) Church. As a Catholic he did not seem to be interested in the American Church and he did not leave any more essays on it.

¹⁷ J. H. Newman, *Fragmentary Diary*, [in:] ed. A. Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During his Life in the English Church*, Vol. 1, London 1891, p. 432.

¹⁸ Keble himself used the strong words "Erastian principles" (Keble, *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, p. iv). Most basically, Erastianism meant subjection of the Church to the State, especially no temporal rights of the Church. On the origin and development of the meaning of this term see: J. N. Figgis, *Erastus and Erastianism*, [in:] J. N. Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings*, Cambridge 1914, p. 316–317 and following.

d”.¹⁹ Keble saw that the interests of the State were no longer relevant to the aims of the Church, and that the State pursued its own policy. He thought the alliance of Church and State was distorted, as the Whig Parliament had started to treat the Church instrumentally. It was not obviously Hooker’s intention that the “Commonwealth” would pursue natural, economical ends, as it did in the case of Irish Church Bill. According to Keble, England, being a “Christian nation”, was “bound in all her legislation and policy, by the fundamental rules of that Church”²⁰, so it should act relevantly to the aims of the Christianity.

The second thing Keble pointed out was the disaster of the admission of dissenters into the British parliament. He thought that here again the goals of Church and State were contradicted: the English Church (or at least many of its clergy) wanted to keep its privileged position as the only official, national Church, but parliament intended to pursue the policy of religious and political tolerance and abandon confessional ideas. The step made by parliament – passing the Protestant and Catholic relief and admission acts (1828-1829) – was intended to fulfill the demands of these religious groups to participate in British public life and to reassure Irish Catholics who craved independence or at least autonomy.

However, the admission of dissenters implied that the State had withdrawn its support for the English (Anglican) religion and that it would tend to treat religions indifferently. The national Church was about to be “abandoned” by the State – and that was something the Tractarians did not at first wish.²¹ Sir Robert Peel, one of the architects of the Liberal-Whig reforms 1828–1833, plainly stated:

we must abandon Religion if we aspire to be statesmen ... another age has come in, and Faith is effete ... seek we out some young and vigorous principle ... where shall we find such a principle but in Knowledge?²²

Newman called this deep ideological change to the fundamental principle of English politics “sacrilegious”, and dangerous for the integrity of the Church (he refused to call the British legislature “Christian”),²³ while Keble spoke of it as “national apostasy”; the latter compared it to the story of Israelites who, in the First Book of Samuel, demanded a change in their “constitution” so that they would have a king like other nations. Keble suggested that the conduct of both the Isra-

¹⁹ J. H. Newman, *The Catholic Church*, [in:] Members of the University of Oxford, *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 1: 1833–1834, London 1834, *Tract II*, p. 1. See also: C. Brad Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*, Pennsylvania 2003, p. ix-x and 5.

²⁰ J. Keble, *National Apostasy*, p. 12.

²¹ However, should the Erastian steps become unbearable, the Tractarians seemed to have been ready to accept the disestablishment as a way to preserve the Church’s authority – see: R. H. Froude, *Letter to A. P. Perceval, 14 August, 1833*, [in:] *A Collection of Papers Connected with the Theological Movement of 1833*, ed. A. P. Perceval, London 1842, p. 12.

²² The letter of Sir Robert Peel is cited in: I. Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography*, Oxford 2009, p. 207.

²³ J. H. Newman, *The Catholic Church*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 1, *Tract II*, p. 1. See also: C. Brad Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*, p. 5.

elites and English statesmen was nothing less than a declaration of will of staying independent from God and His ways and choosing one's own human-like interests.

Abandoning the political support of the Church of England was tantamount to apostasy from Christianity.²⁴ Newman, similarly, compared the reforms of Sir Robert Peel to the French revolution of 1830, unmasking the same "revolt against the Traditions of Christendom".²⁵

Both problems Keble tried to deal with concerned the nature of the English Church and of the English Reformation. It was clear that parliament was no longer interested in keeping the Church of England's privileged authority as the only official Church. Keble's sermon was then a calling for the Church's authority, but on what basis could he and the Tractarians put it? What arguments could the Anglican clergy give to defend their Church from troublesome State interference and to explain its importance in English society?

The answer was already found before 1833: Keble and Newman discovered Catholic arguments about Apostolic Succession²⁶ and claimed that the Church of England derived its authority from Apostles and their successors – Catholic bishops.²⁷ It was not the first time this notion appeared in the Church of England, but the Oxford Movement was probably the first group since the pre-reformation era to emphasize it so strongly and to use Catholic (not Hooker's) arguments. The Tractarians had the idea of proving that the 19th-century Church of England was a proper descendant of the Apostles, their power and their teaching. To do so, they needed to show that it did not break with the Catholic tradition of the Fathers of the Church and that the post-Reformation English Church held the same tradition. This is why the Tractarians started to publish their tracts – short, at first, pamphlets concentrating on the contemporary and historical status, authority and doctrine of the Church of England. Starting with Pusey's translation of St Augustine's *Confessions* in 1838, they began to edit the monumental Library of the Fathers (around

²⁴ J. Keble, *National Apostasy*, p. 13, 20–21.

²⁵ W. Ward, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 22.

²⁶ Newman gave the following definition of Apostolic Succession: "We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord JESUS CHRIST gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who would succeed them; and these again on others and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives... We must necessarily consider none to be ordained who have not been thus ordained... Exalt our Holy Fathers the Bishops, as the Representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches; and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their ministry" (J. H. Newman, *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission Respectfully Addressed to the Clergy*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 1, *Tract I*, p. 2–4; capitals by Newman).

²⁷ There is a number of references by Tractarians to the Apostolic succession; amongst them see for example: J. Keble, *National Apostasy*, p. 21; J. H. Newman, *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission Respectfully Addressed to the Clergy* (*Tract I*); W. Palmer, J. H. Newman, *On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church* (*Tract XV*); J. H. Newman, *On Arguing Concerning the Apostolical Succession. On Reluctance to confess the Apostolical Succession* (*Tract XIX*); B. Harrison, *The Scripture View of the Apostolical Commission* (*Tract XXIV*); B. Harrison, *The Ministerial Commission: A Trust from Christ for the Benefit of His People* (*Tract XVII*) – all these Tracts may be found in: *Members of the University of Oxford, Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 1: 1833–1834, London 1834.

50 volumes) and the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (95 volumes). They also published in the conservative journal *British Critic*, which they edited (Newman and Thomas Mozley) from 1838 to 1843. Such extensive interests in the Church of England and its aspects did not leave the problems of the Anglican Church in America unnoticed.

The American Church context

The milieu of the Anglican Church in America was much different than the soil of Oxford or England. The Anglican Church had never been established in the United States; since 1770s it did not treat the English king as the head of the Church, and it did not have a tradition of bishops.²⁸ Moreover, the influence of Puritanism, however noticeable in England, was much more apparent and stronger in America.

Although the first Anglican “congregations” (it is hard to call the first Anglican settlements in America otherwise) were built in the 17th century (in Virginia), the Anglican Church in America had actually been shaped by the American Revolution. The revolutionists, so-called “patriots,” demanding independence from the British Crown, most frequently regarded the British king as their obvious enemy. These patriots consisted not only of Puritans, who had been trying to undermine Anglican establishment ever since the 16th century, but also of some Anglicans. Anglican engagement in the Revolution on the “patriotic” side happened to be problematic for the status of the Anglican Church in America as these “patriotic Anglicans” contradicted the loyalty to the British king. This loyalty was forbidden due to the Congress law passed in 1776: prayers for the British king, which were so far part of the Anglican liturgy, became acts of treason. Although most of the loyalists came from the Anglican Church, their number was not enough to oppose the revolutionists. After the victory of the “patriotic” camp the status and character of the Church of England in America needed to be reconsidered.²⁹

The General Convention of 1789 in Philadelphia arranged the basis of the (Anglican?) Church in America according to political and religious conditions. On the one hand the Church of England was regarded as the bulwark of the loyalists and British (hostile) tradition; on the other hand it had already become part of the religious and social life of many Americans and some of its followers supported the patriotic cause. The solution was a sort of reform of that Church. Therefore a new name – Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America – was given to it.

²⁸ The Anglican Church was established only in some colonies and was disestablished in the 1780s. See D. L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church*, Harrisburg 1993, p. 24.

²⁹ C. L. Webber, *Welcome to the Episcopal Church: an Introduction to its History, Faith and Worship*, Harrisburg 1999, p. 13–16; J. B. Bernardin, *Introduction to the Episcopal Church*, New York 1983, p. 7.

This name indicated that the American Church differed from the English one (e.g. members of the Protestant Episcopal Church would not take the oath of allegiance to the British king because they were already citizens of the United States); however, it held an episcopal and Protestant character at the same time. The way to American episcopacy was, however, neither easy nor obvious.³⁰

Before the General Convention and the Revolution, the Anglican Church (or “Anglican churches”) in America did not have any bishops: the priests were formally subjected to the bishops of London, who never came to visit colonies themselves, but who often sent their commissaries. However, after the Revolution the former jurisdiction of the English bishops over colonies was ceased and, leaving the question of bishops out, the revolutionary-egalitarian spirit was ready to continue its extension in Anglican-American Church. That spirit, much influenced by Puritanism and Congregationalism, would not accept any hierarchical form of government: neither in the Church nor in the State. For these groups (like for the 16th-century Puritans in England) the superiority of a bishop over a presbyter was contrary to the teaching of the Bible.

On the other hand, the calling to have their “own” American bishops for good (or biblical)³¹ governance of the Church was raised amongst some members (“High Churchmen”) of the same free “Anglican churches.” Before the General Convention this group sent the former loyalist Samuel Seabury (1729–1796) to England, where he had to seek consecration from English bishops. When the bishops refused to do so (as Seabury was then an American priest who could not take the oath of allegiance to the British king), Seabury went to Scotland, where he was easily consecrated by local non-juror bishops in 1784 (he then became the bishop of Connecticut and the first Anglican-American bishop).

That step had further implications: two years later, seeing the possible danger of growth of the non-juror schism through Seabury, the British parliament passed the Consecration of Bishops Abroad Act, which allowed foreign priests to be consecrated as bishops.

As a result, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Archbishop of York and Bishop of Bath and Wells consecrated the next American, more “liberal” priests: the ex-chaplain of the Continental Army William White (1748–1836, for Pennsylvania) and Samuel Provoost (1742–1815, for New York). The Anglican Church in America therefore had three bishops who claimed Apostolic Succession, who could thenceforth ordain other priests in America. The Episcopal Church remained in communion with the see of Canterbury, holding an Anglican religious doctrine but

³⁰ *Ibidem*; D. L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 48–53.

³¹ High Churchmen did not argue for biblical justification of the episcopacy – in advocating this idea they used traditional Anglican (Hooker’s and Whitgift’s) arguments, declaring that episcopacy was indifferent to Christ; the first time they took up not only the Catholic solution but also Catholic arguments was during the beginnings of the Episcopal Church (in America) and in the 1830s (in England – these were the Tractarians). These High Churchmen were then called Anglo-Catholics. One of the first people to use Catholic arguments in America was Samuel Seabury (1729–1796).

being at the same time independent from the British Crown and having its own bishops to consecrate.³²

The ideas of William White might be especially worth noting here, as they seemed to be representative for a significant part of the Episcopalian Church clergy accepting the “American revolutionary spirit.” White was a follower of John Locke and declared the ascending theory of government: not only in the State, but in the Church too. As we have seen, this theory appeared in the Church of England in the times of reformation; its earlier proponents were John of Paris and Marsilius of Padua. According to this concept (in line with Hooker’s idea) the power in the Church originated with the people’s consent; in the American milieu it implied that the bishop had to be appointed by the people of the “state church” (diocese) – the diocese then (clergy and laity) elected and possibly deposed the bishop. This theory was quite adequate to the status of the Episcopalian Church, which was in fact formed by many local Anglican churches, which joined together and agreed, not without controversy, to have the episcopacy and its presiding bishop.

To see the influence of White it is sufficient to say that he was made the first Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church. The General Convention of 1789 was then the result of “voluntary associations” of these local “state churches”.³³ The General Convention and the Constitution of the Episcopal Church much resembled the ideas of the American Constitution: the “state churches” (dioceses) were like states (administratively the same) and the meeting of the General Convention like Congress (the Convention even had two houses: the House of Bishops and House of Deputies); the Presiding Bishop had something of the US President, while bishops were sort of state governors; however the Presiding Bishop did not have jurisdiction over state bishops, and he was rather a chief of the House of Bishops; the final authority rested with the people gathered in the General Convention; local conventions did not much differ from state legislatures: their representatives were elected in parishes. The Lockean idea of the people’s power was embodied not only in the American State, but also in the American Church. It seemed hardly possible to convince most post-revolutionary Americans to accept the different concept of the Church’s government, which might have been abstractive for their reality. It will come as no surprise, then, that before their consecration both White and Seabury were elected to be “bishops” by local Anglican communities.³⁴

However, there was also a contradiction in White’s views: these were the ideas of Samuel Seabury, who was appalled by such small authority being given to the bishops. Seabury was supported by the Connecticut clergy; according to their views, it was Christ himself, not the congregation, who appointed the bishop, so

³² C. Podmore, *A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of the Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared*, “International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church” 2008, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 127; D. L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 48–53.

³³ Cf. C. Podmore, *A Tale of Two Churches...*, p. 126–129; J. B. Bernardin, *Introduction to the Episcopal Church*, p. 8.

³⁴ On this topic see: J. B. Bernardin, *Introduction to the Episcopal Church*, p. 18.

the people should not have the right to interfere with the bishop's ruling. Seabury wrote in a letter in 1785:

The rights of the Christian Church arise not from nature or compact, but from the institution of Christ; and we ought not to alter them, but to receive and maintain them, as the holy Apostles left them. [...] If a man be called a Bishop who has not the Episcopal powers of government, he is called by a wrong name, even though he should have the power of Ordination and Confirmation. And if the government of the Church could be remodeled, why not its sacraments, creeds and doctrines too?" he wrote. "But then," he added, "it would not be Christ's Church, but our Church".³⁵

The ideas of these two founders of the Episcopal Church differed so much that it was likely that White would not have gone to England to acquire his consecration if Seabury had not done so first. The Philadelphian agreement therefore did not mean that the American Church would have a uniform episcopacy: the views on the bishop's power were far from being homogeneous. In fact local churches were not mandated to have their own bishop, and some of them did not have any for many years. However, the Philadelphian agreement did mean that bishops could not be deposed by the people's consent, and that this may be formally done only by another bishop after the trial. The beginnings of the Episcopal Church were then marked by much controversy; the question of the role of the bishops was not the only one; however, this issue seemed to be important, as it was connected with other doctrinal themes.³⁶

John Henry Hobart and John Henry Newman

The 19th century did not bring to the Episcopal Church any fewer controversies than the 18th had. Regarding the conditions in which the Episcopal Church emerged it might be surprising that the first half of the 19th century was strongly marked by the influence of High Church tradition and its "Catholic modification" – the Oxford Movement. No less surprising might be the fact that this tradition did not come to America from the Tractarians, but was only reinforced by their ideas in the 1830s and 1840s. One of the major figures who took up Seabury's "Catholic" legacy was John Henry Hobart, bishop of New York (1816–1830).³⁷

³⁵ Seabury to William Smith, 15 August 1785, quoted in: C. Podmore, *A Tale of Two Churches...*, p. 136. It is worth adding that "High Church" groups, stressing the authority of the bishops, were of course active in America. One of this group was led by John Wesley, who held "paternalistic view on society as a whole" and therefore supported the hierarchical organization of the Church's governance. Consequently, Wesley, treating the British king as a father of the commonwealth, criticized a revolt against him (cf.: A. Raymon, "I Fear God and Honour the King": *John Wesley and the American Revolution*, "Church History" 1976, Vol. 45, No. 3, p. 316–328 (esp. p. 316–318)).

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 134–138.

³⁷ High Church tradition in America might be traced back at least to Samuel Johnson of Connecticut (1696–1772), who opposed the Puritan ideas in Connecticut in spite of the Puritans' domination in this state. See: E. C. Chorley, *Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church*, New York 1946, p. 136, quoted by:

Hobart taught that the Episcopal Church had its origins in Christ and the Apostles. Apostolic faith, order and worship were transmitted to it from the Church of England, of which members of the Episcopal Church should be proud. This inheritance did not include possession and “particular organization of government” but “faith, the order, and the worship which were the characteristics and the glory of the primitive ages of the Church”.³⁸ For Hobart government probably meant the English establishment – an idea that American Episcopalians disliked.³⁹ Apostolic order and the doctrine of the Church were doubtlessly central ideas in his thinking: Hobart stressed that the English Church had Apostolic Succession because there remained one English archbishop validly consecrated during the Reformation – Matthew Parker, who preserved the Apostolic Descent.⁴⁰ The argument about Parker’s consecration has been crucial for anyone willing to argue for the Apostolic character of the Church of England, and has been repeated since the 16th century. Hobart then reexamined Hooker’s statement about the origins of Episcopacy and found in his writings some traces justifying the power of bishops on scriptural grounds: he found Hooker mentioning the biblical idea of three orders. That was an important statement, as Hooker, Father of Anglicanism, was thought to have stated that the bishops’ power came from consent and tradition. Hobart appealed to John Whitgift (the Archbishop of Canterbury 1583–1604) too, and, showing his argument with the Puritans over the Church’s government, he pointed out that the archbishop rightfully saw Episcopacy as an “institution apostolical and divine.” Finally, Hobart wrote about the architect of the English Reformation, Thomas Cranmer, who, according to Hobart, held Protestant doctrines only privately and often changed his mind; Cranmer was thought to have published a catechism in which “he fully owns the divine institution of Bishops and Priests”.⁴¹ Hobart then tried to

L. Crockett, *The Oxford Movement and the 19th-Century Episcopal Church: Anglo-Catholic Ecclesiology and the American Experience*: www.quodlibet.net/articles/crockett-oxford.shtml (19.04.2011).

³⁸ J. H. Hobart, *The Origin, the General Character and the Present Situation of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, New York 1814, published on the website: www.anglicanhistory.org/usa/jhhobart/moore_consecration1814.html (18.04.2011).

³⁹ An attitude towards establishment was one of the major differences between High Churchmen and the Tractarians. High Churchmen generally advocated the union of Church and State, while the Tractarians were more apt to see the advantages of disestablishment. American Episcopalians naturally supported the separation of the Church and State and criticized the English Church for the State’s interference.

⁴⁰ During the Reformation fourteen of fifteen bishops were dismissed from their sees. The only one who remained was Anthony Kitchin, bishop of Llandaff. However in 1559 (the times of Elizabeth I) Kitchin refused to take part in Matthew Parker’s consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury. Therefore Miles Coverdale and three other bishops who were previously exiled by Mary Tudor were called to consecrate Parker. Pope Leo XIII stated in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896) that Parker’s succession was invalid because of changes made in the consecration rite under Edward VI. High Church Anglicans generally maintained (and maintain) that these changes, being only verbal corrections, were of not much importance, and therefore the consecration was valid.

⁴¹ J. H. Hobart, *An Apology for Apostolic Order and its Advocates, Occasioned by the Strictures and Denunciations*, New York 1807, p. 131–138. Hobart then tried to show Cranmer as a Catholic; to comprehend the difficulty of this task it suffices to quote Professor MacCulloch writing on the conflicts at the time of Edward VI: “the point at issue... was not whether or not the Church of England should retain a Catholic character, but whether or not remnants of the Catholic past could be redirected to Protestant ends, in order to preserve order, decency and hierarchy” (quoted in: A. Nichols OP, *Anglican Uniatism: A Personal View*, “New Blackfriars” 2006, Vol. 87, is. 1010, p. 341).

show that Episcopacy was not indifferent to Christ (as Hooker and many Anglicans stated), but that it was in fact His commission. The divine origin of bishops' power was obviously Catholic, far from Protestantism.

Hobart's works and preaching caught the attention of the young John Henry Newman. Newman met Hobart when Hobart toured Europe in 1824. Some academics suspect that Hobart "may have influenced this young potential leader [Newman] far more than has hitherto been admitted".⁴² However, Newman did not mention Hobart in his autobiography *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, and Newman's purported essay "The Church Principles of Bishop Hobart" has not been located so far. In fact Newman stated that he was taught the doctrine of Apostolical Succession in 1823 and his tutor was Rev. William James, Fellow of Oriel.⁴³ The similarity of the ideas of Hobart and Newman should not then necessarily imply such influence; however, the similarity between some American Episcopalians and Tractarians is worth nothing. It is more likely to state that Hobart and his ideas intensified Newman's interest in the American Church in the 1830s.

Nonetheless, Newman greatly appreciated Hobart's ideas about the "supernatural state of the Christian Church" and Apostolic ministry of the priests⁴⁴; he was eager to find these ideas in the writings of American Episcopalians.

The Oxford Movement and Apostolical Succession In America

The Tractarians, just like Hobart, liked to indicate the influential divines of the English Church, who pointed to the doctrine of Apostolical Succession. Keble was a sort of a professional in this: he tried to reconcile divines like Hooker with Tractarian ecclesiology. Keble then stated that

the first to avow of the church doctrine of the apostolical succession, after the sort of abeyance in which it had been held (however distinctly implied in the Prayer Book) since the beginnings of our intercourse with foreign reformers

was Adrian Saravia, a friend of Richard Hooker.⁴⁵ Keble found that Saravia, generally stating God's indifference to the Church government, made an exception to England, in which the power of bishops was to be divine, like the power of the king.⁴⁶ Keble then thought that as Saravia was an intimate adviser and confessor

⁴² R. Albright, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, New York 1964, p. 230, quoted in: L. Crockett, *The Oxford Movement and the 19th-Century Episcopal Church: Anglo-Catholic Ecclesiology and the American Experience*.

⁴³ J. H. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, London and New York 1888, p. 10.

⁴⁴ J. H. Newman, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. 1, London 1881, p. 340.

⁴⁵ J. Keble, *Preface to Selections from the fifth book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, Oxford 1839, p. xi.

⁴⁶ Keble quoted Saravia: "To no nation did God ever appoint any certain and perpetual form of government, which it should be unlawful to alter according to place and times. But of this government whereof we are

of Hooker, “we may with reason use the recorded opinions of the one for interpreting what might seem otherwise ambiguous in the other”.⁴⁷ Having Hooker on the “Apostolic” side would certainly prove the Tractarians or Hobart held the right doctrine.

However the Tractarians, unlike Hooker, linked the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession with the descending theory of government. Newman, like Seabury and the Connecticut clergy, was especially appalled by the concept that the minister in the Church depended on the people. He had seen this example before amongst English Puritans, whose position had neither state support nor apostolical justification – Newman called their position “miserable.” “Can a greater evil befall Christians, than for their teachers to be guided by them, instead of guiding?” he asked.⁴⁸ Apostolical succession implied the commission of the minister from above, not from the people. Not surprisingly then, Newman criticized the ideas of William White, who declared the commission to come from the people. In fact, he saw White’s conception as great danger to the “American-English Church” and appreciated Seabury’s conviction about authority and his statements that bishops as successors of the Apostles are the only authorized ministers of Christ.⁴⁹ For Newman bishops, who receive their commission through ordination by laying on of hands,⁵⁰ were the ones on whom the “American-English Church” should depend.

Newman was then delighted seeing “that truth in her”: that Seabury – “the first who was consecrated diocesan bishop” – held the doctrine of Apostolical Succession and opposed Dissenters’ theories of government and Church doctrines.⁵¹ Holding this “Apostolic” doctrine by the first American bishop implied that the Episcopal Church was Apostolic in its nature, just like the English Church. Nonetheless, Newman realized that certain American conditions did not support the “Apostolic” character of the Church there, and that its nature was corrupted by dissenting theories. According to Newman, this corruption was made by application to the Church of the theories of the American state and assuming that the Church is a sort of guest on American soil and should therefore accept local ideas or conditions. “The Church is in a country, not of it, and takes her seat in a center”⁵² – wrote

discussing the case is different; for since it came immediately from God, men cannot alter it at their own free will. Nor is there any occasion to do so. For God’s wisdom hath so tempered the polity, that it opposes itself to no form of civil government. Bishops I consider to be necessary to the Church, and that discipline and government of the Church to be the best, and divine, which religious Bishops and Presbyters truly so called, administer by the rule of God’s Word and ancient councils” (*The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker*, ed. J. Keble, Vol. 1, New York–Philadelphia, *Preface*, p. xxxiv).

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁸ J. H. Newman, *Thoughts on Ministerial Commission*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times, Tract I*, p. 2.

⁴⁹ J. H. Newman, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 338.

⁵⁰ *Idem*, *Thoughts on Ministerial Commission*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times, Tract I*, p. 3. Newman stressed that Apostolic Succession is transmitted by the imposition of hands and that “the grace of ordination... is contained not in any form of words”. This idea justified, at least in 1830s, the succession of Bishop Parker in the sixteenth century, who received his commission with altered Roman rites.

⁵¹ *Idem*, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 337–338.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 355.

Newman. The ascending theory of government applied in the American state should not then constitute the Church, because the life of the Church is not the same as the life of the state.⁵³ “Is a bishop a mere generalization of a diocese, or its foundation? [...] Does a bishop depend on his diocese or his diocese on him?”⁵⁴ Newman asked rhetorically. The answer was obvious: a bishop (“living Apostle of Christ”⁵⁵) should arrange his diocese, not vice versa. According to Newman it was a shame for the American Church that half of its members did not live by these Apostolic principles. Remarkably, Newman (still as an Anglican) often mentioned that this principle and practice existed in the Roman Church, which he showed as a good example to follow for the American Church⁵⁶.

For Newman the authority of bishops was far more important than the establishment; however, it seemed that disestablishment – in the case of the American Church – started to serve the authority of bishops. Newman did not criticize the American Church for separation from the State, but he saw American disestablishment as a great chance for full application of the Apostle’s principles, without troublesome state interference. American separation proved what Newman longed for: that the nature of the Church is different than the State’s. For Newman the fact of the development of the American Church was clear confirmation that the Church could grow without the State’s support and that it had its own life.⁵⁷ Newman wished the American Church could be more Catholic than the English one, as it was able to implement Catholic principles more freely.⁵⁸

These remarks might be significant because Newman at first declared the need for the State’s support for the Church: he thought that the Church could not work properly without having “temporal honors” secured by the State.⁵⁹ It is likely that the experience of the American Church, the “daughter” of the English Church,

⁵³ It seemed that the problem of differentiating of principles in different “bodies” was urgent both in England in America: Newman wrote that: “The life of a plant is not the same as the life of an animated being, and the life of a body is not the same as the life of the intellect; nor is the life of the intellect the same in kind as the life of grace; nor is the life of the Church the same as the life of the State” (Idem, *Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*, London 1888, p. 44) and referred it to the situation when the Church lacks supernatural life and is filled with political state-like ideas. Such a situation happened in England, where the established Church lived by the state’s principles, and could as well happen in America; despite the fact that the Church was not established there, the lack of Apostolic ideas and “democratic spirit” could cause the life of the Church to be similar to the state’s.

⁵⁴ Idem, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 355.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁶ The passage about the Roman Church in America clearly shows Newman’s idea that the Church should not accommodate local political ideas: “meanwhile the Roman Catholics have located their bishops, and though their succession in the country is later than ours, they have thus given themselves the appearance of being the settlers, not strangers on a visit” (p. 355). On another occasion, Keble gave the same example of Roman Catholics holding the right doctrine of Church not based on the State’s authority: “What answer can we make henceforth to the partisans of the Bishop of Rome, when they taunt us with being a mere Parliamentary Church?” (J. Keble, *National Apostasy*, p. iv).

⁵⁷ Idem, *Note on Essay VIII*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 380.

⁵⁸ Idem, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 374.

⁵⁹ Idem, *Thoughts on Ministerial Commission*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times, Tract I*, p. 1.

helped Newman to rethink his approach to the establishment, finally considering disestablishment appropriate.⁶⁰

Nonetheless, Newman stressed that, in spite of disestablishment, the American Church was not free from civil power because that might have had another form in America: democracy and the laity ruling the Church.⁶¹ The true Church, consisting of the laity and clergy, should be ruled by the clergy. As E. A. Knox states:

The essence of the Oxford Movement was an attempt to assert the existence of a corporate body, wholly clerical, possessing a divine right to prescribe for the Nation its faith and worship.⁶²

For Newman the American Church was then a great hope for a free, Apostolic Church but the essence of that Church was at the same in danger of “democratization.”

Towards Rome

The Tractarians’ and American Churchmen’s ideas about the Apostolic nature of the Church increased their interest in the Church of Rome. Old Protestant prejudice, holding that the Church of Rome and its doctrines were totally corrupted, was then questioned. In fact, some followers of the Oxford Movement and American Churchmen, examining the continuity of the Apostles’ teaching preserved in the Tradition of the Ancient Church, had to state that the Church of Rome is closer to the Catholic ideal than Protestant Churches.⁶³ This meant not only that the Church of Rome had Apostolical Succession and that it did not allow Erastian principles in its government, but the Church of Rome also held valuable other Catholic doctrines.

On the other hand, many Tractarians held that doctrines of the Roman Church only resembled “doctrines or customs of the Primitive Church”, but were “really of a different character”.⁶⁴ Therefore the Anglican Newman, seeing Catholic doctrines

⁶⁰ Certainly the other (perhaps even the first) factor that convinced Newman about disestablishment was constant English state interference in administrative and financial policies by which the Church was losing its authority.

⁶¹ Idem, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 356–357.

⁶² M. D. Chapman, *The Politics of Episcopacy*, “Anglican and Episcopal History” 2000, Vol. 69, is. 4, p. 475.

⁶³ Perhaps the first Tractarian to state this kind of idea at the very start of the Oxford Movement was Richard Hurrell Froude – see: R. H. Froude, *Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, ed. J. H. Newman, J. Keble, J. B. Mozley, Vol. 1, London 1838, p. 336; R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement; Twelve Years, 1833–1845*, Chicago 1892, p. 50–51, 119. Froude was so keen on the pre-Reformation Catholic Church that one of his contemporaries wrote about him: “With his affection for the theocratic mediaeval Church Froude could be called the founder of Anglican Ultramontanism, a harbinger of the Anglo-Papalism” (A. Nichols OP, *Anglican Uniatism: A Personal View*, “New Blackfriars” 2006, Vol. 87, is. 1010, p. 344).

⁶⁴ J. H. Newman, *Archbishop Ussher on Prayers for the Dead (No. II, Against Romanism)*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 3, London 1836, *Tract LXXII*, p. 1.

in the American Church in the 1830s, thought of them as doctrines of the Primitive Church, not of the Roman Church.

For example Newman, reading Seabury, rejoiced that Seabury had restored the consecration prayer in the liturgy – a prayer that had been removed from the English Church in the 16th century by Protestant reformers during Edward VI's reign.⁶⁵ That doctrine apparently did not differ from that used in the Roman Church. However, when Newman wrote about Seabury's idea that the Eucharist was "a true and proper sacrifice" that commemorates the original sacrifice of Christ, and that during the Eucharist, bread and wine are transformed into Christ's body and blood not "only truly and spiritually", but were "made to be, what by nature they were not",⁶⁶ he did not think it was the same as the Roman idea of transubstantiation; the Eucharist was supposed to be the doctrine of the Primitive Church, from which the Church of Rome departed by developing its own idea of transubstantiation and other ideas.⁶⁷ Seabury then rightly recognized, as Newman reported, that Christ's Last Supper was the ultimate authority of the priesthood and that the "Eucharist is... a true and proper sacrifice, commemorative of the original sacrifice and death of Christ"⁶⁸. Again here, the latter idea was not to be the same as "Romish".⁶⁹ Another example: Newman found that Seabury favored prayers for the dead or, more precisely, "prayers for the faithful departed from this life." Newman himself wrote a tract on this practice, and found these prayers justified because he saw that idea emerging from the writings of the Church Fathers. He found similar arguments in Seabury's writing, which stated

It was the belief of primitive Christians, as well as of the old Jews, that at the departure of the soul from the body it went to a secret, invisible place ... on this ground stood ... the prayers for the faithful departed out of this life.⁷⁰

Newman, at the end of the 1830s, stressed this idea differed from the Roman concept of Purgatory.⁷¹ It might be said that the more Newman was trying to defend himself from Anglican accusations that the Oxford Movement held Roman doctrines, the more he drifted towards Rome. In 1841 he wrote Tract XC, in

⁶⁵ Idem, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 339.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁷ "Thus because the early Fathers spoke of the Holy Communion in such reverent and glowing terms, as became those who understood its real nature and virtue, they [Roman Catholics] have tried to make it appear that they believed in their own theory of Transubstantiation". Idem, *Archbishop Ussher on Prayers for the Dead (No. II, Against Romanism)*, [in:] *Tracts for the Times, Tract LXXII*, p. 1.

⁶⁸ Idem, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 339.

⁶⁹ "Whereas they [Roman Catholics] spoke of it as a *commemorative* sacrifice, they have thence taken occasion to make it a *real and proper* sacrifice". Idem, *Archbishop Ussher on Prayers for the Dead (No. II, Against Romanism)*, *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 3, *Tract LXXII*, p. 1.

⁷⁰ Idem, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 339.

⁷¹ One of Newman's objections to Purgatory was that: "none have the privilege of being in Purgatory but such as have died in the communion of the Roman Church". Idem, *On the Controversy with the Romanists (Against Romanism. No. 1)*, *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 3, *Tract LXXI*, p. 31.

which he launched a critique of the Protestant idea of private judgment in matters of faith and stated that the Elizabethan XXXIX Articles of Anglican Faith implied the authority of Church and of the Ecumenical Councils.⁷² The most controversial idea was that of “Romish doctrines”, of which the XXXIX Articles spoken of were the doctrines of some “Roman schools” before the Council of Trent. The XXXIX Articles, announced in the same year as the canons of the Council (1563) but in fact completed mostly in 1552, condemned then not the teaching of the Council of Trent, but ante-Tridentine teaching of some “Roman schools.” This entailed there being a necessary contradiction between the canons of the Tridentine Council and the Anglican Confession. Post-Tridentine prayers for the dead, pardons, images, relics and invocation of saints as well as other doctrines might have been reconcilable with the Anglican Articles of Faith.⁷³ In other words, the Anglican “via media” between Catholicism and Protestantism started to be repudiated. Seeing the possibility of justification of so many Roman doctrines was something High Churchmen did not use to do; it was rather surprising even for this group. After publishing this tract, Pusey wrote to Keble: “I feel the storm will lie heavy on us”.⁷⁴

Newman, studying the Christian Antiquity, indeed discovered ideas that he had not expected. He found that Vincent of Lérins’ principle of Catholicity needed to be reconsidered as it was impossible to state that all Catholic doctrines were “held at all times, in all places, and by all believers”: because there was a difference between Catholic ante-Nicene theology and the Catholic Creed of Nicaea (in the concept of the Trinity), there must have been some sort of doctrinal development and its rules. That implied that so called “errors of Rome” – “unbiblical”, traditional ideas attacked by Protestants – might have been just the development of ideas found in the Scriptures. After further examination of the development of the Church’s authority, Newman found that the true Christian doctrine was to be found in “extreme party”: the Church of Rome was the proper Catholic Church⁷⁵. The Anglican Church, which separated from the Catholic, was then in a schism.

In September 1845 William George Ward, author of “Ideal of a Christian Church”, joined the Church of Rome; Newman did the same on October 9, 1845. He was followed by a group of Tractarians (directly and indirectly) later.⁷⁶

⁷² Idem, *Tract XC. On Certain Passages in the XXXIX Articles with a Historical Preface by the rev. E. B. Pusey*, London 1866, p. v.–vi.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. xxvii.–xxviii, 22–43.

⁷⁴ H. P. Liddon, *Life of E.B. Pusey*, Vol. 2, London 1893, p. 174.

⁷⁵ See: U. M. Lang, *Newman and the Fathers of the Church*, “New Blackfriars” 2011, Vol. 92, is. 1038, p. 151–155.

⁷⁶ This group included for example: the theologian Frederick William Faber (1845), the historian Thomas William Allies (1850), future Cardinal Henry Edward Manning (1850), a poet who became a Jesuit named Gerard Manley Hopkins (1866), the son of the Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Hugh Benson (1903), the son of the Bishop of Manchester Ronald Knox (1918).

Some further influences of the Oxford Movement in America

Generally the ideas of the Oxford Movement developed in America quite independently, coming, just as in England, from the High Church Tradition. Bishop Hobart, who might be called an American Tractarian or even pre-Tractarian, started to apply “Apostolical” principles at least twenty years before Keble preached his “National Apostasy.” Hobart was co-founder of the first General Theological Seminary in America (New York 1817): its teaching emphasized the doctrines of Apostolical Succession, the role of priesthood, the sacraments, the visible Church (another co-founder of that Seminary was Theodore Dehon, bishop of South Carolina, of whom Newman wrote with great awe too – he especially appreciated his commitment to the Eucharist and priest ministry⁷⁷). It is impossible to exaggerate Hobart’s influence on the development of the Episcopal Church: he founded a mission society and Prayer Book society and managed to expand the number of clergy and laity in the Episcopal Church in New York fourfold. His activities and ideas led to his followers being called “Hobartian Churchmen”.⁷⁸

Hobart’s student and successor, Benjamin Onderdonk, was known for his support of the Oxford Movement’s ideas. He was engaged in a controversy in which a candidate for a priest, Arthur Carey, was suspected of supporting Roman Catholicism. Onderdonk was asked to conduct an inquiry after which he said that Carey was suitable for ordination. Opposition against Onderdonk and Carey grew in the Episcopal Church, and Onderdonk was condemned by a resolution from the diocese of Ohio. Nonetheless, Carey was ordained and Onderdonk continued his service as Bishop of New York till 1861, when he was accused of immoral behavior and suspended from his functions.⁷⁹ Onderdonk’s successor was Horatio Potter, who tried to revive monastic life in the Episcopal Church. Potter founded the Sisterhood of St Mary – the first Anglican convent in America. He might have taken an example from Pusey, who, since 1845, had been creating Anglican convents in England (it was the first time since the 1500s that formal convents reappeared) and is known as the restorer of Anglican monastic life.

New York was a diocese where the influence of Hobart and the Oxford Movement was relatively strong. It was not the same in other dioceses: as we saw, some bishops accused others of betraying the Anglican (or Protestant) roots of the Episcopal Church. However, in the second half of the 19th century the presence of the “Hobartian Church” and the Oxford Movement in the United States was so strong that there appeared a decisive Protestant reaction to it. In 1873 a section of the Anglican clergy led by the Bishop of Kentucky George Cummins decided to le-

⁷⁷ J. H. Newman, *The Anglo-American Church*, [in:] *Essays Critical...*, p. 340–342.

⁷⁸ D. L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 62.

⁷⁹ *The Ordination of Mr. Arthur Casey*, www.anglicanhistory.org/usa/carey/newenglander.html (29.04.2011). On the trial see: www.anglicanhistory.org/usa/wmeade/statement_reply1845.html (29.04.2011). It is possible that the accusations were intended to suspend Onderdonk as he was thought to be supporting Roman Catholicism or at least Oxford Movement Catholic theology.

ave the Episcopal Church and to establish the Reformed Episcopal Church, which would preserve the Protestant character of Christianity.

The influence of “Apostolic” tradition did not last so vividly in the 20th century: especially the second half of it saw a significant liberalization of the Episcopal Church and abandonment of the traditional doctrines. A similar thing happened in the Anglican Church in Great Britain. Anyway, America had her converts too. In the 19th century there was no such famous admission to the Catholic Church, as in the case of Newman; however, there was the somewhat controversial conversion of the Bishop of North Carolina. Levi Sillman Ives, after his trip to Rome, decided to join the Roman Catholic Church (in 1852). Sillman Ives was married to Rebecca, the daughter of John Henry Hobart, who entered the Catholic Church with her husband. The ex-bishop then became a layman and worked as a professor. In 1854 he published *The Trials of the Mind in its Progress to Roman Catholicism*.⁸⁰

A Catholic revival in America came in the second half of the 20th century; it was marked by numerous conversions of American intellectuals, officials and ecclesiastics from various Church denominations. One of them was Richard John Neuhaus.

⁸⁰ L. Sillman Ives, www.newadvent.org/cathen/08256c.htm (29.04.2011).