



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Receptions of Newman, Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds), Oxford University Press, 2015 (ISBN 978-0-19-968758-9), xi + 264 pp., hb £65

Citation for published version:

Grumett, D 2016, 'Receptions of Newman, Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds), Oxford University Press, 2015 (ISBN 978-0-19-968758-9), xi + 264 pp., hb £65: Reviews', *Reviews in Religion and Theology*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 249-252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rirot.v23.3>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/rirot.v23.3](https://doi.org/10.1111/rirot.v23.3)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Reviews in Religion and Theology

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Grumett, D. (2016). Receptions of Newman, Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds), Oxford University Press, 2015 (ISBN 978-0-19-968758-9), xi + 264 pp., hb £65 : Reviews. *Reviews in Religion and Theology*, 23(3), 249-252. [10.1111/rirot.v23.3](https://doi.org/10.1111/rirot.v23.3), which has been published in final form at <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/rirot.12660>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Receptions of Newman, Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds),
Oxford University Press, 2015 (ISBN 978-0-19-968758-9), xi + 264 pp., hb £

Over the past decade, Cardinal John Henry Newman's beatification has raised the profile of the man and of his contribution to the life and doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Newman has been capably enlisted by Church authorities to evangelize an increasingly skeptical Western society, with his motto '*cor ad cor loquitur*', which he chose on his elevation to the cardinalate in 1879, suggesting a faith that is grounded in personal relationship rather than abstract dogma.

However, Newman is an amorphous figure open to widely divergent interpretation. This excellent and readable volume, which is the first to deal specifically with Newman's reception by his contemporaries and later generations, candidly presents these divergences by means of a five-part structure that places difference clearly on view. In so doing, it enables a wide variety of current readers across the denominations to acquire a more nuanced understanding of what Newman represents than they might previously have possessed.

The first part addresses Newman's 1845 *Essay on Development*. Drawing on notions of organic development – which were present, during the mid-nineteenth century, in other disciplines like history and biology – the *Essay* was typically loathed by the Evangelicals and Liberal Protestants of Newman's day, who viewed it as a self-justifying departure from the truth of scripture. Nevertheless, as the century neared its end, increasing interest in theories of development, including from unlikely sources such as the Scottish Presbyterian theologians Robert Rainy and Alexander Whyte, led to warmer reception. On the Roman Catholic side, the newly elected Pope Pius IX and Giovanni Perrone, whose theological influence in Rome was tremendous, rejoiced in what Kenneth Parker and Michael Shea perceptively show was a developmental theory that justified ultramontanism, even if Newman's theory turned out not to be embraced at the First Vatican Council and would take another century to gain formal acceptance by the wider Church.

Attention next turns to the *Grammar of Assent*, which Newman completed in 1870. This work compared assent to religious belief with the 'real' assent that all humans grant on a daily basis, in the course of living their lives, to basic truths such as the existence of physical objects external to the mind. This was very different from the approach of John Locke, who had grounded religion in a wholly abstract divine revelation, but equally from that of William Paley, who had taken external evidence of design to be its sole possible proof. Instead, when formulating his own account of the credibility of religious belief, Newman urges us to consider the mind's constitution in its relation with the wider world. Of fundamental importance here is the illative sense, which, for Newman, is the faculty by which we both acquire rational beliefs and connect these beliefs with our wider store of knowledge and understanding. As Mark McInroy ably demonstrates, however, the idea that assent could be grounded in something as apparently whimsical as inference left Newman vulnerable to misappropriation by modernists, to the extent that even Léonce de Grandmaison SJ, who nurtured many of the postwar *nouvelle théologie* Jesuits like Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and Henri de Lubac, vehemently opposed him with scholasticism. However, Pope Pius X, in the wake of his encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*, refuted Newman's modernist appropriators, thereby leaving the way open for a gradual reassimilation of Newman via Pierre Rousselot's doctrine of the act of faith and later transcendental Thomism, even if buttressed by a stronger theory of grace than Newman himself provided.

Although reflecting deep ongoing disagreement between Newman and the Irish bishops, his *Idea of a University*, published in 1852, was, in its day, less contentious. This manifesto has, however, acquired an unexpected afterlife through being invoked by many critics of current changes in the running and perceived mission of higher education institutions. John Sullivan and Colin Barr both helpfully point out that, on an attentive reading, Newman might not in fact offer the desired comfort, advocating interdisciplinarity, rigorous philosophical understanding, and an ongoing serious intellectual and cultural life. Moreover, Newman also valued the practical usefulness of education and its social utility, which even include what might now be termed 'employability'. In this as in the fields surveyed in the first two parts of the volume, he presents as a figure whose ideas have a strikingly modern salience, and who resists simplistic adoption by one side or the other of an argument.

A fascinating trio of essays follows on different denominational and national receptions. Newman's vexed relations with the English Tractarians is powerfully assessed by Peter Nockles, who suggests that Newman, by his conversion to Roman Catholicism, unwittingly encouraged some other Tractarians towards a latter-day latitudinarianism that would ultimately cause them to forsake the Anglican Church. Unable to accept Newman's departure for Rome, some historians of the Oxford Movement have sought to write him out of it, despite clear evidence of his deep and continuing commitment to their cause. Keith Beaumont outlines the wide dissemination of Newman's translated works in France, explaining how Henri Bremond's widely read studies of 1904–1906 largely set the tone for a psychological and experiential exposition of Newman that went uncorrected until Louis Bouyer's 1952 revisionary work *Newman, sa vie, sa spiritualité*. The Orthodox readers of Newman presented by Daniel Lattier offer a further perspective. Whereas some, such as Georges Florovsky, have embraced elements of his idea of development, others, such as George Dragas and Andrew Louth, have refuted it, preferring to deploy Newman to promote a Neoplatonic synthesis, asceticism, and apophaticism.

Because this volume is an edited collection of the work of twelve scholars, it lacks a single thesis or style that may be contested. However, in this lies its great strength. By inviting a wide range of figures to address topics on which they are expert, the editors have enabled a new generation of readers of Newman to orient themselves within his multifaceted theology and the intellectual culture of which it was part, in a way that Newman himself would surely have regarded as a reliable path to real knowledge.