

Newman  
and the  
Alexandrian Fathers

*Shaping Doctrine in  
Nineteenth-Century England*

BENJAMIN JOHN KING

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii
Introduction	1
1. Three Views of Doctrine: Three Phases of Newman's Life	24
The High Church Context: (1) The Church Faces Persecution	26
A Twofold System of Doctrine (1830s)	33
Doctrine Develops (1840–59)	46
Doctrine as Science (1860–81)	56
Conclusion: Three Views of 'Consubstantial'	66
2. The Sources of <i>The Arians of the Fourth Century</i> (1831–3)	70
The High Church Context: (2) The Role of Bishops	71
Mirror Opposites: (I) Antiochene Heresy	79
Mirror Opposites: (II) Alexandrian Orthodoxy	98
Conclusion: What Has Oxford to Do with Alexandria?	119
3. Preaching and Researching an Alexandrian Christology (1834–40)	127
The High Church Context: (3) Interpreting the Alexandrians	128
The Quest of Three Summers: Dionysius and the Confession against Paul	135
Dionysius of Alexandria or Paul of Samosata? (Summer 1834–Easter 1835)	144
Cyril of Alexandria or Apollinarius? (Summer 1835–Easter 1836)	149
Leo or Eutyches—or Leontius of Byzantium? (Summer 1839–Easter 1840)	162
Conclusion: What Newman's Sermons Show about his Christology	176

4. Newman on the Trinity before and after Nicaea (1840–58)	181
The Littlemore Context: In Exile with Athanasius	182
The Eclipse of Origen	186
The Rise of Athanasius	197
Conclusion: Development without Dynamism	214
5. The Athanasius ‘With Whom I End’ (1864–81)	218
The Roman Context: Engagement with the Schools	218
Arianism Revisited and Origen Rehabilitated	224
General Changes to the Athanasius Translation	231
Theological Changes to the Athanasius Translation	237
Conclusion: A Latin Athanasius for a Catholic Cardinal	246
6. Conclusion	248
The Legacy of <i>The Arians of the Fourth Century</i>	250
Origen the Redeemable Pre-Nicene	257
Athanasius the Composite Post-Nicene	260
<i>Bibliography</i>	265
<i>Glossary</i>	275
<i>Index</i>	281

## Introduction

This book will trace the dynamism of the patristic scholarship of John Henry Newman (1801–1890) as he moved from young Evangelical, to scholar learning from Oxford's High Churchmen, to Tractarian leader alienated from the Church of England, to Catholic alienated from the Roman schools, and finally to cardinal. Throughout Newman's life, the early Church Fathers most important to his thought were those from Alexandria in Egypt. But how he read Clement and Origen, Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria shifted at each stage of his life. Therefore something else must be traced in this book as well: how Newman shaped the tradition of patristic scholarship that he inherited into the quite different tradition that he bequeathed to those who followed him. Newman changed how the history of Alexandrian doctrine was understood and written about, so his work must be set in the broader context of Anglican and Catholic historiography of Christian doctrine.

The teachings of the Church Fathers, particularly on the doctrines of God's Trinity and Christ's incarnation, fascinated Newman from his teenage years until his death. He famously wrote that at the age of fifteen he was 'enamoured of the long extracts from St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the other Fathers' that he discovered in the second volume (1795) of Joseph Milner's *The History of the Church of Christ* (*Apo* 20). Although this recollection of his teenage years in the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, nearly fifty years later (1864), puts the stress on the Latin Fathers, that was Milner's own Evangelical stress, having little time for the theology and piety of the Greek Fathers. A Latin like Ambrose, Milner wrote, 'might have both preached and written better, had he always attended to the simple word of God, and

exercised his own natural good sense in humble dependence on DIVINE GRACE, and paid less regard to the fanciful writings of Origen, which corrupted his understanding exceedingly'.<sup>1</sup> Yet Newman came to disagree. In 1833, Newman's first book regarded Origen's interpretation of scripture as something to be relished not regretted. Milner also found 'nothing important' in the writings of Athanasius, 'except what relates to the Arian controversy'; he held the patriarch to be a good judge of character 'except in the life of Anthony the monk . . . the superstitions and follies of which unhappy perversion of piety received but too liberal a support from his influence'.<sup>2</sup> Yet Newman would devote much of the 1840s and the late 1870s to Athanasius's theology, while Antony of Egypt provided the example for the ascetic disciplines of Newman's life. Albeit, due to Milner's influence, they were not Newman's first love, nevertheless the Greek Fathers, especially those from Egypt, became his lifelong companions.

Already the first theme of this book has become clear: Newman's alliances to various Fathers changed over the years. Although scholars have long been aware of the depth and breadth of Newman's patristic reading, there is a tendency to reduce all that he wrote on the Fathers to an expression of Athanasian orthodoxy. Attention has typically focused on Newman's handling of the fourth-century theological controversy, to which he returned time and again, because '[s]een Newman's way, contemporary civilization is a contest between the irreconcilable principles of Arius and Athanasius'.<sup>3</sup> To avoid such generalizations, this book will explore *which* Fathers interested Newman the most and *when*. Moreover, evidence from

<sup>1</sup> J. Milner, *The History of the Church of Christ*, ii (Boston, Mass.: Farrand, Mallory and Co, 1809), 228.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 165. For Milner's theological agenda, see J. D. Walsh, 'Joseph Milner's Evangelical Church History', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 10 (1959), 174–87.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 116. The same trend can be seen among those more sympathetic to Newman, e.g., Denys Gorce, *Newman et les Pères* (2nd edn.; Bruges: Editions Charles Beyaert, 1946); George Dragas, 'Conscience and Tradition: Newman and Athanasios in the Orthodox Church', *Newman Studien*, 11 (1980), 73–84; and G. Tokarsik, 'John Henry Newman and the Church Fathers', *Eastern Churches Journal*, 7 (2000), esp. 102–3.

his patristic writings will replace mere speculation in discerning *what* Newman took from these Fathers.<sup>4</sup>

Such an exploration of Newman's patristic writing on the Fathers will reveal a second theme of this book: that his view of what was 'orthodox' doctrine changed.

There was a period in Newman's life when his interest in doctrine depended less on the orthodoxy of Church Councils than was later the case. Clement and Origen predated conciliar 'orthodoxy', yet were central to Newman's understanding of doctrine in the 1830s. He would turn against Origen in the 1840s when, formulating his idea that doctrine develops, Newman promoted a version of orthodoxy that centred on Athanasius and judged those who predated Nicaea by the Creed of that Council which Athanasius promoted. In the 1870s, he began to rehabilitate Origen, reassessing the role he played leading up to the Council of Nicaea. In each of these periods, a causal connection will be revealed between the patristic theology Newman was reading and his own theology; but events in these periods will also be shown to change how he interpreted the Fathers. It is as if Newman tried on each of the Fathers for size, beginning with the pre-Nicene Greeks in the late 1820s, then the post-Nicene Greeks during his research into Christological controversies in the mid-1830s, and finding Athanasius the best fit in the 1840s—albeit this interpretation of Athanasius was made of a cloth that intertwined Latin threads with Greek. The patriarch of Alexandria whom Newman depicted was a composite figure. This was even more the case in the 1870s, when Athanasius was tailored to Catholic tastes. Moreover, measuring Origen up with the interpretations made by Aquinas and Suarez, in 1872 Newman found him a better fit than he had in the 1840s.

The multiple interpretations of the Alexandrian Fathers reveal multiple periods in Newman's life, which is the third theme of this book. Though taking a chronological approach to Newman's

<sup>4</sup> Others' speculations attribute to Newman's reading of the patristic sources some suspiciously modern ideas, e.g., G. Magill writes that Newman discerned a 'personal' rather than 'logical' style of reasoning from the Fathers, 'Newman's Personal Reasoning: The Inspiration of the Early Church', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 52 (1992), 305–13; and V. F. Blehl discerns the 'The Patristic Humanism of John Henry Newman', *Thought*, 50 (1975), 274.

patristic writings, it will not divide Newman's life into Anglican and then Catholic periods as most studies do.<sup>5</sup> The account that Newman gave of his conversion to Catholicism governs such studies, an account that began in Lecture XII of 'Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans' (1850), was polished in the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864), and continued to be used against his Anglican critics.<sup>6</sup> Instead, this book depicts three periods (the 1830s, the 1840s and 50s, and the 1860s and 70s) rather than just two (Anglican and Catholic), in order to see the shaping of patristic teaching on the Trinity and Christology. Any way of dividing history up into periods is artificial, because of continuities across periods. Yet Newman's own history provides two clear divisions in his interpretation of the Alexandrian Fathers rather than just the one division of his conversion: the first came after the publication of Tract 90 in February 1841, which left him feeling increasingly alienated from the Anglican hierarchy, and the second came when the reaction to an article in the *Rambler* in July 1859, 'On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine', left him feeling increasingly alienated from the Catholic hierarchy. In the periods of isolation that followed, Newman reassessed his own theology by turning to the Fathers, and in so doing reinterpreted the Alexandrians.

<sup>5</sup> This division is found from the beginning of Newman scholarship with John Oldcastle's pamphlet, *The Catholic Life and Letters of Cardinal Newman* (London: Burns and Oates, 1885) and Richard Church's 1891 study, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833–1845* (London and New York: Macmillan, 1904). Some recent studies focus on the Anglican years only, notably Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) and Frank Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002). Even Ian Ker's thematic approach in *Newman on Being a Christian* (Leominster and Notre Dame, Ind.: Gracewing/University of Notre Dame Press, 1990) divides Newman's writings into 'Anglican' and 'Catholic' categories.

<sup>6</sup> In *A Letter Addressed to the Rev. E. B. Pusey* (1865), Newman says of his days as an Anglican: 'I recollect well what an outcast I seemed to myself, when I took down from the shelves of my library the volumes of St Athanasius or St Basil, and set myself to study them; and how, on the contrary, when at length I was brought into Catholic communion, I kissed them with delight, with a feeling that in them I had more than all that I had lost' (*Diff* ii. 3). In *A Letter Addressed to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk on Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation* (1874), he writes of the Tractarians that 'none of us could read the Fathers, and determine to be their disciples, without feeling that Rome, like a faithful steward, had kept in fulness and in vigour what our own communion had let drop' (*Diff* ii. 198).

The fourth and final theme of this book will set Newman's multiple interpretations of the Alexandrians in the wider context of the historiography of Christian doctrine. While Milner's *History* influenced his earliest interpretation of patristic doctrine, Oxford in the 1820s and early 1830s brought other influences to bear, especially from the High Churchmen. The High Church tradition of Anglican teaching was founded on two Testaments of scripture, three Creeds, and four Councils (only the Ecumenical Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon carried weight for Anglicans).<sup>7</sup> Greek theologians, rather than Latins, were since the seventeenth century the favourites of High Churchmen; indeed, it is noticeable in that era how few Latin Fathers were printed in England, compared to Greek Fathers.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, High Church historians like George Bull, the Bishop of St David's (1634–1710), and William Cave (1637–1713), Chaplain to Charles II, did not discriminate in praising both pre-Nicene and post-Nicene Greek theology, seeing continuity across the first five Christian centuries. Until his idea of doctrinal development, Newman likewise thought that pre- and post-Nicene Fathers taught the same doctrines as one another. But one difference from his Anglican predecessors in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833), as Rowan Williams has observed, was Newman's view that 'doctrine, even if only in its outward expression, does have a *history*', an insight many High Churchmen found shocking.<sup>9</sup> While today many might find it equally shocking that Newman's own doctrinal writings also have a history, this book will trace that history as it is located in the events of his life. Those events led Newman to change his mind repeatedly about the Fathers and their doctrine.

The remainder of this introduction will begin where Newman's reading of the Greek Fathers did, with Oxford in the 1820s, before

<sup>7</sup> This tag was originally from the seventeenth-century bishop Lancelot Andrewes: 'Our faith is the ancient catholic faith contained in the two testaments, the three creeds, the four councils, only restored to its proper lustre', quoted in Robert L. Ottley, *Lancelot Andrewes* (London: Methuen, 1894), 164.

<sup>8</sup> Anglican scholars 'concentrated on ante-Nicene Fathers and on Greek Fathers and Byzantine writers,' and Augustine was usually read in Catholic editions, according to Jean-Louis Quantin, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth Century Roman Catholic Theology', in Irena Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. (New York: E. J. Brill, 1997), ii. 999.

<sup>9</sup> Rowan Williams, 'Newman's *Arians* and the Question of Method in Doctrinal History', in Ian Ker and Alan G. Hill (eds.), *Newman after One Hundred Years* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 276.



giving a brief overview of each chapter. The University of Oxford, like Cambridge, had gone through fifty years of vigorous intellectual activity when Newman went up. A. M. C. Waterman writes: ‘During the 1770s the world changed’, not only politically but also intellectually.

[Smith’s] *Wealth of Nations* and Bentham’s *Fragment on Government*, both of which were published in 1776, symbolically inaugurate a fundamentally new way of looking at human society and its ills. The first two volumes of [Gibbon’s] *Decline and Fall*, which also appeared that year, marked the beginning of a frontal assault on Christianity; Hume’s posthumous *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* was first printed three years later.<sup>10</sup>

With political and religious radicalism going together, scholars from the Universities tended to return to theological orthodoxy and a defence of the Thirty-nine Articles, as seen in the Cambridge-educated Joseph Milner and his brother Isaac (who became President of Queens’ College) who went from being radical young Churchmen to vigorous opponents of heterodoxy. The Milners’ orthodox generation taught the scholars who, in turn, helped shape Newman’s Oxford and Hugh James Rose’s Cambridge.

During his second summer as an Oxford undergraduate, Newman once again read Gibbon’s *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* and wrote that he relished ‘[his] happy choice of expressions, his vigorous compression of ideas, and the life and significance of his every word’ (*LD* i. 67). Although ‘disconcerted’ by Gibbon’s remark that ‘Ambition is a weed which often flourishes in the vineyard of Christ’, Newman was not as shocked as earlier readers because the intellectual world had changed since the 1770s, as intimated by the reference to Southey in the same letter (*ibid.*). The early years of the 1770s saw the births of Wordsworth, Southey, Coleridge, and Walter Scott—the group of English Romantics that would profoundly influence Newman’s generation.<sup>11</sup> The Oxford undergraduate could

<sup>10</sup> A. M. C. Waterman, ‘A Cambridge “Via Media” in Late Georgian Anglicanism’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 42 (1991), 421–2.

<sup>11</sup> For a possible direct influence of the Romantics on Newman, see John Coulson, *Newman and the Common Tradition: A Study in the Language of Church and Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970); Stephen Prickett, *Romanticism and Religion: The Tradition of Coleridge and Wordsworth in the Victorian Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); and David Goslee, *Romanticism and the Age of Newman* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1996).

relish Gibbon's storytelling because Newman had learned from the Romantics to value imagination.<sup>12</sup> The ancient world that Gibbon depicted continued to captivate Newman as a tutor at Oriel and curate of St Clement's, Oxford, when he began writing history himself. His first articles were on Cicero, in 1824,<sup>13</sup> and the first-century philosopher and wonderworker Apollonius of Tyana, in 1826, for the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, the Church's rival to the godless *Britannica* (*HS* i. 239–331). Newman's imagination shaped the way he read the Fathers, a way that the older generation saw as dangerously 'enthusiastic'. While the English Romantics represented something new and radical for the generation of High Churchmen who were born or grew up in the 1770s and 1780s,<sup>14</sup> their ideas were constitutive of life in 1820s Oxford and Cambridge.<sup>15</sup> When Newman accused the older High Churchmen of being 'High and Dry', immune to feeling in their religion, overly rationalistic, and unwilling to appeal to the imagination, he was speaking the sentiments of a Romantic. In a series of three anonymous articles on Antony of Egypt in the *British*

<sup>12</sup> Appealing to the imagination in argument is typical of the English Romantics and not the Milners or William Paley (1743–1805). But where the Romantics spoke of imagination as co-creative with God, the Tractarians spoke of the imagination's grace-filled *recognition* of God's work. For Coleridge, imagination enables us to create the world we experience in order to know it, 'a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM' (*Biographia Literaria* 2 vols. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983), i. 304). For Coleridge, this is a religious insight, but for the Tractarians 'the province of the true poet has been not to invent likenesses, but to trace out the analogies, which are actually impressed upon the creation', quoted from Pusey's unpublished 'Lectures on Types and Prophecies in the Old Testament' by A. M. Allchin, 'The Theological Vision of the Oxford Movement', in John Coulson and Allchin (eds.), *The Rediscovery of Newman* (London: SPCK, 1967), 64.

<sup>13</sup> While criticizing Gibbon's lack of belief, Newman's belief brought a different shape to his own history writing. Robert Pattison argues that 'Cicero's life was of little interest to [Newman] not for its lack of event but for its lack of application of belief to event', *Great Dissent*, 99.

<sup>14</sup> This generation of High Churchmen includes William Van Mildert (born 1765), William Howley (1766), John Watson (1767), H. H. Norris (1771), Joshua Watson (1771), Christopher Bethell (1773), John Jebb (1775), Henry Phillpotts (1778), Charles Le Bas (1779), John Kaye (1783), Charles Lloyd (1784), and William Lyall (1788). When introducing these older High Churchmen in my text, their birthdate has been mentioned to stress the generational difference from Newman's friends.

<sup>15</sup> Newman (born 1801) had as close contemporaries among High Churchmen: W. F. Hook (1798), R. W. Jelf (1798), A. P. Perceval (1799), E. B. Pusey (1800), Edward Churton (1800), William Gresley (1801), Isaac Williams (1802), Robert Wilberforce (1802), George Moberly (1803), William Palmer of Worcester (1803),

*Magazine*, between July and September 1835, Newman did not argue for Evangelical sentiment but rather that ‘enthusiasm is sobered and refined by being submitted to the discipline of the Church, instead of being allowed to run wild and external to it’ (*HS* ii. 103). When the older generation thought of Antony, they were suspicious of his life as a hermit and his fights with demons. By contrast, Newman not only praised Antony’s virtues but espoused the excitement of the English Romantics for a disciplined and holy way of life.<sup>16</sup>

In addition, Newman’s three articles acted as a defence of Athanasius, who wrote the *Life of Antony*. Newman felt that the doctrine for which Athanasius was a spokesman, and which the High Churchmen revered, went together with the sort of asceticism embodied by Antony. Therefore, Newman criticized those who ‘make it their boast that they are more *comfortable* than that ancient creed which, together with joy, leads men to continual smiting on the breast, and prayers for pardon’ (*HS* ii. 125). Both morbid and emotional, both self-denying and fervent, the Tractarian ethos scared the older High Churchmen, whom Newman judged as too ‘comfortable’. Judging by its ability to shock the older generation, this ethos represented something more Romantic than the ethics of Aristotle or Bishop Butler (1692–1752).<sup>17</sup> Newman and his friend Hurrell Froude insisted upon withdrawal from worldly affairs, looking to the Fathers for their example of holiness and reserve, but also to John Keble, himself a Romantic poet and the embodiment of self-denial, who exchanged reputation at Oxford for the role of a country parson. But the older High Churchmen were the generation who had lived through the fears of the French Revolution and whose nation had

Richard Hurrell Froude (1803), William Copeland (1804), Samuel Wilberforce (1805), and Henry Wilberforce (1807). Newman looked on Keble (1792) and Rose (1795), both slightly older, as his guides.

<sup>16</sup> For the way Coleridge also used enthusiasm to encourage moral development, see J. Robert Barth and John L. Mahoney (eds.), *Coleridge, Keats, and the Imagination* (Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1990), esp. 139.

<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, for the importance of Butler and Aristotle, see James Pereiro, *‘Ethos’ and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008). See also D. Newsome, *Two Classes of Men: Platonism and English Romantic Thought* (London: John Murray, 1974), ch. 4, who argues that Newman was more an Aristotelian and Coleridge more a Platonist.

defended their rights and liberties in the wars against Napoleon. Such men grew up worrying about national politics—seeing the stability of the State constantly threatened—whereas the younger generation named such politics ‘Erastian’, after the Swiss theologian who upheld the civil authority’s jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs.

Two older High Churchmen became Newman’s teachers in the Greek Fathers: first, in the 1820s, Charles Lloyd (b. 1784) and then, in the 1830s, Martin Routh (b. 1755). In 1823–4, alongside Edward Pusey and six others, Newman ‘attended some private lectures in Divinity by the Regius Professor, Dr Charles Lloyd’ (*LD* i. 167). Although Newman later reported that Lloyd kept his opinions to himself about the books of apologetics and biblical history which they read in class, nevertheless something of the Professor’s High Church affinity for the Fathers must have rubbed off (*AW* 70–1). And although Newman later felt ashamed of ‘some flippant language against the Fathers in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* . . . on the Scripture Miracles in 1825–6’—the result of reading ‘Middleton on the Miracles of the early Church’<sup>18</sup>—nevertheless he retained an interest in the Fathers (*Apo* 26). In January 1826, he asked Edward Smedley, editor of the *Encyclopaedia*, ‘May I venture to inquire whether it would fall in with your arrangements, were I to undertake the Fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries in one paper . . . engaging to send it to you in two years[?]’ (*LD* i. 274). In line with this timeframe, Newman told Lloyd in February 1827, by which stage he was Bishop of Oxford, of a plan to read the Fathers. He recorded in his journal that Lloyd said in response to the plan that ‘our theological systems do not agree’, although Newman thought they ‘agree[d] more than when I was in class with him, but I do not tell him so’ (*AW* 210).

<sup>18</sup> His article cited Conyers Middleton on the Fathers, whose book was entitled: *A Free Inquiry into the miraculous powers which are supposed to have subsisted in the Christian Church from the earliest ages* (1748). (*Mir* 79 n.r) By September 1831, Newman thought that Middleton was too liberal, Gibbon was too pagan, and Milner was too Protestant: ‘of the historians I have met with I have a very low opinion—Mosheim, Gibbon, Middleton, Milner, etc.’ (*LD* ii. 371). Newman’s opinion did not change in 1842: ‘What we meet in Fleury’s work is a minute and exact narrative of the course of ecclesiastical events, as they occurred; and this, from the plan of their histories, is not found in Mosheim, Milner, Gibbon, Neander, Milman or Dollinger [*sic*], great as are the merits of these authors in various ways’ (*Fleury* i, p. v). These other historians will be introduced below.

Grounds for further agreement came later in 1827, when Newman read the High Churchman William Wall (1647–1728) and ‘drew up a defence of Infant Baptism from the patristical testimonies’ that he found in *The History of Infant Baptism* (AW 83).

Indeed, from the humble beginnings of the class with Lloyd grew a fascination for the ‘period between the Apostolical Fathers and the Nicene Council’ (LD i. 274). The *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* recounts that another teacher, Richard Whately (b. 1787),<sup>19</sup> accused him of ‘Arianizing’ in a sermon preached in Oriel chapel in 1827, a term Newman interprets to mean being ‘very strong for that ante-Nicene view of the Trinitarian doctrine’ which made the Son of God subordinate to God the Father (Apo 25). Perhaps Newman imbibed this doctrine from what little he read of the pre-Nicene Greeks through the High Churchmen who, as this book will show, judged that some degree of ‘subordinationism’ could not be heretical because the Alexandrians had taught it. Newman only became aware of problems with the Alexandrian doctrine of the Trinity when drawn to the Latin doctrine from the 1840s onwards. Thus, it is with the hindsight of a conception of the Trinity learned later that Newman looks back on that Oriel sermon, writing elsewhere that he ‘took, without knowing it, [George] Bull’s doctrine of the “Subordinatio Filii”’ (AW 142). At the time of writing *Arians of the Fourth Century*, however, he thought that neither he nor Bull’s *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae* ‘which at this time I read’ (Apo 36), nor Origen, whom both were defending, had committed the heresy of subordinationism.

In the late 1820s, Newman’s growing sympathy for Lloyd and growing opposition to Whately brought him closer to the Greek Fathers.<sup>20</sup> It was Lloyd who suggested that Pusey go to Germany to study Hebrew (Pusey would become Professor of Hebrew at Oxford).

<sup>19</sup> Newman worked on an article on logic with Whately, who wrote: ‘I cannot avoid particularizing the Rev. J. Newman, Fellow of Oriel College, who actually composed a considerable portion of the work as it now stands’ (*Elements of Logic, Comprising the Substance of the Article in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* (4th edn.; London: B. Fellowes, 1831), p. ix). At this stage of his life (though not later on), Newman agreed with Whately about the Schoolmen’s ‘waste of ingenuity and frivolous subtilty of disputation’ (p. 8).

<sup>20</sup> An *Autobiographical Memoir*, written in the third-person for Newman’s friend Ambrose St John in 1874, compared Lloyd with Whately: ‘Lloyd professed to hold to theology, and laid great stress on a doctrinal standard, authoritative and traditional

By the time Newman told Lloyd of his patristic reading plans, he had already ‘commission[ed]’ Pusey, while there, to buy him some editions of the Fathers, and the first to be acquired were volumes of Chrysostom and Theodoret in November 1826 (*LD* i. 309). Newman told his mother when other volumes arrived from Germany in October 1827: ‘huge fellows they are, but very cheap’, probably referring to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, large compilations in Latin of Fathers whose works were too small to be sold individually (*LD* ii. 30). In the summer of 1828, Newman finally started a chronological reading of the Fathers with Ignatius of Antioch and Justin Martyr (*Apo* 35). By July 1831, he had become proficient enough in the Fathers to begin writing *Arians of the Fourth Century* (*LD* ii. 340); work that was helped when, that October, his friends and pupils bought him another thirty-six volumes, described as ‘so fine in their outsides as to put my former ones to shame’ (*LD* ii. 369). These editions were mainly by the Benedictines of St Maur (the Maurists) and included the works of Origen and Athanasius.<sup>21</sup>

After Lloyd’s early death in 1829, a second High Churchman greatly influenced Newman’s patristic scholarship.<sup>22</sup> Martin Routh was the President of Magdalen College, who had collected together

teaching, and ecclesiastical history; Whately called the Fathers “certain old divines”, and, after Swift or some other wit, called orthodoxy “one’s own doxy”, and heterodoxy “another’s doxy” (*AW* 70).

<sup>21</sup> The two most famous members of the order are Jean Mabillon (1632–1707), who worked mostly on Latin Fathers and whose book *De re diplomatica* invented the word ‘diplomatic’, and Bernard de Montfaucon (1655–1731), who from 1687 was ‘working on the edition of the Greek Fathers, and particularly on Athanasius. In the year after Mabillon’s death he produced *Paleographia graeca*, and in this case too the title of his book invented a word that has been the standard ever since’ (L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (2nd edn.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 171).

<sup>22</sup> T. M. Parker contends that, while Newman’s ‘work on the Arians led him inevitably to Bishop Bull... I would suspect that it was Martin Joseph Routh who encouraged him to read further in the seventeenth-century divines. In the beginning of February 1834, we are told by J. B. Mozley, in a letter to his sister Maria, ‘Newman was closeted the other day two hours with Dr. Routh of Magdalen, receiving his opinions as to his work [*The Arians of the Fourth Century*], which were very complementary’... Did Routh direct him to them [Laud, Bramhall, Stillingfleet]? (‘The Rediscovery of the Fathers in the Seventeenth-century Anglican Tradition’, in John Coulson and A. M. Allchin (eds.), *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium* (London: SPCK, 1967), 45, quoting *Letters of Rev J. B. Mozley*, *DD* (London: Rivingtons, 1885), 39).

various fragments of patristic writing in *Reliquiae Sacrae* (1814–18), a work to which Newman frequently turned. Routh taught history in the High Anglican tradition, as described in a letter from Newman in 1837 asking him to be the dedicatee of the ‘Lectures on the Prophetic Office’. ‘I have tried’, Newman wrote, ‘as far as may be, to follow the line of doctrine marked out by our great divines, of whom perhaps I have chiefly followed Bramhall, then Laud, Hammond, Field, Stillingfleet, Beveridge and others of the same school’ (*LD* vi. 7). Newman and his followers came to propagate the view that, apart from Routh and Lloyd, other High Churchmen at the time were largely forgetful of the Fathers. Newman suggested this himself when, in his dedication to Routh, he thanked a scholar ‘who has been reserved’—a word of highest praise—‘to report to a forgetful generation what was the Theology of their Fathers’ (*VM* i, p. i). In fact, the generations between Routh and Newman were fluent in the Fathers.<sup>23</sup> The difference was that Routh remained a constant friend of the Oxford Movement, whereas other High Churchmen criticized Newman. Routh received the praise of Richard Church fifty years later for having ‘stood alone among his brother Heads [of Oxford Houses] in his knowledge of what English theology was’; which is to say, Routh stood alone in not criticizing Newman for Tract 90.<sup>24</sup>

Charles Lloyd’s death before the Tracts meant that, in the historiography of the Movement, he could be safely idealized by Newman and friends.<sup>25</sup> Lloyd became a yardstick with which to measure other

<sup>23</sup> As so much Oxford Movement scholarship does these days, I depend here upon Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship 1760–1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Nockles has shown the exaggerated distance that Tractarian leaders, and subsequent historians of the Movement, put between themselves and the High Churchmen of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

<sup>24</sup> Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833–1845*, 304. For Church’s animus against the heads of Oxford colleges, see Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 150–1. Routh’s renowned sense of humour probably helped in his dealings with Newman’s friend, William Palmer of Magdalen (not of Worcester College), as recounted in Robin Wheeler, *Palmer’s Progress: The Life of William Palmer of Magdalen* (Berne: Peter Lang, 2006).

<sup>25</sup> Newman later wrote that he ‘retained to old age an affectionate and grateful memory of Lloyd (an excellent man). Many of his pupils rose to eminence, some through his helping hand. Mr Jelf was soon made preceptor to Prince

theologians, not least Renn Dickson Hampden (b. 1793) in his 1832 Bampton lectures, against whose appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity, in 1836, Newman led a fierce campaign. That chair became open upon the unexpected death of Lloyd's successor as Regius Professor, Edward Burton (b. 1794). In the *British Critic* of July 1836, writing about a work by Burton, Newman lamented 'the sagacity of Bishop Lloyd [who] discerned the renewal of hostilities with the Romanists in prospect, and began, in this very Review [in 1825], to prepare for defence' (*Critic* 20: 210). Lloyd was the High Church ideal of a scholar, compared with whom Burton fell short: 'At this moment especially, when the orthodox doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, or Atonement, are so lightly treated in quarters where one might have hoped for better things, we regret the *accident*, which makes Dr Burton appear to put those divine truths in the second place in the Christian scheme.' Such a statement was animated more by Hampden, whose lectures Newman held to be heterodox, than it was by Burton—at least the latter had been 'zealous' for doctrine 'in former publications' (ibid. 229). But Burton takes the blame, along with other High Church scholars of the day, for not presenting doctrinal history in a way that it might oppose, on the one hand, 'Romanists' and, on the other, liberal Protestants like Hampden.

Another High Churchman, Hugh James Rose (b. 1795), was essential in encouraging Newman's earliest work on the Greek Fathers. A notable scholar and well-connected clergyman, Rose was Professor of Divinity at the new University at Durham in 1834, and then Principal of King's College London in 1836, where he remained until his early death in 1838. Rose commissioned *Arians of the Fourth Century*; moreover, throughout their correspondence in the early and middle 1830s, Rose was an important interlocutor in all of Newman's schemes, even sometimes acting as a brake. Newman shared with Rose a belief that scholarship was useless if it did not lead to action; its purpose was to make readers grow in holiness not just in

George... Mr Churton, who died prematurely, became chaplain to Howley, [then] Bishop of London... Mr Pusey he recommended to the Minister for the Hebrew Professorship, first sending him to Germany to study that language in the Universities there' (AW 71–2). Ibid. 70 mentions that 'Oakeley... testified to [Lloyd's] influence... having acted in a Catholic direction; but such men attended his lectures some years later', referring to *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement* (1865).



knowledge.<sup>26</sup> Newman tried to live such a life in his ministry as a priest. He wrote to Rose in September 1834 of his decision not to allow a parishioner to marry: ‘The Primitive Church would never have sanctioned such a marriage. How could I allow a man calling himself a Churchman to commit himself to the peril of having a wife and then children (probably) who were without the Covenant?’ (*LD* iv. 327). For Newman, the history of the early Church was the example for holy living in the present and that recognition should shape the way such history was written.

While some High Churchmen, like Rose, remained true to those who had been their teachers and priests, and who, as patrons, controlled ecclesiastical appointments, Newman persuaded other contemporaries to accompany him in his attempt to retrieve the holiness of the early Church for the present day.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, Rose became increasingly concerned about Newman’s powers of persuasion among those training at Oxford to be clergymen. One article that Rose delayed publishing in the *British Magazine*, much to the frustration of Newman and Froude, was the two-part piece entitled, ‘Home Thoughts Abroad.’<sup>28</sup> Subsequent commentators have rightly seen the letters between Rose and Newman, dating from the time of the article’s publication in March and April 1836, as a parting of the ways. J. W. Burgon included the correspondence in his character sketch of Rose in *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, in order to suggest the Tractarians departed from the authentically High Church ways of Rose. Reginald Fuller has argued that, in these letters, Rose was ‘protesting at the altered tone manifested in Newman’s Tract 71 and in his “Home Thoughts from [*sic*] Abroad.” Newman had

<sup>26</sup> Rose wrote in his Durham Divinity lectures: ‘In a word, in Milner there is no love of the cause, or, if the man had a heart, the writer thought it his duty to overlay his feelings with dry details of barren facts, without the record of a single moral lesson to which they can lead or a feeling which they can inspire’; quoted by Newman (*Fleury* i, p. iv).

<sup>27</sup> Among them, William Copeland found it ‘a relief to contrast’ antiquity with ‘the cold-heartedness and semi-infidel conservatism of many of the maintainers of our so-called happy establishment’ (to M. A. Copeland, 3 May 1836, Copeland MSS (Pusey House), quoted by Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 28).

<sup>28</sup> It was republished in 1872 as ‘How to Accomplish it’ in *DA*. For Froude’s frustration, see, e.g., *LD* v. 192.

spoken of the Church of England as “safe” and nothing more.<sup>29</sup> In the letter quoted above, from May 1836, Rose addressed the question of Newman’s passion for the early Church. Rose thought it dangerous for Newman to be

turning the readers [among the clergy], such as they are, out to grass in the spacious pastures of Antiquity without very strict tether. *All* that is in Antiquity is not good; and much that was good for Antiquity would not be good for us . . . Antiquity should be studied by them only with full, clear and explicit directions how to derive from it that good which is to be derived from it; and to avoid the sort of quackery of *affecting* Antiquity.<sup>30</sup>

Rose worried that Newman’s disciples, in reading the Fathers, were not getting them right, to which Newman replied: ‘*Where* have I bid people to search into Antiquity without guide?’ (*LD* v. 304). Pusey attempted to reassure Rose, saying that ‘we do take care not to build on one or other Father, but on Catholic Antiquity . . . This is what I meant by saying that we must spread our sails, not knowing whither we should be carried.’<sup>31</sup>

Meanwhile, in the *British Critic* in July 1836, Newman portrayed the Tractarians as the rudder to steer High Church scholarship, discounting his various rivals. The article already cited took the death earlier that year of both the Regius Professor of Divinity, Edward Burton, and the former Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford and Bishop of Durham, William Van Mildert, to indicate the end of an era. But he does not lament its passing, writing:

The highly to be revered school of divinity, commonly called high Church, has lately been bereaved of its brightest ornament, in the admirable Prelate who filled the See of Durham [Van Mildert]; while it is fast losing ground in the Christian Knowledge Society. As to the party who seem to be succeeding to their power, and are full of hope of triumph in consequence, they have no internal consistency, clearness of principle, strength of mind, or weight of ability sufficient to keep the place they may perhaps have to win. (*Critic* 20: 212–13)

<sup>29</sup> Reginald Fuller, ‘The Classical High Church Reaction to the Tractarians’, in Geoffrey Rowell (ed.), *Tradition Renewed* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 52.

<sup>30</sup> Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, 2 vols. (5th edn.; London: John Murray, 1889), i. 210.

<sup>31</sup> Quoted *ibid.* i. 220 n.

According to Newman, it was Froude who originally ‘said Waterland was the first, and Van Mildert the last of the school’ (*LD* v. 363). While Van Mildert was to be revered, Newman found his school as lacking in passion as their High Church forebears: ‘Bull, Waterland, Petavius, Baronius and the rest’, Newman wrote in October 1831 to his friend at the time, Samuel Rickards (b. 1796), ‘are magnificent fellows, but they are Antiquarians or Doctrinists, not Ecclesiastical Historians’ (*LD* ii. 371).<sup>32</sup> What Newman regrets about ‘Doctrinists’, from Bull and Waterland to Van Mildert, is that detail overwhelms plot: they are ‘Antiquarians’ who are interested in the past for its own sake, not ‘Ecclesiastical Historians’ who tell the story of the past in order to change lives in the present. In the same letter, Cave and Tillemont<sup>33</sup> are called ‘highly respectable, but biographers’, suggesting that, already in 1831, Newman thought he offered something new to the writing of Church history. In the *British Critic* in 1836, Newman proclaims what he has to offer: history written with an eye to current events, not like Burton’s history writing, which had ‘too little of moral or lesson’. Burton was at least ‘a very considerable advance upon Mosheim’s history; which is as dry and sapless as if the Church were some fossil remains of an antediluvian era’, Newman taking his view of the German historian straight from Rose (*Critic* 20: 214).

With the death of Van Mildert and Burton, this school had been left directionless—not that either of them offered much direction. Of those High Churchmen who could replace them, Bishop John Kaye of Lincoln ‘has apparently been led by an accurate taste, critical

<sup>32</sup> Newman must have read portions of the Anglican Daniel Waterland’s *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed* (1723) and *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1737), the Jesuit Denys Petaus’s *De Theologicis Dogmatibus*, 4 vols. (1644–50), and the Oratorian Cesare Baronius’s *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 12 vols. (1588–1607). Similar criticism of George Bull came in his article from Oct. 1838: ‘Bull, again, is beyond his other traits, remarkable for discursiveness. He is full of digressions, which can only be excused because they are so instructive and beautiful. If he is often rhetorical, he is never dry; and never tires, except from the abundance of his matter. This same remark applies *mutatis mutandis* to Pearson’s *Vindiciae [Epistolarum S. Ignatii (1672)]* and Wall’s *Infant Baptism* [2 vols. (1705)]’ (*Critic* 24: 348/*EH* i. 180).

<sup>33</sup> See Louis-Sébastien le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols. (2nd edn.; Paris: Charles Robustel, 1701–12). Upon receiving a gift of the *Mémoires* from his former student, Frederic Rogers (b. 1811), Newman wrote in Aug. 1833: ‘The ‘Church of the Fathers’ [in the *British Magazine*] is in great measure drawn up from it’ (*LD* iv. 36).

exactness, and dislike of theory or paradox, into an over-estimation of facts, as such, separated from their meaning and consequences'; too many facts with too little interpretation was no way to write history (*Critic* 20: 214). What about younger men in the tradition of Van Mildert, like William Lyall? These he describes as having 'no internal consistency [or] clearness of principle'. Hugh James Rose himself? According to Newman in a letter to Froude in January 1836, at this stage Rose's editorship of the *British Magazine* was making him 'jealous of the Critic', and 'I think he wished the Oxford Tracts to stop, as ticklish things, which might go he knew not where' (*LD* v. 223–4). Newman thought the various High Church leaders, like Rose and the proprietor of the *British Critic*, Joshua Watson (b. 1771), were divided among themselves. Watson was an influential layman and sometime treasurer of SPCK, the brother of John James Watson (b. 1767), rector of Hackney. Together with Henry Handley Norris (b. 1771), perpetual curate and then rector of South Hackney, the brothers led the so-called Hackney Phalanx of influential London High Churchmen. With Rose divided from the Phalanx, Newman felt confident to demand, here in Joshua's own *British Critic*, that new leadership was needed among the High Churchmen to bring about a return to the Fathers. By January 1838, Newman had manoeuvred into such a position of leadership as editor of the *Critic*.<sup>34</sup>

Rose's concern in 1836 was for the Oxford students whom Newman influenced. Two of those students provide a commentary on the shape of that influence in the 1830s. S. F. Wood (b. 1809), whom Newman taught and who went on to become a London lawyer, expressed similar concerns to Rose's after a meeting with Newman in January 1836. The subject of Wood's disagreement was how to get from the tenets of the early Church to what came after, thinking Newman too mired in the Fathers. Ironically, to get him out of the mire, Wood proposed doctrinal development as an alternative, an idea like the one Newman would propound in the following decade. But, at the meeting, Newman rejected the idea, leading Wood to write to his Oxford contemporary, Henry Manning (b. 1808):

<sup>34</sup> For the publishing battles of Tractarians and High Churchmen in London, see Pereiro, *Ethos' and the Oxford Movement*, 14–25.

[Newman] says that before the Reformation the Church never deduced any doctrine from Scripture, and by inference blames our Reformers for doing so. Moreover he objects to their doctrine in itself as to Justification by Faith, and complains of their attempt to prove it from the Fathers . . . Generally, his result is, not merely to refer us to antiquity but to *shut us up* in it, and to deprive, not only individuals but the Church, of all those doctrines of Scripture not fully commented on by the Fathers.<sup>35</sup>

James Pereiro's research into Wood supports Louis Allen's findings that Newman did not sympathize with Rome's teachings in the middle 1830s.<sup>36</sup> Thus, Rune Imberg, finding evidence for a Catholic drift in the corrections Newman made to the early Tracts that were republished in 1836–8, is too hasty to see a move towards *Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845) and thence to Rome.<sup>37</sup>

F. W. Faber (b. 1814) was an Evangelical undergraduate at Balliol when he wrote to a friend in 1835, expressing suspicion of Newman's love of antiquity. Initially drawn to Newman because they shared an antipathy to 'the rationalities of Whately', Faber nevertheless thought that

a very serious blow may be given to the Church by bodies of young men going out to be parish priests, believing that there are inner doctrines, which it is well not to reveal to the vulgar—mysteries—I am using Newman's own words, which are his peculiar treasure—'thoughts which it is scarcely right to enlarge upon in a mixed congregation'.<sup>38</sup>

Faber continued that, given 'the accidents of depth of thought, peculiar line of study, and a somewhat monastic seclusion, I do not wonder that Newman's mind has been deeply tintured by that mystical allegorizing spirit of Origen and the school of Alexandria.

<sup>35</sup> To Manning, 29 Jan. 1836, Manning Papers (Bodleian), printed *ibid.* 248–9 (App. I).

<sup>36</sup> Pereiro, 'S. F. Wood and an Early Theory of Development in the Oxford Movement', *Recusant History*, 20 (1991), 540–1. Allen remarks that where development 'is referred to in Newman's early work it is usually an attribute of "Romanism", in other words it is a case against which he argues' (Allen (ed.), *John Henry Newman and the Abbé Jager: A Controversy on Scripture and Tradition 1834–1836* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 12).

<sup>37</sup> Rune Imberg, *In Quest of Authority: The 'Tracts for the Times' and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833–41* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1987), 124–5.

<sup>38</sup> John Edward Bowden, *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber, D. D.* (London: Thomas Richardson & Son, 1869), 21.

I can answer from personal experience for the manner in which it captivates a mind which is in the least imaginative'.<sup>39</sup> In the 1830s, Newman was so 'shut up' in pre-Nicene doctrine that many feared he would be stuck there.<sup>40</sup>

The later chapters of this book will argue that, in the 1840s, Newman changed his focus. His paradigm for conceiving of the Fathers shifted from the pre-Nicenes to Athanasius. In doing so, Newman also changed the paradigm by which Athanasius was understood by many subsequent scholars, through the annotations to his translation for *A Library of the Fathers*. In the wake of Tract 90, Newman abandoned his aim of making the ancient Church live once more in England. Instead, he sought an authority who would guarantee that developments in doctrine were legitimate, and in his reading of Athanasius he found such a guarantor. Throughout his life, though, Newman retained his High Church formation. Etienne Gilson finds it still present in the 1870s,<sup>41</sup> which explains why in 1879, the year Newman became a cardinal, he was hard at work on a translation of Athanasius. This was a retranslation of the *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians* of 1842–4. By the later date, however, he was reading the Greek Father through the lens of scholasticism, which led Athanasius's theology to be translated in very different terms in the version published in 1881. Here, the patriarch is introduced as the one 'in whose name and history years ago I began to write, and with whom I end' (*Ath i*, p. ix); but was it the same Athanasius? Newman contributed to the history of doctrine by bequeathing to those who read him different views of the Fathers at different stages of his life.

In what follows, Chapter 1 gives an overview of the way that the three different stages of Newman's life shaped his writing on the Alexandrians. The first period (broadly covering the 1830s) came

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 20.

<sup>40</sup> Ironically, by Apr. 1837, Faber was translating for *A Library of the Fathers* the work of 'Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, on the schism of the Donatists' (*ibid.* 70).

<sup>41</sup> Gilson wrote: 'while it would be wrong to imagine Newman as unacquainted with scholasticism when he wrote the *Grammar of Assent*, it must not be forgotten that, born and educated in the Anglican Church, his first theological formation owed little to the scholastics... [rather,] owing to him, the great theological style of the Fathers has been worthily revived in the nineteenth century' (introduction, *An Essay Towards a Grammar of Assent* (New York: Image Books, 1955), 17–18).

to an end with Newman's alienation from the Anglican Church after Tract 90. Seeking seclusion at Littlemore, in the quasi-monastic community he set up in his parish, he could work hard on translating Athanasius and perhaps see himself as an exile making the journey to Rome with the saint. In Rome to study, he then rejected scholastic theology in favour of a Latin dissertation on Athanasius. The second period (the 1840s and 50s) ended with alienation from the Catholic Church after 'On Consulting the Faithful', which, as John Coulson pointed out, 'provides the reasons for his silence as a Catholic writer between the publication of the *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects* in 1858 and the writing of the *Apologia* in 1864, as well as helping to explain why Kingsley's attack produced such a volcanic reply'.<sup>42</sup> The third period (the 1860s and 70s) saw Newman return to scholastic theology. Thus, Note II in the appendix to the 1871 republication of *Arians of the Fourth Century* refers to 'the received Catholic teaching *de Deo* and *de SS. Trinitate*', which reflects the sort of division of the doctrine of God into two parts, *de Deo uno* and *de Deo trino*, found in his Catholic contemporary, Johannes Baptist (later Cardinal) Franzelin (*Ari* 417). This reconceiving of patristic doctrine was a change first of all from the 1833 *Arians of the Fourth Century*, but also his retranslation of *Select Treatises* presented a neo-Thomist Athanasius compared with the 1842–4 version, justifying the claim that Newman read the Fathers differently in the three stages.

Chapters 2 and 3 focus on the first stage. In the 1830s, Newman dealt separately with the doctrines of the Trinity (in *Arians of the Fourth Century*) and the incarnation (in three subsequent summers of research). Taking the doctrine of the Trinity as its theme, Chapter 2 examines in detail Newman's first book, written in 1831–2, looking at the ways in which the previous two centuries of Anglican debate on the Alexandrian Fathers helped form his opinions. *Arians of the Fourth Century* set the stage for all subsequent discussion of the early Alexandrians, both in Newman's and in Anglophone scholarship.

Chapter 3 examines what Newman had to say between 1834 and 1840 about the person and work of Christ. Covering the period from the publication of *Arians of the Fourth Century* to his first insights into doctrinal development, its focus will be three summer vacations

<sup>42</sup> Coulson, introduction, *Cons* (p. 1).

which Newman spent researching different Greek patristic views of Christ and the sermons which resulted. In the summer of 1839, examining various Fathers before and after the Council of Chalcedon, he began to see doctrine no longer as something static but as in development. Newman became aware of the need for an idea whereby pre-Nicenes like Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria could 'develop' into the fuller doctrinal positions of Athanasius and Cyril. But even Athanasius and Cyril needed some later interpreters to clarify their positions, particularly the trio of Leontius of Byzantium, Maximus, and John of Damascus.

By the 1840s, Newman understood Christology and the incarnation as an integral part of the doctrine of the Trinity, so that Chapters 4 and 5 consider these themes together, through the lens of Newman's changing opinions on the theology of Origen and Athanasius. Chapter 4 shows that Newman's opinion of Origen and Athanasius changed in the 1840s and 50s, as a consequence of the very different conception of the Trinity from that he held in the 1830s—one that was different again from that he held in the 1870s, discussed in Chapter 5. Comparing Newman's earlier translation of the anti-Arian works in *A Library of the Fathers* (1842–4) with his later version of *Select Treatises* (1881), the increasingly 'Latin' ways in which Newman came to read Alexandrian theology will be charted. Notice that this Latin reading begins before his conversion. Subsequently, in Rome, in 1846–7, he was challenged to make his reading of the Fathers accord specifically with the theology of the Roman Schools. His views on the Fathers continued to get him into trouble, leading to his being investigated for heresy after 'On Consulting the Faithful' appeared in the *Rambler* in 1859. Therefore, not only did his reading of the Alexandrian Fathers change before he went to Rome, but it changed even more in the 1860s and 70s when he began to engage fully with scholastic theology. In his freer translation of Athanasius, discussed in Chapter 5, it is not so much Thomas Aquinas but the neo-Thomism of the teachers of Leo XIII that he read back into Athanasius. Origen, too, in 'Causes of Arianism' (1872) is seen through Aquinas's interpretation of him.

The general reader might like to know that each chapter begins with Newman's biography and gets more theological towards the end of the chapter. The theological reader might like to know what I mean by Newman's 'Latin' reading of the 'Greek' Fathers. This



book is not concerned with the oversimplified accounts of the differences between Greek and Latin notions of the divine Trinity found in twentieth-century historical theology; in fact, it attempts to locate Newman's writing in a period *before* such categories came to dominate doctrine. The arguments about what French scholar Theodore de Régnon said, or might not have said, about Greeks approaching God from the Three and Latins from the One, in the last years of the nineteenth century, are not relevant to discussions of doctrine taking place before.<sup>43</sup> My suggestion, following others, is that readers of the Fathers today find it difficult to see past the doctrinal terminology of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>44</sup> Yet Newman's viewpoint is not ours: he could read the Fathers without inflicting on them notions of East–West difference that have arisen since him. Newman's own ideas of what are distinctively Greek or Latin conceptions of God's Trinity begin with his critique of Gibbon in the 1840s. Newman's categories for how the three divine persons can be one are those of Latin 'numerical' and Greek 'generical' unity, which he claims are ways of saying the same thing.<sup>45</sup>

The description in Chapters 4 and 5 of Newman's changing interpretation of Origen and Athanasius avoids the categories which beset a certain type of historical theology, doing so in order to reveal the mistakes in the historiography of doctrine that Newman himself introduced. The conclusion will suggest what influence these mistakes had on subsequent scholarship of Athanasius's view of the Trinity and on the importance of Origen. Labels used

<sup>43</sup> Theodore de Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte trinité*, i (Paris: Retaux, 1892). See also Michel René Barnes, 'De Régnon Reconsidered', *Augustinian Studies*, 26 (1995) and Kristin Hennessy, 'An Answer to De Régnon's Accusers: Why We Should Not Speak of his Paradigm', *Harvard Theological Review*, 100 (2007), 179–97.

<sup>44</sup> For an example of this sort of historiography of doctrine, see Sarah Coakley (ed.), 'Introduction: Disputed Questions in Patristic Trinitarianism', *Harvard Theological Review*, 100 (2007), 125–38.

<sup>45</sup> 'Gibbon remarks that the doctrine of "a numerical rather than a generical unity", which has been explicitly put forth by the Latin Church, is "favoured by the Latin language; τριὰς [lit: three] seems to excite the idea of substance, *trinitas* of qualities"; ch. 21, n. 74' (*Ox Frs* viii. 46, n. k). Quoting Gibbon, *Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury (2nd edn.; London: Methuen, 1909), 374 n. 74.

below—Anglican, Catholic, Latin, or neo-Thomist—are not intended to be pejorative but heuristic, attempting to name the changes going on in Newman's brilliant but generally unsystematic mind. Only once these changes have been described can we judge 'in whose name' Newman really wrote.