

*Newman's Early Roman Catholic Legacy: 1845–1854*. By C. Michael Shea. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. xiii + 230 pages. \$80.00.  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2018.101

In his *From Bossuet to Newman*, first published in 1957 and later in 1987, Owen Chadwick outlined the reception narrative of John Henry Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845) as “almost wholly negative”<sup>1</sup> on the Continent. In Rome, though some were sympathetic to Newman's theory of doctrinal development, Chadwick argued that Newman's theory was rejected. Chadwick based his argument upon the correspondence between renowned theologian Giovanni Perrone and Newman, in which Chadwick claimed that “Perrone laconically but flatly denied Newman's thesis.”<sup>2</sup>

As C. Michael Shea demonstrates in his *Newman's Early Roman Catholic Legacy: 1845–1854*, scholars since Chadwick have constructed their narratives of the reception of Newman's theory of doctrinal development based on the narrative that Newman's theory was poorly received. As Shea points out, Aiden Nichols' *From Newman to Congar* “built upon Chadwick's foundation,” and thus “perpetuated and deepened the impression of the *Essay on Development's* being neither accepted nor influential after it first appeared” (19).<sup>3</sup> These two seminal works—by Chadwick and Nichols—have nearly solidified the narrative that Newman's *Essay on Development* was rejected during his lifetime and then accepted at Vatican II in Roman Catholic circles.

Through careful attention to otherwise neglected primary sources, Shea complexifies the narrative made popular by Chadwick and Nichols. Shea demonstrates that it is inaccurate to categorize Perrone's reception of Newman's theory of doctrinal development as a wholesale rejection. Shea reads the “Newman-Perrone Paper on Development” within the context of Newman's private correspondence, and what becomes apparent is that rather than a disagreement between Perrone and Newman on doctrinal development, it was a lively conversation in which both theologians thought through the merits of the theory. Using Newman's *Letters and Diaries*, Shea is able to show that Newman left his exchange with Perrone assured that his theory fell within the orthodoxy of Roman Catholicism.

Most importantly, Shea traces how Perrone drew upon Newman's theory of development to argue for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Shea

<sup>1</sup> Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 19.

<sup>2</sup> Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, 182.

<sup>3</sup> Aiden Nichols, *From Newman to Congar: The Idea of Doctrinal Development from the Victorians to the Second Vatican Council* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 59–60.

also demonstrates that other theologians of the Roman School were also advocates of Newman's work, and Newman's theory of doctrinal development was influential in Pope Pius IX's thought leading up to the promulgation of *Ineffabilis Deus* in 1854, which defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It is important to note that Shea is careful not to portray Newman's theory of doctrinal development as entirely accepted, either. Rather, Shea's thesis demonstrates the complex nature of its reception history. It was neither completely rejected nor completely accepted by those in Rome and on the Continent during Newman's lifetime.

This book is best suited for the graduate classroom and beyond, though the advanced undergraduate with adequate knowledge of Newman's theory of doctrinal development and its reception history would find this work useful. Shea's work is notably a reappraisal of a long-held narrative of the reception of Newman's *Essay on Development*, which is one of the most influential theology works of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Shea's work, most importantly, demonstrates that Newman's theory of doctrinal development gained traction much earlier than the Second Vatican Council. Because of this, Newman scholars and historical theologians interested in nineteenth-century European reception history should be acquainted with Shea's thesis.

ELIZABETH H. FARNSWORTH

*National Institute for Newman Studies*

*Mothers of Faith: Motherhood in the Christian Tradition.* By Wilfred M. Sumani, SJ. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2017. xviii + 298 pages. \$28.00.  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2018.96

I must confess that I normally find myself a bit wary when priests write about women's experience, but despite this I was pleasantly surprised by Fr. Wilfred M. Sumani's text, *Mothers of Faith*. This book comes out of the African theological tradition, taking primarily a narrative approach to motherhood in the Christian tradition. It is divided into four parts: the first three provide the stories of these mothers—from the Old Testament, the New Testament, and subsequent Christian history—while the final part is a reflection on motherhood as a theological analogy.

In the introduction, Sumani frames his work clearly in the African tradition. His key point, however, is that "motherhood is one of the most theologically fertile human and Christian experiences" (xv), and that we do not have to turn to science or psychology to understand this experience because religion, and especially, in this case, the Christian tradition, have their own