

**The search for continuity in the face of change in the
Anglican writings of John Henry Newman**

**Stephen Morgan
St Benet's Hall**

Trinity Term 2013

**The search for continuity in the face of change in the
Anglican writings of John Henry Newman**

D.Phil. Abstract

This dissertation provides an analysis of the attempts by John Henry Newman to account for the historical reality of doctrinal change within Christianity in the light of his lasting conviction that the idea of Christianity is fixed by reference to the dogmatic content of the deposit of faith. The existing literature on Newman is enormous and wide-ranging but this present work fills a notable gap by treating Newman at any particular point in the account as a person with an open future, where his present acts are not determined by later events, and where any apologetic intent has to be identified and accounted for by reference to the immediate matter under consideration and the contemporaneous evidence. The argument of the thesis is that Newman proposed a series of hypotheses to account for the apparent contradiction between change and continuity, that this series begins much earlier than is generally recognised and that the final hypothesis he was to propose, contained in *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, ('*Essay*'), provided a methodology of lasting theological value.

The introduction establishes the centrality of the problem of change and continuity to Newman's theological work as an Anglican, its part in his conversion to Roman Catholicism and its contemporary relevance to Roman Catholic theology. It also surveys the major secondary literature relating to the question, with particular reference to those works published within the last fifty years. In the first main chapter, covering the period to the publication of his first major work, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, in 1833, Newman's earliest awareness of the problem and first attempts to solve it are considered. The growing confidence of Newman's Tractarian period and his development of the notion of the *Via Media* form the second chapter and the collapse of that confidence, the subject matter of the third. The fourth chapter is concerned with the emergence of the theory of development and the writing and content of the *Essay*. The conclusion considers the legacy of the *Essay* as a tool in Newman's theology and in the work of later theologians, finally suggesting that it may offer a useful methodological contribution to the contemporary Roman Catholic debate about hermeneutical approaches to the Second Vatican Council.

**Stephen Morgan
St Benet's Hall
Trinity Term 2013**

The search for continuity in the face of change in the Anglican writings of John Henry Newman

D.Phil. Long Abstract

In 1845, six weeks after being received into the Roman Catholic Church, John Henry Newman published *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* ('*Essay*'). In this work he proposed a theological methodology which purported to be for assessing whether any development in Christian doctrine constituted an authentic development or a corruption of an antecedent doctrine. This work was the last of Newman's Anglican writings and it represents the synthesis of a number of ideas with which he had increasingly struggled for most of the preceding thirty years. He called the *Essay* 'an hypothesis to account for a difficulty' and the difficulty to which he referred provides the basis of the research question for this dissertation: how does the Anglican Newman account for doctrinal continuity in the light of the evidence of change in the history of the Church? The dissertation will describe and analyse the successive attempts Newman made to provide a coherent hypothesis, how and why he lost confidence in each of these, how he came to his theology of development, the hypothesis that formed the subject matter of the *Essay*. It will conclude with an assessment of the value of Newman's theology of development for both Newman and the Roman Catholic Church.

Newman had believed, from the time of his first 'conversion' to an evangelical form of Christianity at the age of fifteen, that the Christian faith was fundamentally dogmatic and that the dogmatic content of its doctrines were fixed. This stemmed from a belief that Christian revelation was grounded in historical events that provided the revealed data of the Christian faith. However, from his earliest reading of Christian history and of the Fathers of the early Church, he was continually confronted by the reality that at the very least, the expression of the doctrines of the Christian faith had undergone change. I argue that the history of Newman's religious opinions and of his ecclesial activity from this 1816 conversion until his 'submission to Rome' and the publication of the *Essay* in 1845 is one of the attempts to resolve the apparent paradox of the fixed dogmatic content of Christian faith and the changing expression of it, an attempt which he ultimately came to see could only be achieved through a theory of doctrinal development that was fundamentally ecclesiological.

The field of 'Newman Studies' is both very large and wide-ranging. The genesis of the *Essay* and the causes of Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism are amongst the areas that have received the most attention from scholars. There are those who have sought to interpret the conversion (and the *Essay* as the final intellectual monument of that event) through the interpretative key of some previous biographical event, for example his youthful Evangelicalism, as Gilley does in *Newman and His Age*, or to read-back his Roman Catholic conversion into the whole of Newman's previous intellectual history, which is the approach of Ker in his definitive *John Henry Newman*:

A Biography. Others have approached the subject with an apologetic purpose, such as those who have sought to call into question the reliability Newman's own later accounts of his early life and his changing theological opinions, by imputing to him, at best, strong polemical intent, as does Chadwick in *From Bossuet to Newman* or Turner in *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*. There are others who impute to him intellectual dishonesty, such as his contemporary, Charles Kingsley, whose accusations caused Newman's to feel compelled to write the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. Such accusations of bad faith on Newman's part persist into the present in, for example, Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*. I contend that these approaches, whilst helpfully and not so helpfully illuminating aspects of the process of Newman's conversion, do not accord to the theological history of Newman's religious opinions the priority in this process it should be given. In taking the approach of treating Newman at any point in this history as a person with an open future, rather than reading back some future event, or an over-arching polemic or apologetic meta-narrative, there remains, therefore, significant scope for originality in considering the issue of development in a treatment of the works and events in the life of the Anglican John Henry Newman. This dissertation does that by concentrating on the history of his encounter with the notion of doctrinal change and his working out of the ecclesiological consequences of the paradox of change and continuity.

This dissertation will approach the topic primarily by reference to Newman's published works, letters and diaries, unpublished notes and biographical events of the period under consideration. His own later works, particularly his *Autobiographical Writings* and *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, are also of value where it is possible to establish, by reference to other contemporary evidence, that they are reliable guides to the history of his religious opinions in this area. It will also be necessary to review the extensive corpus of secondary literature, insofar as it is relevant to the topic.

The introduction establishes the centrality of the problem of change and continuity in modern Roman Catholic theological discourse. Outlining a historiographical method in which Newman is, at any point in time, as an individual with an open future, it suggests that the resolution of this problem was central to the history of Newman's religious opinions as an Anglican and was instrumental in his conversion to Roman Catholicism. The introduction then surveys the major secondary literature relevant to the thesis. The dissertation concentrates on that secondary literature which has been published in the last fifty years or so, beginning with Chadwick's, *From Bossuet to Newman* up to the present day.

The main body of the dissertation is contained in four chronologically arranged chapters which are divided by reference to the establishment of each of the successive hypotheses. This method of treating the material has been chosen because it best enables a consideration of the events in Newman's life and his works, without succumbing to the temptation of anachronistic or teleological readings that risk distorting the account of Newman's search for continuity in the face of change.

The first of these main chapters, Chapter 1, is called “Becoming aware of the difficulty - encountering change whilst looking for continuity - the period to 1833”. It traces Newman’s earliest encounters with issues of change and continuity. The chapter then provides an account of how Newman came to believe in the fixed and essentially dogmatic nature of Christianity during his teenage years and then describes Newman’s growing awareness, during his studies for Anglican Orders, of the problem that historically observable doctrinal change poses for a religion with a fixed deposit of faith. It charts and explains the emergence of Newman’s first hypothesis, the *disciplina arcani*, in the publication of his first major work, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*.

Chapter 2, ‘Antiquity, the *Via Media* and a Catholicism of the Word – 1833-8’, analyses the reasons for Newman’s emerging awareness of the limitations of the *disciplina arcani* and his growing dependence on the role of antiquity in securing the connection of later doctrinal expression to Apostolical faith. The chapter argues that the correspondence with the Abbé Jager played a significant in working out in Newman’s mind the place of tradition and its differing expressions. It shows that the importance of the idea of the Church of England as a *via media* between what he came to see as Roman corruption and Protestant infidelity had a crucial part in producing Newman’s next hypothesis. As his confidence in the Tractarian movement grew, the chapter shows how Newman sought to establish both the Apostolic and Catholic notes of the Church of England in the written witness of the Fathers.

Chapter 3, entitled ‘From a Catholicism of the Word to a Catholicism of the Church – 1839-42’ first considers Newman’s researches into the Monophysite controversy before demonstrating how Newman’s confidence in the *Via Media* was deliberately and successfully undermined by Nicholas Wiseman. It shows how, in his unpublished material on Apollinarianism and his attempt to recover from Wiseman’s attack, Newman came to recognise the central and indispensable importance of the Church as the living organ of the authentication of doctrinal change and his unsuccessful attempt to claim, to his own satisfaction, a place within that Catholicism of the Church for the Church of England.

The fourth chapter, ‘From a Catholicism of the Church to the Church of Catholicism – 1842 to 1845’, argues that Newman came to understand that the theory of a Catholicism grounded in an authoritative teaching Church was could not be reconciled with the historical and lived reality of the Anglican Church. The chapter shows that this realisation coincided with the loss of Newman’s anti-Catholic sentiments and it describes the emergence of Newman’s theory of the development of doctrine, first in his final *University Sermon* and then in the *Essay*, and his identification of the Church of his theory with the Roman Catholic Church.

The final chapter concludes the dissertation with an evaluation of the reception and legacy of the theory of development outlined in the *Essay*. It contends that the theory provided a useful theological methodology both for Newman himself in his life and work as a Roman Catholic and how it has been treated by other Roman Catholic theologians. Finally it argues that it is of contemporary relevance and utility in the current Roman Catholic debate about the proper hermeneutical approach to the Second Vatican Council.

**Stephen Morgan
St Benet's Hall
Trinity Term 2013**

CONTENTS

Abstracts	iii
Contents	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	1
I. The current significance of development of doctrine in Roman Catholic Theology	2
II. Writing it ‘historically’	8
III. Structure of the Dissertation	15
 Chapter 1	
Becoming aware of the difficulty: encountering change whilst looking for continuity - the period to 1833	18
I. Before the <i>Arians</i>	19
II. Writing the <i>Arians</i>	42
III. The text of the <i>Arians</i>	59
 Chapter 2	
Antiquity, the <i>Via Media</i> and a Catholicism of the Word – 1833-8	77
I. The Assault on the <i>Disciplina Arcani</i>	79
II. <i>Tracts for the Times</i>	91
III. Newman’s early Tractarian use of the Fathers	113

IV. The Correspondence with the Abbé Jager	120
Chapter 3	
From a Catholicism of the Word to a Catholicism of the Church – 1839-42	134
I. Researching the Monophysites	136
II. Wiseman’s <i>Dublin Review</i> Article	147
III. The Theory of Possession	166
IV. The 1840 Correspondence with Francis Newman	186
V. Tract 90 and the Jerusalem Bishopric	193
Chapter 4	
From a Catholicism of the Church to the Church of Catholicism – 1842 to 1845	209
I. Background to the Final University Sermon	210
II. ‘The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine’	217
III. <i>An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine</i>	232
Conclusion	276
Bibliography	283

ABBREVIATIONS

JHN John Henry Newman

Works by John Henry Newman

<i>Add.</i>	<i>Addresses to Cardinal Newman and His Replies</i>
<i>Apo.</i>	<i>Apologia Pro Vita Sua,</i>
<i>Ari.</i>	<i>The Arians of the Fourth Century: Their Doctrine, Temper and Conduct chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church between A.D.325 & A.D.381</i>
<i>AW</i>	<i>John Henry Newman: Autobiographical Writings</i>
<i>Dev.</i>	<i>An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine</i> (1845 edition)
<i>Dev.(1878)</i>	<i>An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine</i> (1878 edition)
<i>Ess. i-ii</i>	<i>Essays Critical and Historical</i> , 2 volumes
<i>HS i-iii</i>	<i>Historical Sketches</i> , 3 volumes
<i>Idea</i>	<i>The Idea of a University, Defined and Illustrated</i>
<i>Jfc.</i>	<i>Lectures on Justification</i>
<i>LD i-xxxi</i>	<i>The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman</i> , 31 volumes
<i>PS i-viii</i>	<i>Parochial and Plain Sermons</i> , 8 volumes
<i>TP i-ii</i>	<i>The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman</i> , 2 volumes
<i>Tract</i>	<i>Tracts for the Times</i> , 1840, 5 volume edition
<i>TTE</i>	<i>Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical</i>
<i>USS</i>	<i>Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford</i>
<i>VM i-ii</i>	<i>The Via Media</i> , 2 volumes

Other Works and Abbreviations

<i>AAS</i>	<i>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</i>
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>BOA</i>	<i>Birmingham Oratory Archives</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>

Introduction

Six weeks after being received into the Roman Catholic Church on 9 October 1845, John Henry Newman published *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* ('*Essay*').¹ In this work he outlined a theological approach for assessing whether any development in Christian doctrine constituted an authentic development or a corruption of an antecedent doctrine. This work was the last of Newman's Anglican writings, and arguably the first of his Roman Catholic works. It represents the synthesis of a number of ideas with which he had engaged, in a struggle of increasing intensity, for most of the preceding thirty years. In March 1844 John Henry Newman had begun a new notebook: one in which he was to begin to organise his thoughts regarding the development of doctrine, to deal with the intellectual difficulty, the paradox, that history presents in any consideration of Christian doctrine.² It was not, however, a theory simply produced in the year and a half between the beginning of the notebook and the publication in November 1845 of the *Essay* but rather one that had grown out of the *cursus* of Newman's entire religious life to date. The theory that was to be fully expressed in the *Essay* provided both the workable hypothesis for which he had long searched and it offered an intellectually and historically cogent justification for its concrete expression in the Roman Catholic Church to which Newman had already made his submission.

¹ John Henry Newman ('JHN'), *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, (London: James Toovey, 1845). ('*Dev.*').

² JHN, *Copybook on Development*, in Birmingham Oratory Archives ('BOA') B.2.8. See also JHN, *Papers and Fragments on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, in BOA B.2.8 and *Preparatory Notes for the 3rd Edition of Development*, in BOA D.7.6.

Newman called the *Essay* ‘an hypothesis to account for a difficulty’³ and the difficulty to which he referred provides the basis of the research question for this dissertation: how does the Anglican Newman account for doctrinal continuity in the light of the evidence of change in the history of the Church? This question is not simply one of historical interest or of concern primarily for those engaged in the various aspects of that sub-genre of nineteenth-century Theology that has come to be called ‘Newman Studies’. It is an issue that goes to the heart of much of the discourse in Roman Catholic theology at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In order to begin to understand and appreciate both the significance and potential to contribute to that dialogue that Newman’s theology of development as set out in the *Essay* represents, it is necessary first to comprehend the process through which he arrived at that theology. In order to do this, this dissertation seeks to locate Newman’s earliest awareness of the difficulty. It describes and analyses the successive attempts he made to provide a coherent hypothesis to account for the difficulty. It charts how and why he lost confidence in each of those hypotheses, how, at length, he came to his ‘*Theory of Developments*’,⁴ the hypothesis that formed the subject matter of the *Essay*, and shows that the fundamental ecclesiological character of this hypothesis. Finally, it argues that this understanding of the hypothesis contributes significantly to the current debate concerning conciliar hermeneutics in the Roman Catholic Church.

I. The current significance of development of doctrine in Roman Catholic Theology

Writing in the magazine *America*, immediately before the beginning of the fourth period of the Second Vatican Council in January 1965, the American Jesuit

³ *Dev.*, p.27.

⁴ *Dev.*, p.27.

theologian, John Courtney Murray referred to the issue of the development of doctrine as ‘the issue underlying all issues at the Council’.⁵ Murray was writing in response to the decision of Pope Paul VI, announced on the last working day of the third period of the Council, 20 November 1964 by the Secretary General of the Council, Eugène Cardinal Tisserant, to defer the Council’s vote on the *schema* on religious liberty.⁶ Murray had collaborated with his fellow *peritus*, Pietro Pavan, then Professor of Social Economics at the Pontifical Athenaeum of the Lateran, in drafting this *schema*. Their draft *schema* went substantially further than existing Catholic doctrine on religious liberty and, in the *America* article, Murray was setting out his case for this particular development of doctrine.

The manifestation of disquiet which attended Paul VI’s decision to defer consideration of the Murray/Pavan *schema* was a foretaste of the lasting theological controversy that was to surround the eventually approved Declaration on Religious Liberty *Dignitatis Humanae*.⁷ This conciliar doctrine was to be amongst the root causes of the 1988 schism with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and his followers, and the debate regarding the limits of this doctrine and the extent of the development it entailed continues to the present.⁸ The Second Vatican Council was to see other developments,

⁵ Murray, J.C., ‘This Matter of Religious Freedom’, *America*, 9 January 1965, pp.40-43, here p.43.

⁶ For an account of these events, see Tagle, L., ‘The “Black Week” of Vatican II (November 14-21, 1964)’, in Alberigo, G. and Joseph Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II: Volume IV - Church as Communion, Third Period and Intersession, September 1964-September 1965*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), pp.387-452, here pp.393-406. This account is itself not uncontroversial. It has received trenchant adverse criticism recently, including accusations of ‘severe and partisan bias’, in Marchetto, A., *The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: A Counterpoint for the History of the Council*, (trans. Kenneth D. Whitehead), (Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 2010), p. 219.

⁷ ‘Declaratio de Libertate Religiosa’, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, (‘AAS’), 58 (1966), (Rome: Typis Vaticanis Polyglotis, 1966), pp.929-941.

⁸ The current debate between Professor Thomas Pink and Martin Ronheimer is one such example. See Pink, T., ‘What is the Catholic Doctrine of Religious Liberty’, at <http://www.academia.edu/639061/What_is_the_Catholic_doctrine_of_religious_liberty>, [accessed 16 September 2013]; Ronheimer’s reply at Ronheimer, M., ‘Benedict XVI’s “Hermeneutic of Reform” and Religious Freedom’, in *Nova et Vetera*, 9 (2011), pp.1029-1054; and Pink’s response ‘The Interpretation of *Dignitatis Humanae*: A Response to Martin Ronheimer’, at

a demonstrable ‘increase and expansion in Christian Creed and Ritual’⁹ of varying degrees of controversy and the post-conciliar period has been one in which rate of change has, if anything, accelerated.

The question of the extent to which the conciliar changes can be reconciled with previous Catholic doctrine and the post-conciliar changes can be justified by appeal to conciliar authority has become an acute one. Speaking to the members of the Roman Curia in December 2005, Pope Benedict XVI made the issue central to an analysis of the appropriate theological hermeneutic which should be adopted in considering the Council itself, its teaching and post-conciliar developments.¹⁰ His proposed ‘hermeneutic of reform in continuity with the one subject Church’ was offered as a *tertium quid* between two radically opposed expressions of what he termed the ‘hermeneutic of discontinuity and rupture’. On the one hand, this rupture has been used to deny the legitimacy of the teachings of the Council, post-conciliar magisterium and, at its most extreme, the institutional identity of the post-conciliar Roman Catholic Church with the pre-conciliar body. On the other hand, this same claim that the Council marked a decisive rupture with the immediately foregoing period has been used, so Pope Benedict seemed to suggest, to justify radically novel interpretations of the teachings of the Council and even going well beyond the conciliar teachings in fidelity to a *soi-disant* ‘Spirit of Vatican II’.

<http://www.academia.edu/2911284/The_Interpretation_of_Dignitatis_Humanae_A_Reply_to_Martin_Ronheimer>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

⁹ *Dev.*, p.27.

¹⁰ ‘*Da una parte esiste un’interpretazione che vorrei chiamare “ermeneutica della discontinuità e della rottura”; essa non di rado si è potuta avvalere della simpatia dei mass-media, e anche di una parte della teologia moderna. Dall’altra parte c’è l’“ermeneutica della riforma”, del rinnovamento nella continuità dell’unico soggetto-Chiesa*’. Pope Benedict XVI, *Ad Romanam Curiam ob Omnia natalicia*, 22 December 2005, in *AAS*, 98 (2006), (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 2006), pp.40-53, here p.45. The expression ‘hermeneutic of discontinuity’ was coined, in this context, in Avery Cardinal Dulles article ‘Vatican II: The Myth and the Reality’, *America*, 24 February 2003.

Seeking to propose that a hermeneutic of reform in continuity was essential to a proper understanding of the Council and the interpretation of both conciliar and post-conciliar doctrinal developments, Pope Benedict confirmed the continuing centrality of the issue of development that Murray had identified forty years earlier. The problem of this centrality, however, remains as it had been when Murray wrote: that the theology of development in Roman Catholicism is still a relatively embryonic field. One possible explanation for this undeveloped state is the phenomenon of magisterial positivism, which achieved one expression in the traditional Ultramontane form which reached its zenith between the two Vatican Councils and another in the conciliar positivism of the period since the Second. This positivism has been so dominant in popular and scholarly Roman Catholic theological discourse that it has been possible to conduct that discourse without being aware of the need for addressing the question of development except by reference to positivism. A less than thoroughgoing commitment to return *ad fontes*, except where even the most vague claim to a conciliar mandate is lacking, has arguably marked a period when the ‘event’ of the Second Vatican Council and its ‘spirit’ have often seemed to be justification enough for theological and liturgical novelty.¹¹ In either of its forms, this positivism manifests itself in a self-referential

¹¹ This appeal to the ‘event’ of the Council is expressed well in John O’Malley, Joseph A. Komonchak, Stephen Schloesser, Neil Ormerod and David Schultenover, *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?*, (London: Continuum, 2007), in Faggioli, M., *Vatican II: the Battle for Meaning*, (Mahwah NJ: Paulist, 2012) and in James Sweeney, ‘How Should We Remember Vatican II’, *New Blackfriars*, 90 (2009), pp.251-260. This article appeared in the March 2009 edition of *New Blackfriars*, containing the proceedings of the 2008 Catholic Theological Association of Great Britain’s conference, which had the theme ‘the challenge of providing the means for the Church to fulfill its mission today as the vantage point for a re-reading of both the documents of Vatican II and the ecclesial event that was the Council’. It is expressive of a theological position built upon an extraordinarily univocal historiographical consensus, derived in no small measure from the approach adopted by those who have collaborated with Alberigo and Komonchak in their undoubtedly impressive five volume *History of Vatican II*, 5 vols., (Leuven: Peeters, 1995-2005), cited in n.2 above. This history has been so influential that Gerard Mannion was surely not exaggerating, in his review of the work, when he called it ‘a work of the Church’, (‘History of Vatican II – Edited by Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak’, in *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 12 (2010), pp.478-484, here p.478). A critique of this position is beginning to emerge, in works such as Gherardini, B., *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II: Un*

satisfaction with or justification for any particular change by claiming for it the authority of its chosen source of magisterial authority. Neither form of this positivism has provided the necessary impetus for a widespread engagement with the task of working out a proper account of development which takes seriously the claims both of continuity and change. Pope Benedict's insistence on a hermeneutic of reform in continuity suggests that this question can no longer be deferred.

That Christian doctrine was static and immutable would have seemed self-evident to those schooled in a theology heavily reliant upon the categories of Aristotelian thought, at least in the expression St Thomas Aquinas and others gave to it. As late as the seventeenth century the Roman Catholic Bishop, historian and theologian Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) could claim that:

... variation in religion is always a sign of error; that the Christian religion came from its Lord complete and perfect; that the true Church had maintained immutably, *must* have maintained immutably, the deposit of truth which had been given to it.¹²

It was a view that would have seemed entirely unexceptional fifty years earlier when his compatriot, the French Jesuit Denis Pétau (1583-1652) considered the history of Dogma in his *Opus de doctrina temporum*.¹³ Yet the very engagement spawned by Bossuet's own work, especially his 1688 work, *Histoire des variations des Églises protestantes*,¹⁴ and the correspondence it engendered with Gottfried Leibnitz (1646-1716), meant that Roman Catholic theology could not remain indefinitely insulated against the currents of

discorso da fare, (Turin: 2009) and *Concilio Vaticano II: Il discorso mancato*, (Turin: Lindau, 2011), in Agostino Marchetto's work cited at n.6 above, De Mattei, R., *Il Concilio Vaticano II. Una storia mai scritta*, (Turin: Lindau, 2010) and in a volume of essays that appeared in English edited by Matthew Lamb and Matthew Levering, *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

¹² Chadwick, O., *From Bossuet to Newman*, (London, 1957), pp.5f. Chadwick claims this to be axiomatic, yet nowhere cites the axiom in Bossuet's work. It is, however, an entirely fair representation of the position he takes in his *Exposition de la foi catholique*, (Paris: 1671).

¹³ Petavius, D., *Opus de Doctrina Temporum: Auctius in Hac Nova Editione Notis & Emendationibus Quamplurimis, Quas Manu Sua Codici Adscripserat Dionysius Petavius*, (Paris: Lutet, 1627).

¹⁴ Bossuet, J-B., *Histoire des variations des Églises protestantes*, (Paris: Charpentier, 1844-5).

European thought that came to be called the Enlightenment. Although Ernst Breisach traces the remote origins of this awareness of doctrinal development in Roman Catholic theology to the high-medieval period,¹⁵ it had certainly become an unavoidable question by the beginning of the nineteenth century when an awareness of the history of doctrine, and the attendant notion of development, was beginning to become more widespread. An example of this was the work of Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838) and Johann Sebastian Drey (1777-1853) at the Roman Catholic faculty of the University of Tübingen. Their work was, on occasion, controversial enough to result in delation to Rome, yet was important enough to have placed the question at the centre of theological discourse. Nearly two centuries later, Karl Rahner (1904-1984) could write, as if it were a quite matter-of-fact observation, that:

As Catholics, we believe in the development of dogma, that as the awareness of our faith becomes more and more developed, we achieve a deeper understanding of the dogma itself¹⁶

Rahner treated the subject of development of doctrine in several other essay-length pieces,¹⁷ and there is an undoubted awareness of development in the theology of other twentieth-century Roman Catholic theologians, such as Yves Congar,¹⁸ Henri de

¹⁵ Breisach, E., *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp.139-141.

¹⁶ Rahner, K., 'The Position of Christology in the Church between Exegesis and Dogmatics', in *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 11, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1974), pp.185-214, here p.209.

¹⁷ See, for example, Rahner, K., 'The Historicity of Theology: The Teaching Office of the Church in the Present-Day Crisis of Authority', in *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 12, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1974), pp.3-30; 'Basic Observations on the Subject of Changeable and Unchangeable Factors in the Church', in *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 14, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1976), pp.3-23; 'Yesterday's History of Dogma and Theology for Tomorrow', in *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 18, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1983), pp.3-34; and 'On the Situation of Faith', in *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 20, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1981), pp.13-32. Patrick Burke provides an analysis of Rahner's changing theology of development in the chapter 'The Development of Dogma' in his *Reinterpreting Rahner: A Critical Study of His Major Themes*, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), pp.188-225.

¹⁸ Especially in Congar, Y., *A History of Theology*, (New York: Doubleday, 1968).

Lubac¹⁹ and Bernard Lonergan.²⁰ Nevertheless, only one major, full-length treatment of the subject exists in what might reasonably be called Roman Catholic Theology: John Henry Newman's *Essay*. The singular status of this work is such that any attempt at working out a practical expression of a hermeneutic of reform in continuity needs to take its arguments and their origins seriously.

II. Writing it 'historically'

The first entry in Newman's 1844 notebook, that for 7 March 1844, began with the imprecation: '*Write it historically*'.²¹ No less than in any other area touched upon by historical considerations, theology, and particularly an account of the theological history of a particular individual or concept, is attended by controversial historiographical considerations. Newman's self-injunction is not without its difficulties.

The extreme reaction of the Oxford Historian Simon Skinner²² to Ian Ker's admittedly stinging review²³ of Frank Turner's *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*,²⁴ suggests that any attempt by a Roman Catholic scholar to give an account of Newman's life, or even to contribute to the general academic discourse,

¹⁹ Especially in his work on nature and grace. See de Lubac, H., *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, trans. R. Sheed, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1998); and, also *A Brief Catechesis on Nature and Grace*, trans. R. Arnadez, (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1984).

²⁰ For a treatment of Lonergan's theology of development, see Egan, P., *Newman, Lonergan and Development*, an unpublished doctoral dissertation for the University of Birmingham, 2004.

²¹ JHN, *Copybook on Development*, in BOA B.2.8.

²² Skinner, S., 'History versus Hagiography: The Reception of Turner's *Newman*', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, ('JEH'), 61 (2010), pp.764-781. This article was a 'review of the reviews' and was a sustained polemic to the effect that Roman Catholic scholars are incapable of the necessary scholarly detachment when writing in the field of history concerning their co-religionists.

²³ Ker, I., 'Slow Road to Rome', in *Times Literary Supplement*, Issue 5201, 6 December 2002, p32.

²⁴ Turner, F., *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

risks particularly trenchant adverse criticism from certain quarters. It is difficult to read Skinner's argument without coming to the conclusion that he would want to silence the voice of Roman Catholic scholarship. Whilst conceding nothing to Skinner's overblown allegations of disreputable hagiographic intent on the part of Roman Catholic authors, and of Ker in particular – allegations that Duffy has more than adequately dealt with²⁵ – nor to a wider historiographical consensus in favour of a methodological agnosticism, this dissertation is written by a Roman Catholic scholar who accepts both that Newman is a controversial figure, hardly less so today than in his own lifetime, and one with whom the author shares a confessional attachment. The dissertation has been written, therefore, with a constant consciousness of the author's biases and religious sympathy with the position to which Newman came at the end of the period under consideration. The issues that arise concerning Newman's position in the Roman Catholic Church typically give less occasion for neuralgic and pungent reaction than does his time as an Anglican and, particularly, the period leading up to his conversion to Rome. That is not to say that he has not been a controversial figure within the Roman Communion, both during his life and since. In the last thirty years or so attitudes to Newman have often been proxies for other theological controversies. Since this present work is principally concerned, however, with the period up until his conversion to Roman Catholicism, a measure of caution is not only necessary but desirable. Nevertheless, the call for a 'religious turn' in ecclesiastical history, made most insistently by Sarah Foot in her presidential speech at the Summer Conference of the Ecclesiastical History Society in 2011²⁶ and repeated in the second part of her

²⁵ Duffy, E., 'The Reception of Turner's *Newman*: A Reply to Simon Skinner', in *JEH*, 63 (2012), pp.534-548. The editor accorded Skinner the last word in this exchange with a rebuttal of Duffy published in the same edition as Duffy's reply. See Skinner, S., 'A Response to Eamon Duffy', in *JEH*, 63 (2012), pp.549-567.

²⁶ Foot, S., 'Has Ecclesiastical History Lost the Plot?', in 'I. The Church on Its Past', *Studies in Church History*, 49 (2013), pp.1-25.

Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Oxford that same year²⁷ requires serious consideration. Foot's argument is that unless the claims that religious belief and practice makes on individuals and societies are taken as at once authentic, sincere and serious, then any account of the past is necessarily distorted and incomplete. To seek to understand Newman's personal religious history and his theological contribution without this religious turn would necessitate such a distortion and be so incomplete as to entirely lack value.

In order to give proper weight to these historiographical considerations, this dissertation is written on the basis of treating Newman at any particular point in time as an individual with an open future. This approach has been taken in order to take seriously both his own freedom and the claims of the present moment upon Newman at any particular point, rather than to overstate the influence of any particular efficient or final cause, let alone to read back, anachronistically, into his present the claims of events that lay in his future. This is not to say that there is not great value and significant insight to be obtained by reading Newman under a particular biographical event, teleological aspect or meta-narrative theme. Ian Ker's definitive 1988 biography *John Henry Newman: A Biography*²⁸ owes much of its completeness and thorough organisation of the material to a structure that presents Newman's work and life as leading up to and flowing away from the religiously and chronologically central event of his conversion to Roman Catholicism. Newman's earlier conversion to an explicitly Evangelical religion provides the interpretative key in Sheridan Gilley's *Newman and*

²⁷ Foot, S., 'Thinking with Christians: Doing Ecclesiastical History in a Secular Age', the Inaugural Lecture of Professor Sarah Foot as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Oxford, on 18 May 2011. This lecture is, as yet, unpublished but may be listened to as a podcast from <<http://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/thinking-christians-doing-ecclesiastical-history-secular-age-audio>>, last accessed 24 June 2013.

²⁸ Ker, I., *John Henry Newman: A Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). It is this first edition that is cited throughout.

His Age.²⁹ Similarly, Owen Chadwick's reworking of his 1956 Birkbeck Lectures in Cambridge, in his *From Bossuet to Newman*, relies on a number of hermeneutical presuppositions, not the least of which is a profound scepticism of the value of Newman's own account of events, grounded in what he sees as Newman's profound polemical intent.³⁰

Stephen Thomas's attempt, in *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years*,³¹ to understand the place of heresy in forming Newman's theological opinions, offers subtle insights which might otherwise be missed, even if he, like Chadwick, doubts Newman's sincerity because of the apologetic and polemic character of much of his published work. John Coulson's account of the influence of Samuel Taylor Coleridge on Newman's adoption of sacramental language as a response to rationalism is another work where an account is given which privileges certain aspects, here exactly that sacramental language offers particular perspectives which might otherwise remain obscure.³² In two works, *Newman the Theologian*³³ and *Unfolding Revelation*,³⁴ Jan Hendrik Walgrave seeks to arrange Newman's thoughts according to fundamentally theological priorities related to the psychological effect of development on the individual subject, here specifically on Newman. Nicholas Lash's *Newman and Development*³⁵ offers a convincing synthetic analysis of the theology of the *Essay* itself

²⁹ Gilley, S., *Newman and His Age*, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1990).

³⁰ See, e.g., his comments about the revision of the *Essay* for the Uniform Edition in Chadwick, O., *From Bossuet to Newman*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), p.123 and pp.188f.

³¹ Thomas, S., *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

³² Coulson, J., *Newman and the Common Tradition: A Study in the Language of Church and Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970).

³³ Walgrave, J., *Newman the Theologian: The Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works*, trans. A.V.Littledale, (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1960)

³⁴ Walgrave, J., *Unfolding Revelation: The Nature of Doctrinal Development*, (London: Hutchinson, 1972).

³⁵ Lash, N., *Newman and Development: A Search for an Explanation in History*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1975).

and of the influence of concrete events related to doctrinal history on the process of development.

Less successful are those attempts which seek to overstate the place or influence of a particular individual or cause. Pereiro's *'Ethos' and the Oxford Movement*³⁶ is one such in its attempt to make the contribution of S.F. Wood central to the whole question of the development of doctrine to the extent of largely minimizing and making derivative, if not completely eclipsing, Newman's contribution. He shares Thomas's and Chadwick's profound scepticism regarding the reliability, even validity of Newman's own account of his history, accusing him of having 'interpreted the past by the final issue of his intellectual course and read development where he had not seen it before'.³⁷ Pereiro is joined in this attempt to deny Newman the accolade of originality, perhaps surprisingly, by several other academics who happen also to be Roman Catholics. One such is Professor V.A. McClelland,³⁸ whose quite understandable devotion to the memory of Henry Manning appears to require of him that he arrive at a distinctly mixed assessment of Newman. Another is Peter Nockles, whose undoubtedly significant *The Oxford Movement in Context* suggests that Newman arrived at his theology of development and, hence, Rome as a result of a reading of the Fathers that was 'peculiarly personal [and] imaginative'.³⁹ Elsewhere he speaks of this reading as leading Newman on a 'peculiar religious odyssey':⁴⁰ in neither case is 'peculiar' a neutral expression. In fact Nockles proceeds on the basis that Newman's

³⁶ Pereiro, J., *'Ethos' and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

³⁷ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.166.

³⁸ It is the overriding motif of the collection of essays he edited in McClelland, V.A., ed., *By Whose Authority: Newman, Manning and the Magisterium*, (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1996).

³⁹ Nockles, P., *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship 1760- 1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), here p.145

⁴⁰ Nockles, 'Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops', in in Nicholls, David, and Fergus Kerr, eds., *John Henry Newman: Reason, Rhetoric and Romanticism*, (Bristol: Bristol Press, 1991), pp.28-87, here p.29.

own account of events and manner of arguing is both ‘disingenuous’ and marked by ‘self-conscious cynicism’.⁴¹

Whatever Frank Turner’s lengthy 2002 *John Henry Newman: the Challenge to Evangelical Religion* brought to the field of Newman studies was thoroughly obscured by the author’s clear intimations of Newman’s dishonesty and by an attempt to impose a meta-narrative of almost exclusively anti-evangelical motive on Newman’s Anglican years that the evidence simply will not support. Turner appears to have been influenced by the attempts at remote and inexpert psychoanalysis of Newman which suggest either that he suffered from a delicate self-absorption⁴² or neurosis born of suppressed homosexual desire.⁴³ Furthermore, Turner appears to have lacked a clear understanding of the taxonomy of nineteenth-century Anglican churchmanship, confusing and conflating, at various times, evangelicalism, latitudinarianism, liberalism

⁴¹ Nockles, ‘Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops’, pp.37 and 47.

⁴² Strachey, L., *Eminent Victorians : Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale, Dr. Arnold, General Gordon*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1918), p.69. The accusation is one of ‘feline sarcasm’ in Diarmaid MacCulloch’s *Christianity: the First Three Thousand Years*, (London: Penguin, 2009), p.841, and the same author referred to the ‘... agonised, perennially self-scrutinising journey of this Victorian cleric from initial religious certainty via another religious certainty to a very different final religious certainty ...’, in a review of Cornwell, J., *The Unquiet Grave: the Reluctant Saint*, (London: Continuum, 2012) entitled ‘A Different Cloth’ for the *Literary Review*, June 2010 at <http://www.literaryreview.co.uk/macculloch_06_10.html>, [last accessed 16 September 2013].

⁴³ This view is heavily suggested by Geoffrey Faber in his *Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1933), although the word ‘homosexual’ is notable by its absence. It forms part of the picture of Newman presented by Ellis Hanson in *Decadence and Catholicism*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988) and it emerged as a consistent theme in the broadcast and print media coverage of the run-up to the Papal Visit to Britain in 2010 during which Pope Benedict XVI was to beatify Newman. In the review cited in n.35, above, MacCulloch goes so far as to write: ‘Newmanolators cannot abide the idea that he could have been gay. As conservative Roman Catholics, they can’t just accept that homosexuality is one unremarkable and morally neutral variant in human behaviour; and so Newman’s enthusiastic biographer, Father Ian Ker, has insisted emphatically on Newman’s heterosexuality. Reading Cornwell’s account of Newman’s emotional life - his passionate friendships with other single men (St John was just the most long-lasting), his tortured opinions about his own sinfulness, his obvious revelling in the homosocial world of early Victorian Oxford - it is difficult to avoid applying to him that useful variant of Ockham’s Razor: “Looks like a duck, quacks like a duck - can it be a duck?”’. So pervasive was this discourse at the time that, in the new edition of *John Henry Newman: A Biography* issued to coincide with the beatification, Ker added an ‘Afterword’ which argued that the biographical and textual evidence demonstrated that the suggestion of homosexuality could not be sustained (Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp.746-750.

and low church Protestantism. This limitation makes the task of following and sustaining his main thesis particularly difficult.

The body of secondary literature relating to Newman in general and to the issue of development in particular is both enormous and wide-ranging. This means that it is only possible to engage with such of the secondary literature that is either of greatest significance to the wider current discourse in Newman Studies or has a particular claim to consideration by reference to the questions here under consideration. In any event, if the claim that Newman be considered a man with an open future at any particular point in the history of his religious opinions is to be sustained, then it is proper that the primary literature and archival evidence has the first place in this account. Indeed, such is this claim to the priority of the primary evidence that, unless other explicit reasons are given, the works of Newman referred to will be those as originally published. This requires a departure from the common practice of citing Newman's works from the Uniform Edition of his works that Newman reworked for Longman in the late-1870s.⁴⁴ In this dissertation reference will almost always be to the first edition of any particular title and, in particular, references to the *Essay* are, unless otherwise noted, to the first edition published by James Toovey in 1845. Newman made a number of minor corrections to this text for a second edition in 1846 and substantially reworked the *Essay* for the third edition in the Uniform Edition in 1877. Although Newman was to claim that this third edition had 'no substantial alterations', he acknowledged that he had 'nearly turned it inside out, as far as arrangement goes'.⁴⁵ The extent and effect of, and the reasons for the changes between the first and third editions are outside the scope

⁴⁴ Where, exceptionally, citations are from the Uniform Edition, the abbreviations given in Rickaby, J., *An Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914) have been used.

⁴⁵ John Henry Newman ('JHN') to Mrs William Froude, 23 December 1877, in *LD* xxviii, pp.288f.

of this work, save and except to note that those changes exist and Newman's assertion that they are not substantial might not be taken at face value.⁴⁶ Where reference is made to texts of Newman's sermons, it is either made to the first published edition (as with the University Sermons) or to the copies to be found in the Birmingham Oratory Archives. Newman's own correspondence and diary entries are cited from the thirty-two volume series of *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and others.

III. Structure of the Dissertation

The main body of the dissertation is contained in four chronologically arranged chapters which are divided by reference to the establishment of each of the successive hypotheses. The first of these main chapters, 'Becoming aware of the difficulty: encountering change whilst looking for continuity – the period to 1833', traces Newman's earliest encounters with issues of change and continuity. The chapter provides an account of how Newman came to believe in the fixed and essentially dogmatic nature of Christianity during his teenage years and then describes Newman's growing awareness, during his studies for Anglican Orders, of the problem that historically observable doctrinal change poses for a religion with a fixed deposit of faith. It charts and explains the emergence of Newman's first hypothesis, the

⁴⁶ Lash certainly believed the alterations to be not without significance, in *Newman on Development*, p.4, as do both Aidan Nichols in his *From Newman to Congar: the Idea of Doctrinal Development from the Victorians to the Second Vatican Council*, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1990), pp.45-47, and Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, pp.185-191. A full, critical comparison of the two editions exists in the form of an unpublished doctoral dissertation for the Catholic University of America in 1998, by Gerard McCarren, *Tests or Notes? A Critical Evaluation of the Criteria for Genuine Doctrinal Development in John Henry Newman's "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine"*.

disciplina arcana, in the publication of his first major work, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*.

Chapter 2, ‘Antiquity, the *Via Media* and a Catholicism of the Word – 1833-8’, analyses the reasons for Newman’s emerging awareness of the limitations of the *disciplina arcana* and his growing dependence on the role of antiquity in securing the connection of later doctrinal expression to Apostolical faith. It notes Newman’s first use of the term ‘development’ in the context of the question of change and continuity at a date rather earlier than has hitherto been recognised. The chapter argues that the correspondence with the Abbé Jager played a significant role in working out in Newman’s mind the place of tradition and its differing expressions. It shows that the importance of the idea of the Church of England as a *via media* between what he came to see as Roman corruption and Protestant infidelity had a crucial part in producing Newman’s next hypothesis. As his confidence in the Tractarian movement grew, the chapter shows how Newman sought to establish both the Apostolic and Catholic notes of the Church of England in the written witness of the Fathers.

The third chapter, ‘From a Catholicism of the Word to a Catholicism of the Church – 1839-42’, demonstrates how Newman’s confidence in the *Via Media* was deliberately and successfully undermined by Nicholas Wiseman. It shows how, in his unpublished material on Apollinarianism and his attempt to recover from Wiseman’s attack, Newman came to recognise the central and indispensable importance of the Church as the living organ of the authentication of doctrinal change and his attempt to claim for the Church of England a place within that Catholicism of the Church.

The fourth chapter, 'From a Catholicism of the Church to the Church of Catholicism – 1842 to 1845', argues that Newman came to understand that the theory of a Catholicism grounded in an authoritative teaching Church could not be reconciled with the historical and lived reality of the Anglican Church. The chapter shows that this realisation coincided with the loss of Newman's anti-Catholic sentiments and it describes the emergence of Newman's theory of the development of doctrine, first in his final *University Sermon* and then in *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, and his identification of the Church of his theory with the Roman Catholic Church.

The conclusion summarises the findings of the previous chapters and points forward to the importance of those findings for the evaluation of the reception and legacy of the theory of development outlined in the *Essay*. It contends that the genesis of the theory provides a useful theological hermeneutic for understanding what Newman was attempting in the *Essay*. This in turn assists in assessing the limitations of the methodology it outlines and the care with which that methodology should be applied, as exemplified both for Newman himself in his life and work as a Roman Catholic and how it has been treated by other Roman Catholic theologians. Finally, it proposes areas of further work which might usefully be illuminated by the account offered in this dissertation.

Chapter 1

Becoming aware of the difficulty: encountering change whilst looking for continuity - the period to 1833

This chapter examines the early period of Newman's growing awareness of doctrinal development with the intention of establishing when and how he became explicitly aware of it and how he set about incorporating it into his theology. It argues that the implications of an explicitly dogmatic religious conviction combined with an increasingly firm attachment to notions of tradition and of the necessity of the divinely constituted reality of the Church, of which he first became aware during his early years at Oriel, were worked out in his reading of the Fathers from the late 1820s onwards in such a way as to make him recognise not merely the fact of doctrinal development but also to necessitate a theory to account for it. It further argues that this period made him aware of the need to provide such a theory that could accommodate both continuity and change. The chapter begins by looking at the evidence in Newman's own writing, in his letters, diaries and sermons, in the period prior to his beginning work on what came to be published as *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, a period when he appears to exhibit little explicit awareness of post-Apostolic doctrinal change but became conscious of several factors which were later to play a significant part in his thinking. It will then assess the effect of the process of writing, the subject matter and methodology of *Arians* in beginning to awaken a conscious sense of doctrinal development, noting, in particular, how Newman attempted to deal with the difficulties this presented to the previously assumed fixed character of the content of dogmatic truth.

I. Before the *Arians*

When Newman recalled the history of his own religious opinions in writing his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, he was at pains to describe the character of the ‘great change of thought’¹ that had taken place in him during the autumn of 1816. He sketched a childhood religious practice grounded firmly in the reading of the Bible, of perfect knowledge of the catechism but devoid of conviction, until that ‘great change of thought’, that he later accounted his conversion to Evangelicalism, overcame him at the age of fifteen. The particular character of that conversion, at least as he recalled it forty-eight years later, was one where he ‘fell under the influences of a definite creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God’s mercy, have never been effaced or obscured’.² That is to say Newman’s was a conversion to an explicitly dogmatic conception of the Christian faith whose creeds, as he was later to express it, he believed, ‘were facts, not opinions’,³ and the fundamental underlying ‘fact’ of this revelation was the person of Jesus Christ.⁴

Although it had immediate, profound, affective and existential consequences, the conversion Newman remembered was one that was primarily about the apprehension of the reality of the existence of God and himself, the ‘two, and two only

¹ *Apo.*, p.58.

² *Apo.*, p.58.

³ *Ari.*, p.148.

⁴ Ker, I.T., *Healing the Wound of Humanity: The Spirituality of John Henry Newman*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1993), pp.43-50. See also Merrigan, T., *Clear Heads and Holy Hearts: The Religious and Theological Ideal of John Henry Newman*, in *Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs*, 7, (Louvain: Peeters, 1991), pp.90-102, where he notes that Newman’s notion of the character of revelation, is that of the revelation of ‘...Christ Himself ... the ground, source of coherence, and the continuing dynamic of Christian life and reflection, in and through which He is now known and apprehended’, (p.98). Cf. Misner, P., ‘Newman’s Concept of Revelation and the Development of Doctrine’, in *The Heythrop Journal*, 11 (1970), pp32-47. Misner contends that Newman’s concept of revelation was fundamentally verbal and propositional.

luminously self-evident beings'⁵ and, secondly, of the claims of religious truths expressed in propositional form. Nevertheless, there does not appear to be any evidence in his journals or correspondence from this period that with this conversion came a consciousness that the particular doctrines he found impressed on his intellect had a developmental history. His own much later claim, in 1844, that he had 'always' held 'a development of doctrine at least in some great points of theology'⁶ clearly was not intended to refer back to this period. Neither is it possible to find supporting evidence from this period for his recollection in the *Apologia* of his having adopted as his own Thomas Scott's maxim, which he encountered in his reading in 1816, that 'Growth is the only sign of life.'⁷ Indeed, although he later referenced Scott's expression in paraphrase in the *Essay*,⁸ it would appear that he recalled that he understood it at the time primarily in a moral rather than a doctrinal sense.⁹ It is also worth noting that it was at this same time he first encountered the writings of the Fathers, when he read Joseph Milner's *History of the Church of Christ*.¹⁰ This marked the beginning of a fascination with patristics but, again, there is no evidence in his journals or letters to indicate that his reading of Milner suggested to him any sense of doctrinal development. What Milner did do was to make Newman 'enamoured of the long extracts from St Augustine, St Ambrose, and the other Fathers' that the five volumes contained.¹¹ It was to be over ten years before Newman's interest was

⁵ *Apo.*, p.59.

⁶ JHN to Mrs William Froude, 9 June 1844, in *LD* x, p.264. He gives as examples of such 'great points' the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, which he notes 'are intellectual developments of the inspired declarations of Scripture'. It would appear that the term 'always' was not intended to be construed exactly but, rather, to convey the sense that this was, in 1844, a long-held view.

⁷ *Apo.*, p.61.

⁸ *Dev.*, p.73.

⁹ In support of this contention, it is noted that, in the *Apologia*, he pairs the aphorism with another explicitly moral injunction: 'Holiness before peace', *Apo.*, p.61.

¹⁰ Joseph Milner, *History of the Church of Christ*, 5 vols.(London, 1794).

¹¹ *Apo.*, p.62.

converted into any kind of systematic reading of the Fathers,¹² but this early encounter can clearly be seen as being of remote causal significance to both Newman's first need to propose a theory of development¹³ and to his later Catholic conversion.

In *From Bossuet to Newman*, Owen Chadwick argues that Newman's own recollection of such matters was fundamentally unreliable, whether these recollections were written nearly thirty years later in the *Essay* and in his correspondence around the time of his conversion to Roman Catholicism, or nearly fifty years later in the *Apologia*. It is Chadwick's contention that from both psychological necessity and apologetic intent Newman adopted a 'passionate devotion to "consistency"', and that an 'element of self-justification entered into most of what he published between 1840 and 1878'.¹⁴ Chadwick suggests this caused him to misrepresent the history of his religious opinions and argues that Newman did this to justify his Roman Catholic conversion as having 'relentlessly issued from those trains of thought which he had pursued while he was an Anglican'.¹⁵ Chadwick contends that the real reason for the progress through Evangelicalism, incipient liberalism and Tractarianism to Roman Catholicism was a gradual realisation, in both his opinions and ecclesial loyalties, of the principles of development that he had learned, albeit second-hand and in translation, from the work of Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838) and of which he only became consciously aware towards the end of his life as an Anglican.¹⁶ It is true that Chadwick states that Newman was not 'influenced by Möhler' noting that: 'He was not reading Möhler, nor Wiseman, nor Perrone, nor even Petau. He was reading Justin Martyr, Athanasius,

¹² JHN to Harriett Newman, 1 May 1826, in *LD* i, p.284.

¹³ JHN to Mrs William Froude, 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, pp.297f.

¹⁴ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.123.

¹⁵ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.88.

¹⁶ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, pp.111-138.

Tertullian, Ambrose, Lactantius, Cyril.’¹⁷ It can only be, however, direct first-hand influence that Chadwick is denying, since it is certainly Möhler’s hand to which he refers when he notes that: ‘the theory of development ... coming not from Newman’s mind but from across the seas – was in the atmosphere that surrounded Newman at Littlemore’.¹⁸ In adopting this position, Chadwick advances a rationale for Newman’s changing position which neither accepts Newman’s own apologetic of ‘consistency’, nor echoes the suspicions and criticisms of disingenuousness and deception which have been continually levelled at Newman since his secession to Rome and which were widely hinted at before that event. Chadwick’s argument is not unproblematic, however, in so far as it seeks to pin the responsibility for Newman’s awareness of doctrinal development upon indirect, atmospheric influence. Pereiro, considering the period of the 1840s, when W. G. Ward had certainly exposed Newman explicitly to Möhler’s thought, makes use of similar language when he concluded that: ‘Newman, while not directly influenced by Möhler, would not have escaped the atmosphere around him’.¹⁹ The suggestion of an atmospheric cause, whether made by Chadwick or Pereiro, fails to take account of a series of other more direct influences which are contemporaneously documented in Newman’s correspondence, journals and sermons. The argument, in the terms framed by Chadwick, has often seemed to be about whether Newman was, from the very beginning of his own religious history, driven by thinking dependent in some way on Möhler’s thinking, or whether he was inconsistent in or disingenuous about the development of his religious opinions in his later accounts. The evidence from Newman’s own hand at the time seems to support his later

¹⁷ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, pp.118f. Chadwick relies here on the *Papers and Fragments on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, in BOA B.2.8.1.

¹⁸ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.119. In the ‘Introduction’ to the second edition Chadwick moves his ground to suggest that Newman had come to ‘see’ the fact of development ‘quite independently’ of ‘... a group of South German Catholics ...’, yet he does not revise the argument in the text. (Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, 2nd ed., (London: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p.xv.

¹⁹ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.162.

recollections and reveals that whilst it is not possible to date any explicit, conscious awareness of doctrinal development as early as his Evangelical conversion, it certainly significantly ante-dates an explicit encounter with Möhler.²⁰

What it is possible to demonstrate, however, is that, as soon as Newman began any formal, systematic doctrinal study, he did encounter the reality of the development of the propositional forms in which Christian doctrine was expressed. On 1 November 1823, Newman wrote to his mother telling her that he had started to attend a series of private lectures.²¹ These were an initiative of the newly appointed Regius Professor of Divinity, Charles Lloyd²² and were given to an invited group of four Oriel fellows and four Christ Church students.²³ Newman recorded, in the manuscript autobiographical memoir, composed in 1874 and revised in 1876, published posthumously under the title *Autobiographical Writings*,²⁴ that he started attending these in 1823 and continued to do so until his acceptance of the curacy of St Clements in 1824 (on 16 May).²⁵ His journals, however, suggest that he attended these lectures until early 1826 and even then his non-attendance appears to have been initially conceived by him as being a temporary thing.²⁶ It has been argued that the lectures represent the only formal training in theological and historical method that Newman received and that Lloyd's intent, which was primarily apologetic and controversialist, had a defining influence on

²⁰ The first time Newman explicitly quoted Möhler, in his 1859 article for the *Rambler*, 'On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine', he did so from *Symbolik*, but in French with an attribution to Perrone, suggesting that it is possible that, even at so late a date, he did not have first-hand knowledge of the work. See JHN, 'On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine', in *Rambler*, July 1859, pp.211f.

²¹ JHN to Mrs Newman, 1 November 1823, in *LD* i, p.167.

²² Charles Lloyd, (1784-1829), Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford (1822-1827), Bishop of Oxford (1827-1829), in which last office he was, it should be noted, Newman's ordinary, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* ('*DNB Online*') at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/16822?docPos=6>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

²³ The fellows of Christ Church, Oxford are known as 'students'. The college has singular terminology that differs markedly from that in use in other Oxford colleges.

²⁴ *AW.*, p.72

²⁵ Diary entry for Sunday 16 May 1824, in *LD* i, p.174.

²⁶ JHN notes, in his diary entry for Tuesday, 31 January 1826, that 'Lloyd's lectures began' and on Thursday, 9 February 1826, 'withdrew for term from Lloyd's lectures': see *LD* i, p.275.

Newman's own approach.²⁷ Lloyd's lectures were, Newman recalled, concerned with 'exegetical criticism, historical research, and controversy'²⁸ and the effect on his students of the detail and thoroughness of his research was profound. Henry Liddon recorded that the opening lecture, a detailed, even exhaustive exegesis of the first four verses of the Letter to the Hebrews, had the effect of amazing the attendees, amongst whom were Newman and Pusey.²⁹ It is not without significance for the present purposes that the underlying theme of the Letter to the Hebrews, that of the relationship between the Jewish and Christian Covenants, had been conventionally used as a scriptural example of the notion of progress in religious truth, certainly since the publication of Joseph Butler's *Analogy*,³⁰ which Newman was to begin reading in June 1825.³¹

Lloyd's lectures adopted a deliberately historical method and relied heavily on patristic sources. It seems very likely that Newman's own resolve to engage in the previously noted systematic study of the Fathers in May 1826 was not unconnected with the lectures at which he had, at that point, only just suspended his attendance. Bokenkotter has noted that Lloyd's treatment of ecclesiastical history, in the lectures he gave whilst Newman was still regularly attending, concentrated heavily on the rise and development of papal power:³² a question that continued to engage Newman at least until the publication of the *Essay* and which, arguably, dogged his footsteps throughout

²⁷ Bokenkotter, T., *Cardinal Newman as an Historian*, (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1959), pp.14-19.

²⁸ AW., p.71.

²⁹ Liddon, H.P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 3 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, 1893-8), vol.1, pp.62-4.

³⁰ Butler, J., *The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, (London, 1736).

³¹ 'began Butler's *Analogy*', diary entry for Saturday 25 June 1825, in *LD* i, p.238.

³² Bokenkotter relies, here, on the abstract of Lloyd's lectures given in Ffoukes, E.S., *A History of the Church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford: the University Church: from Domesday to the Installation of the late Duke of Wellington, Chancellor of the University*, (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1892), pp.381-383.

his life.³³ In any event, it was a subject that demanded the recognition of doctrinal development as a demonstrable reality, whether one viewed such development as in conformity with the Christian faith or, as was Newman's position at the time (and by his own account until 1843),³⁴ as a manifestation of the Antichrist predicted in Sacred Scripture. Lloyd's own position was much less hostile to Rome than Newman's,³⁵ and it seems probable, although his journals give no clue as to his reading at the time, that Newman would have encountered a more balanced view of the Papacy in the standard works on ecclesiastical history to which Lloyd was directing his students. Lloyd certainly intended his students to read de Maistre in this connection³⁶ and de Maistre's work, *Du Pape* explicitly identifies the development of the doctrine of the papacy as he, an early nineteenth-century Ultramontane, conceived it: that is precisely as having grown from a 'germ' in the Apostolic age.³⁷ Newman does note that when he was preparing the *Arians*, some six or seven years later, he 'was not ignorant of the works of Mosheim and other learned Germans',³⁸ and remarks, in the *Essay*, that he was at this time aware of the work of 'several distinguished writers of the continent, such as De Maistre and Möhler'³⁹. Accordingly, Newman must have been conscious of the notions of historical progress and doctrinal development with which many of these

³³ Bokenkotter, *Cardinal Newman as an Historian*, p.19.

³⁴ *Apo.*, p.63.

³⁵ In an 1825 article originally appearing anonymously, but which he later admitted to having written, Lloyd explicitly disavowed strong language with regard to the Roman Catholic Church, and stated that he was '... unwilling to fix upon the Romish Church the charge of positive idolatry' and disclaiming even '... the most remote intention of bringing any insinuation against Roman Catholics'. He was, also, an enthusiastic proponent of Catholic Emancipation, in favour of which he both organised opinion and spoke out. As Bishop of Oxford, he opposed both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of Armagh, speaking powerfully and effectively in the second reading of the 1829 Catholic Relief Bill in the House of Lords. For his pains, he was attacked both in Parliament and in the press, these attacks, it was claimed, played no small part in his death less than two months later. See 'Obituary – Bishop Lloyd', in *Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, 99 (1829), pp.560-563. See also Baker, W.J., *Beyond Port and Prejudice: Charles Lloyd of Oxford 1784-1829*, (Orono: University of Maine at Orono Press, 1981).

³⁶ Churton, E., ed., *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, (Oxford: Parker, 1861), vol. I, p.285.

³⁷ Joseph de Maistre, *Du Pape*, (Paris: 1819), in *Oeuvres Complètes de J. De Maistre*, (Paris: Vitte, 1928), vol. II, pp.34f. The word used by de Maistre is 'germe'.

³⁸ *TTE.*, pp.141f.

³⁹ *Dev.*, p.27.

works were imbued, although Chadwick is almost certainly correct in his judgment that he did not share their widespread identification between development and progress.⁴⁰

In the autumn of 1825 Newman preached a series of sermons, initially at St Clement's in Oxford, which would appear to have been heavily influenced by the lectures given by Lloyd as well as his reading of Butler, which continued at least until 12 October of that year.⁴¹ Butler's influence on Newman's later work, and especially on the *Essay*, has been examined in detail by Dick. He argues that Newman's real advance is to extend Butler's use of analogy in theology to the field of history.⁴² These 1825 sermons seem to support Newman's own recollection, in the *Apologia*, that it was Butler's *Analogy* which impressed upon him 'the historical character of Revelation',⁴³ and that it was, as Thomas Sheridan has observed, an obvious feature of Butler's work which influenced Newman greatly.⁴⁴

The series of sermons began on 11 September and ran until 11 December and set out explicitly 'the continuity which exists in the overall plan of salvation whereby God led man generally from natural religion, through the religion of the Old Testament, to that of the New.'⁴⁵ These sermons contain the first explicit example of Newman expressing any notion of doctrinal development. In the introduction Newman used on the first occasion that he preached the first sermon of the series, he laid out his purposes clearly in terms which are redolent with the language of Butler's *Analogy*:

⁴⁰ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, pp.97f.

⁴¹ '... read Davison on Primitive sacrifice, and part of Butler's *Analogy*...', Wednesday 12 October 1825, in *LD* i, p.262.

⁴² He also suggests that the structure of the *Essay* is fundamentally identical to Butler's conception of development. Klaus Dick, 'Das Analogieprinzip bei J.H.Newman und seine Quelle in J. Butlers *Analogy*', in *Newman Studien*, 5 (1962), pp.9-228.

⁴³ *Apo.*, p.67.

⁴⁴ Sheridan, T., *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography*, (New York: Alba House, 1967), p.111.

⁴⁵ Thomas Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, p.111.

The *history* of the Christian revelation as connected with and arising out of Judaism, is a subject little attended to by many religious persons ... Whereas we should ... turn our attention to its *history* – i.e. under what circumstances it was made known to the world, by means of what instruments at what successive periods and at what places.⁴⁶

When he preached the sermon a second time at Southampton on 9 October 1825⁴⁷,

Newman expanded the introduction slightly in order that the force of his argument was strengthened:

Doubtless it is more important to understand *what* religion is, than to know *how* it came into the world – to eat the living fruit than to know the particulars of its culture and growth– Yet unless we attend to the *history* of the gospel, as well as its *character and object*, we run the risk of forgetting that there was a time when the true light had not risen, and even at the present day it shines but on a small part of the world.⁴⁸

Newman's notes on the manuscript record that he preached this sermon on four occasions: St Clement's, Oxford on 11 September 1825; Peartree Chapel, Southampton on 9 October 1825; St Mary the Virgin, Oxford on 11 June 1826; and at Well Walk Chapel, Hampstead on 9 September 1827.⁴⁹ Although Newman frequently used sermons more than once, his use of this one on four separate occasions over a two-year period might reasonably be taken as an indication of the importance he attached to its message. None of the others in the series seems to have been preached more than once. They were, perhaps, seen by Newman as no more than an expansion of the theme he had outlined in the introduction to the first.⁵⁰ The first, however, is a detailed treatment of Christian doctrine considered within an historical context. Even though its conclusions are modest – 'We have shown then that the *wisdom of God* is displayed in

⁴⁶ Sermon No.104, in Blehl, Vincent, *John Henry Newman: Sermons, 1824-1843*, vol. II, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), ('JHN: Sermons II'), pp.342-352.

⁴⁷ The dates that he preached his sermons are recorded on the manuscript notes. His diary entries also often record the number, text or theme of his sermons but, as he noted in his diary in June 1826, 'My Private Journal only runs from June 13. 1824 to June 13.1826. while I was Curate at St Clement's. Now it ceases till 1828, when I took possession of St Mary's.', Thursday 15 June 1826, in *LD* i, p.292, where, at n.3, it is noted that 'neither date is strictly accurate'.

⁴⁸ Blehl, *JHN: Sermons II*, p.343.

⁴⁹ Blehl, *JHN: Sermons II*, p.342.

⁵⁰ In fact, the second, third, fifth and sixth exist only in outline note form. cf. *BOA*, A.17.1.

the gradual introduction of the gospel'⁵¹ – the evidence of this series of sermons suggests that Newman was clearly aware by 1825 of some development in the field of religious doctrine.

These sermons indicate that Lloyd's lectures and the related reading, especially of Butler, had influenced Newman's theology and had inculcated a sense that religious truth had about it a character that was decidedly not static. It would be to take the argument too far, however, to suggest that Newman saw that development in dynamic terms. At this stage, he would not appear to encompass within his thinking the possibility of development of the doctrinal truth of Christianity beyond the fulfillment in the Gospel and the Apostolic witness of what he understood to be the prophetic promises of the Old Testament. Indeed, this evidence clearly supports the accuracy of the remark about his views at this point, as he recalled them in the 1844 letter to Mrs Froude already cited, that: 'I used to think either that this development was made in the Apostles' life time and given by them traditionally to the Church, or at least that it was made by the Church in the *first* ages.'⁵²

Having been elected to a fellowship at Oriel in 1822, Newman came under the influence of its then senior Fellow and soon to be Provost, Edward Hawkins.⁵³ Although they were later to have irreconcilable differences, Newman credited Hawkins with having been his guide and critic in his pastoral ministry at St Clement's. It was he who gave Newman the curacy in what was then a chapel of ease to St Mary the Virgin,

⁵¹ BOA, B.3.4.

⁵² JHN to Mrs William Froude, 9th June 1844, in LD x, p.264f.

⁵³ Edward Hawkins (1789-1882), Tutor of St John's College, Oxford (1812-1813), Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford (1813-1882), Vicar of the University Church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford (1823-1828), Provost of Oriel College, Oxford (1828-1882), in *DNB Online at*, <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/12664?docPos=2>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

where Hawkins was Vicar. Newman recorded with gratitude Hawkins' influence on the style and content of his early sermons.⁵⁴ Of greater significance for the present purposes, however, was his being 'the means to great additions to [Newman's] belief':⁵⁵ foremost amongst which was the notion of Tradition.

Following his Evangelical conversion, Newman had quickly adopted the habit of using Sacred Scripture as a means of proving the doctrines of the Church.⁵⁶ It would appear from his own writings that he took to this approach on his own initiative even to the extent of proof-texting the articles of the Athanasian Creed.⁵⁷ He was to find a resonant echo of this methodology in a sermon that he heard Hawkins preach in 1818, a copy of which Hawkins gave him and urged him to study.⁵⁸ Hawkins's sermon, entitled *Unauthoritative Tradition*⁵⁹ was preached as a University Sermon at the University Church on 31 May 1818 and there seems no reason to doubt Newman's recollection of having heard it then, even though there is no mention of it made in his journal. Newman recalled that study of the sermon 'made a most serious impression upon me'.⁶⁰ The accuracy of this memory and the evidence of the sermon's influence over his views are supported by its content.

Hawkins's original sermon notes do not appear to have survived⁶¹ but the published version of the sermon runs to eighty-eight octavo pages. Newman recalls that it seemed at the time to be a long sermon and it may be supposed that, if the

⁵⁴ *Apo.*, p.65.

⁵⁵ *Apo.*, p.66.

⁵⁶ *Apo.*, p.60.

⁵⁷ *Apo.*, pp.60f.

⁵⁸ *Apo.*, p.66.

⁵⁹ Published as Edward Hawkins, *A Dissertation upon the Use and Importance of Unauthoritative Tradition as An Introduction to the Christian Doctrines; including the Substance of a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, May 31 1818, upon 2 Thess. ii. 15, ('Unauthoritative Tradition')*, (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1819).

⁶⁰ *Apo.*, p.66.

⁶¹ Hawkins's papers and correspondence are in Oriel College Archives, PRO 2/41/1-9, but contain no notes of this sermon.

original was of the same length as that which was published, it would have taken nearly an hour to preach. Newman's patience in listening and his later close study would have revealed to him why the sermon became 'celebrated'.⁶² Neither is it necessary to rely upon Newman's account for evidence of its celebrity. Another of Newman's contemporaries as a Fellow of Oriel, Thomas Arnold recalled sourly at the height of the Tractarian success in May 1836, that Hawkins' sermon had 'contributed to their mischief'.⁶³

The sermon was not original in its treatment of the subject – Newman suggests that it did not go 'one step' beyond the standard High Church Anglican position⁶⁴ – nor was Hawkins unique in treating of the matter at the time,⁶⁵ nevertheless *Unauthoritative Tradition* was a systematic treatment of a question that had become unavoidable in the face of powerful currents in the historical and biblical scholarship of the time. The work of German scholars such as Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827) and Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) meant that the relationship between the various parts of Sacred Scripture and the growing awareness of the interrelationship between the historical data of the early Christian centuries and the contents of the Bible needed to be addressed. For Anglicans, the normative status of Article VI of the Thirty Nine Articles⁶⁶ meant that it was important to establish a clear Protestant course between the Scylla of an apparently increasingly untenable *sola scriptura* and the Charybdis of thoroughgoing Latitudinarianism.

⁶² *Apo.*, p.66.

⁶³ Thomas Arnold to Richard Whately, 4th May 1836, in Stanley, A., ed., *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late Head Master of Rugby School and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford*, 2 vols., (London: B.Fellowes, 1844), vol. II, p.34.

⁶⁴ *Apo.*, p.66.

⁶⁵ George Glover relied on the necessity and importance of oral tradition in his *Remarks on the Bishop of Peterborough's 'Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome'*, (London, 1821) in Nockles, *the Oxford Movement in Context*, p.108.

⁶⁶ See, 'The Thirty-Nine Articles, 1571', in Bray, G., ed., *Documents of the English Reformation*, (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 2004), pp.285-309, here pp.287f.

Hawkins' sermon was addressed to this very issue and sought to establish such a course.

At the beginning of *Unauthoritative Tradition* Hawkins claimed that it was written specifically to answer the question: 'Why are so many of the Christian doctrines so *indirectly taught* in the Scriptures?'⁶⁷ He wondered why it seemed that these doctrines were 'rather implied than taught; why we have to learn them in great measure from incidental notices of them in books written upon particular occasions, controversies, or heresies'.⁶⁸ There is here a striking similarity with Newman's own developed view of how doctrinal development actually took place as he was to set it out nearly thirty years later in *Essay*. However, if Chadwick is correct when he contends that the thought of Möhler played a 'decisive role in the debate in the Anglican Church over development before Newman's conversion',⁶⁹ then this similarity is not much more than coincidence and an unsurprising one at that. It has been argued, however, that Chadwick's attachment to the thesis that Möhler was the ultimate, albeit indirect, source for Newman's theory of development 'leads him to undervalue evidence for other sources'.⁷⁰ What is clear is that the language used by Hawkins is so similar to that used by Newman, that it seems more probable that there is some dependence of the later work on the earlier, particularly in the light of Newman's consistent recollection. Chadwick's attribution to Newman of a lasting, disqualifying apologetic concern for consistency might well argue against placing too much reliance on the evidence in the

⁶⁷ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.1.

⁶⁸ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.1.

⁶⁹ Henry, J.L., *Newman and Development: The Genesis of John Henry Newman's Theory of Development and the Reception of His Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, an unpublished PhD thesis for the University of Texas, 1973, p.6. Henry relies, for this judgement, on Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, pp.114-118.

⁷⁰ Henry, *Newman and Development*, p.7.

*Apologia*⁷¹ and might even suggest that Newman's claimed dependence on Hawkins for this notion in *Tract 85*,⁷² written at the height of Newman's involvement in the Oxford Movement in 1837, is unreliable evidence. However, Newman began *Arians* possibly as early as 21 October 1831⁷³ and returned to it 'after many weeks intermission' shortly before the Christmas of that year.⁷⁴ It was completed by 31 July 1832,⁷⁵ nearly a year before the beginning of the Oxford Movement and the emergence of suggestions amongst some of Newman's critics of inconsistency on his part, to which he undoubtedly later felt obliged to give answer. His assertion in *Arians* of a dependence on Hawkins' *Unauthoritative Tradition*⁷⁶ must, therefore, remain free of Chadwick's charge. Nockles notes⁷⁷ that Newman's recollections are supported by the arguments of Bouyer⁷⁸ and Beimer,⁷⁹ although the absence of any evidence in Newman's letters and diaries from either 1818, when he first heard the sermon, or from the 1820s when he fell under Hawkins' influence at Oriel, taken with Chadwick's demonstrable assertion of a wider contemporary awareness of this particular issue, makes a definitive conclusion impossible without further corroborative evidence. That corroboration is found, however, when Hawkins' sermon is compared with the sermons which Newman himself preached in his first years of ordained ministry. It is, therefore, necessary to look in some detail at what Hawkins' wrote.

⁷¹ And particularly the claim that 'There is one other principle I gained from Dr. Hawkins...the doctrine of Tradition.' *Apo.*, p.65.

⁷² *Tract 85: Lectures on the Scripture Proofs of the Doctrines of the Church*, in *Tracts for the Times*, 5. vols., (London: J.G.F.Rivington and Oxford: Parker, both 1839-1841), ('*Tracts*'), here vol. 5, ('*Tract 85*'), pp.4-5. Cf. Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.64.

⁷³ 'resumed my task at the Councils (*This was the History of the Arians*), tho' with many interruptions for a while', Friday 21 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.368.

⁷⁴ Monday 19 December 1831, in *LD* ii, p.377.

⁷⁵ Tuesday 31 July 1832, in *LD* iii, p.74.

⁷⁶ *Ari*, p.55, n.2: 'Vide Dr. Hawkins original and most conclusive work on *Unauthoritative Tradition*, which contains in it the key to a number of difficulties which are apt to perplex the theological student.'

⁷⁷ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context* p.110, n.35.

⁷⁸ Louis Bouyer, *Newman: His Life and Spirituality*, (London: Burns and Oates, 1958), p.63.

⁷⁹ Biemer, G., *Newman on Tradition*, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), pp.33-42.

Hawkins began *Unauthoritative Tradition* by noting that his own experience of learning Christian doctrines, which he supposed to be common, was that it was tradition and not Scripture that had been his first introduction to the various teachings of Christianity. He observed that he had ‘first collected’ doctrine not usually ‘immediately from the Scriptures’, even though those doctrines rested ‘entirely upon Scriptural authority’,⁸⁰ but rather that the tradition of the Church was ‘intended to be the ordinary introduction to them’.⁸¹ Claiming to stand in conformity with the position of such High and Dry Churchmen as Daniel Waterland and Jones of Nayland⁸² and praying in aid of his argument Butler’s *Analogy*,⁸³ Hawkins went on to argue that the normative case is ‘that the Church should carry down the *system*, but the Scriptures should furnish all the *proofs* of the Christian doctrines; that tradition should supply the Christian with the *arrangement*, but the Bible with all the *substance* of divine truth’.⁸⁴ Although Hawkins cites Waterland and Jones of Nayland, in suggesting that he had ‘collected’ doctrine, he could quite as well have gone back to Hooker as authority for his approach. Hawkins’ claim to be operating according to the accepted approach of the Standard Anglican Divines⁸⁵ is, in reality, one of standing in the tradition, for all that unauthoritative, of collecting the sense of Scripture ‘using a reason informed by the doctrinal truths of Christian tradition’ that derives directly from Hooker.⁸⁶

⁸⁰ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.2.

⁸¹ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, Preface, p.v.

⁸² Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.3.

⁸³ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.13, n.d.

⁸⁴ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.18.

⁸⁵ A term used here to include at least Hooker, Andrewes, Taylor, Hall, Laud and Ussher. See Booty, J., ‘Standard Divines’, in Sykes, J. Booty and J. Knight, eds., *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998), pp.176-187. See also Michael Ramsey, *Anglican Spirit*, (New York: Church Publishing, 2004), chap. 2, esp. pp.13-15.

⁸⁶ See Chapman, M., ‘The Theology of Richard Hooker’ the fifth chapter in his *Anglican Theology*, (London: Continuum, 2012), pp.103-125, here p.124.

Hawkins was at pains to exclude what he believed to be the characteristic error of ‘the Romanists’ that is the granting of an ‘*independent authority* for the traditions conveyed to us by the Church’ on the grounds of observable fallibility and a liability to corruption that is intrinsic to its nature.⁸⁷ Neither did he allow these traditions a role that is primarily about the ‘confirmation or interpretation’ of doctrines which are revealed in Scripture.⁸⁸ To do this would privilege them to an extent that would hint at an authoritative status and overturn the plain meaning, to him at least, of that ‘fundamental Article of the Protestant Faith’, Article VI.⁸⁹

It is clearly no part of Hawkins’ intent to aim at the unique and privileged place of Scripture in Protestant Christianity, but rather to posit the place of tradition in a role auxiliary to it:

It (i.e. Scripture) would appear to be in the want of such a guide that the very difficulty complained of consists ... Now exactly such an aid and guide may surely be found in *tradition*, the traditions conveyed from age to age by the Church in general.⁹⁰

This clear conception of the relationship between Scripture and tradition is the characteristic theme: indeed the entire sermon is, in fact, an extended argument for believing that ‘the Church should *teach*, and the Scriptures *prove*, the doctrines of Christianity’.⁹¹ Even a doctrine as central to Christian Faith as the divinity of Jesus, Hawkins suggested, rests not on the fragmentary and tentative hints of it provided by Scripture but because it is and always has been taught by the Church and that ‘[a]ny uninterrupted tradition brings with it a reasonable *presumption* in its behalf’.⁹²

⁸⁷ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.20.

⁸⁸ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, Preface, p.v.

⁸⁹ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.28. See also p.1, n.x., where Hawkins also cites *Homily i* from *The Book of Homilies* as authority for this position.

⁹⁰ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.17.

⁹¹ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.22.

⁹² Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.21.

Drawing his thoughts together, at the end of an exhausting, if not exhaustive, examination of the working out of this principle across a wide spectrum of doctrine throughout the centuries, he concluded: ‘Let no one expect more from the Scriptures than they were designed to afford, or spurn that assistance (i.e. tradition) which they themselves imply.’⁹³

The language of Newman’s 1825 sermons, in addition to revealing the influence of Newman’s reading of Butler, also bears a striking similarity to that employed by Hawkins. It is, however, in the theological method, that is, in the use to which Sacred Scripture is put, that these sermons most resemble Hawkins’s argument. In these sermons, and in others preached on various occasions during this period, Newman consistently argued from the doctrine taught by the Church to the scriptural evidence, rather than the other way around. As a then member of the Oxford Association of the Bible Society, which he had supported since June 1823⁹⁴ and to which he had been a full subscriber since May 1824,⁹⁵ it might have seemed more usual to have followed the pattern of his earlier sermons and to have engaged, in the classical evangelical manner, in a detailed biblical exegesis.⁹⁶ What he did, however, was to set out what he took to be the teaching of the Church and then use Scripture to provide the evidential support for the ecclesial doctrine. In this series of sermons, Newman did not seek to stretch Scripture to prove a point, nor did he engage in an exercise in proof-texting. In this way the argumentation reflected Hawkins’s insistence on the distinction between doctrinal *arrangement* and *substance* and foreshadowed the distinctive method that Newman adopted in his use of patristic sources.

⁹³ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.86.

⁹⁴ A.W., p.192.

⁹⁵ Saturday 15 May 1824, in *LD* i, p.174.

⁹⁶ See, for example, Sermon No.12, preached first at St Clement’s on 15 August 1824, or Sermon No.40, preached at St Clement’s on 5 December, 1824, both in *BOA*, B.3.4.

This use of tradition, even if only in a strictly *unauthoritative* way, sat awkwardly with the evangelical principles to which Newman had heretofore been committed and to which he had only recently publicly recommitted himself in his subscription to the Bible Society. Indeed this adoption of Hawkins' approach 'struck at the root of the principle on which the Bible Society was set up',⁹⁷ although Newman did not feel compelled to remove his name from the subscription list to that body until 1830.⁹⁸ Whatever his motives for remaining so long a member of the Bible Society, Newman's own recollection in his *Autobiographical Writings* that, through his adoption of Hawkins's position, he 'had taken the first step towards giving up the evangelical form of Christianity'⁹⁹ is supported by his letter of 26 November 1826 to Samuel Rickards. In this letter he suggests that his correspondent's expertise in the teachings of the Anglican Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries might be applied to the purpose of acting as 'a band of witnesses for the truth' by treating them '*as a whole, a corpus theologicum et ecclesiasticum, the English Church*'.¹⁰⁰ It is an argument for tradition that went certainly as far as Hawkins. Furthermore, it is clear that even at this early date Newman saw the unavoidable connection between tradition and the development of doctrine. Writing of the scope of theological questions to which this tradition could be applied, he writes that: 'This is, indeed, a large head of inquiry, for it includes questions of ... the gradual development of doctrines'.¹⁰¹ It would be to suggest too much to say that at this date Newman had a notion of the development of doctrine beyond that implied in Lloyd's lectures: that is of a gradual development of the language used to express doctrinal truth.¹⁰² Nevertheless, when taken with the

⁹⁷ *Apo.*, p.66.

⁹⁸ '... withdrawing my name from the Bible Society', Thursday 8 June 1830, in *LD* ii, p.228.

⁹⁹ *A.W.*, p.78.

¹⁰⁰ JHN to Samuel Rickards, 26 November 1826, in *LD* i, pp.309-311, here p.310.

¹⁰¹ JHN to Samuel Rickards, 26 November 1826, in *LD* i, p.310.

¹⁰² Ffoukes, *A History of the Church of St Mary the Virgin*, pp.381-383.

homiletic evidence, it is evidence for a conscious acceptance of unauthoritative tradition sufficiently early in Newman's life to suggest that Newman himself recalled correctly, in 1864, when he wrote that '[t]here is one other principle which I gained from Dr. Hawkins, more directly bearing upon Catholicism, than any other I have mentioned; and that is the doctrine of Tradition'.¹⁰³

Alongside this notion of tradition, and intrinsically implied by it, Newman was at this time becoming ever more explicitly aware of the importance of a vehicle for tradition, of the necessity of the Church. Hawkins' influence was not insignificant here also, for on 19 August 1824, he had given Newman a copy of John Bird Sumner's *Apostolical Preaching considered in an Examination of St Paul's Epistles*.¹⁰⁴ Newman recorded in his journal that he finished reading the book exactly one week later.¹⁰⁵ Like Hawkins' sermon, Sumner's book explicitly confronted the problem that the scriptural evidence for many doctrines is largely implicit and indirect. In its constant resort to the fact of 'Apostolical preaching' as the source for and justification of doctrine, that is, to preaching in accordance with teaching of the Church of Apostolic times, Sumner's argument presented Newman with an historical challenge. Sumner had used de Maistre's word 'germ' to describe the presence in Scripture, albeit in a hidden and implicit way, of later doctrines such as the Trinity and there is evidence of its wider use with reference to Christian doctrine.¹⁰⁶ The challenge then was, Sumner contended, to understand how such a germ could be brought to ever fuller expression. For Sumner the answer was clear: it was through Apostolic preaching in the Church.

¹⁰³ *Apo.*, p.66.

¹⁰⁴ 'Hawkins gave me Sumner's Apostolical Preaching.' Thursday 19 August 1824, in *LD* i, p.185. John Bird Sumner's *Apostolical Preaching considered in an Examination of St Paul's Epistles*, (London: John Hatchard, 1815).

¹⁰⁵ '... and finished Sumner's Apostolical preaching [sic]'. Thursday 26 August 1824, in *LD* i, p.186

¹⁰⁶ e.g. Coburn, K., ed., *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, (London: Routledge, 1962), vol.I., i., p.2640.

As Stern has shown,¹⁰⁷ Sumner accepted the notion of the Church as a self-evident fact and, in this, Newman was inclined to follow Sumner, even where, as Sheridan demonstrates, he found it uncongenial and inconvenient so to do.¹⁰⁸ Sumner's ecclesiology may have evoked echoes of Newman's near contemporaneous reading of Butler, but it was William James, who, despite Newman's later recollection of being 'impatient of the doctrine' on being introduced to it by James,¹⁰⁹ first caused Newman to take an interest in Apostolical Succession. The ideas to which James had introduced Newman were to be explored in detail, however, through the work of another of the Oriel grandees who exercised so profound an influence on Newman at this time: Richard Whately.¹¹⁰

Newman had first come into close contact with Whately after his election to the Oriel fellowship. Whately had entered Oriel in 1805 as an undergraduate and by the time Newman was elected a Fellow in April 1822, had himself been a Fellow for eleven years already and had just given that year's Bampton Lectures. Although marriage necessitated his giving up his Fellowship in August 1823, he returned to Oxford two years later as Principal of St Alban's Hall and asked Newman to assist him as Vice-Principal. Newman readily admitted that he was in Whately's debt, not just for the 'gentle and encouraging' way in which he handled him when, as a new fellow he was still 'awkward and timid', but because he recalled that he had 'emphatically, opened my mind, and taught me to think and to use my reason'.¹¹¹ It was not specifically his

¹⁰⁷ Stern, J., *Bible et Tradition chez Newman: aux Origines de la Théorie de Développement*, (Lyons: Aubier, 1967), pp.62ff.

¹⁰⁸ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, pp.82-85.

¹⁰⁹ *Apo.*, p.67.

¹¹⁰ Richard Whately (1787-1863), Fellow of Oriel (1810-1821), Principal of St Alban Hall (1825-1831), Archbishop of Dublin (1831-1863), in *DNB Online* at, <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/29176?docPos=4>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

¹¹¹ *Apo.*, p.68.

influence in this area that is of most interest for the present purposes, however, but for the ecclesiological ideas to which Whately introduced Newman:

What he did for me in point of religious opinion, was first to teach me the existence of the Church, as a substantive body or corporation; next to fix in me those anti-Erastian views of Church polity, which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian movement.¹¹²

This recollection Newman repeated in his *Autobiographical Writings*:

He found that one momentous truth of Revelation, he had learned from Dr Whately, and that was the idea of the Christian Church, as a divine appointment, and as a substantive visible body, independent of the State, and endowed with rights, prerogatives, and powers of its own.¹¹³

Whately's opinions in this regard are clearly expressed in his anonymous 1826 publication, *Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian*.¹¹⁴ Sheridan argues that this work 'gives us a good clue to the subjects treated in his conversations with Newman'¹¹⁵ on the subject of the Church, and Newman's journals make clear that he and Whately had opportunities for many such conversations throughout 1825 and 1826. There seems, therefore, to be no reason to call into question Newman's accounts of Whately's effect upon his views.

At St George's Chapel, Brighton, on Christmas Morning 1826, Newman preached a sermon on Daniel 7:13-14, entitled 'Sermon for Christmas Day – On the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ'.¹¹⁶ He preached it again, with a slightly altered conclusion a month later, on 28 January 1827 before his own congregation at St Clement's, Oxford. In what was, in fact, as much a consideration of Trinitarian doctrine and of the relationship of the person of Jesus Christ to God the Father as

¹¹² *Apo.*, p.69.

¹¹³ *A.W.*, p.12.

¹¹⁴ Richard Whately, *Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian*, (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1826).

¹¹⁵ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, p.116, n.11.

¹¹⁶ Sermon 158, in *BOA*, B.3.4.

anything else, the sermon is testimony to the dogmatic character of Newman's faith. But more than that, the sermon provides evidence of Newman, as early as the end of 1826, having an inescapable awareness of the historical nature and condition of Christian Revelation together with an embryonic notion of tradition as the place in which that revelation was expressed in doctrinal form and of the necessity of the Church within Christianity as the vehicle that carries forward that tradition. The argument Newman was attempting to make in the sermon draws upon all these notions to present what is, in the event, a not entirely satisfactory doctrinal synthesis of Trinitarian and Christological orthodoxy, which points forward to what was to become an abiding interest over the next six years: the Arian controversy. The Trinitarian theology of the sermon certainly flirted with the subordination of the Son to the Father and in a memorandum, written on 13 May 1827, Newman notes that he 'must be more or less wrong, for B[lanco] White, Whately and Hawkins all think me so'.¹¹⁷ Hawkins more explicitly accused him of 'Arianizing'.¹¹⁸ The obvious and direct influence of these men on Newman made him feel their criticism all the more keenly. It is this criticism that appears to have led to his taking comfort in arguing that he had not attempted a systematic account of the Trinity but had given merely '*a partial view of the doctrine ... the truth (supposing so) but not the whole truth*'.¹¹⁹ and to further admitting to 'cordially dislike all discussions concerning the *nature of God*'.¹²⁰ What is certain is that in his attempt at so doing, Newman was to point forward to what was to become an abiding interest over the next few years: that is to the Arian controversy. It is not, however, the doctrinal content of the sermon that is of most interest here but rather the purpose which determined the manner in which Newman was arguing. In

¹¹⁷ JHN, 'Memorandum: Sermon "On the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ"', 13 May 1827, in *LD* ii, p.15f, ('Memo 13/5/27'), here p.15.

¹¹⁸ *Apo.*, p.71.

¹¹⁹ Memo 13/5/27, in *LD* ii, p.15.

¹²⁰ Memo 13/5/27, in *LD* ii, p.16.

terms that closely prefigure the language he was to use twenty years later in the *Essay*, Newman noted, that in this sermon he was advancing a position which ‘was given to *account for a difficulty*’ and that ‘for *particular purposes*, according to particular occasions, it may be useful to represent Catholic doctrine in this or that form’.¹²¹ He went even further in suggesting that some form of contingency attended the outward expression of the doctrine precisely as it had been expressed in former times:

For some years certain texts have perplexed me – I have tried different solutions – (one to understand ‘the Son’ always of our Lord’s human nature) – at least I have acquiesced in that question – and was emboldened to declare [it to] the satisfaction (if possible) of others similarly perplexed, from considering it to have been the church’s doctrine from the beginning – tho’ (as I now admit) not the *whole* doctrine.¹²²

Quite apart from the fascinating insight this passage gives into the Christological struggle Newman was engaged in and into at least one of his attempts to resolve the ‘Arianizing’ for which he had been criticised, the expression, ‘tho’ (as I now admit) not the *whole* doctrine’, indicates an explicit awareness of the partial nature of the church’s attempts at the dogmatic expression of her doctrines.

Newman was clearly uncomfortable with the need to define closely and in dogmatic form the core content of the Christian faith and yet saw that not to do so was an inadequate response to beliefs that were to come to be rejected as incompatible with that faith. Whilst not yet proposing a solution, Newman was now aware of the problem and, although by no means the fully developed theology of 1845, nor yet anything like it, this memorandum is undoubtedly evidence that, by 13 May 1827, Newman was beginning to grapple with questions which were to lead him, in time, to need to propose

¹²¹ Memo 13/5/27, in *LD* ii, p.16. The italics are Newman’s.. Cf. *Dev.*, p.27.

¹²² Memo 13/5/27, in *LD* ii, p.16

an hypothesis of continuity in the development of doctrine to account for the difficulty of change.

II. Writing the *Arians*

A recurrent challenge in tracing the history of Newman's opinions on any subject is that of providing an account of the intermissions, sometimes of long duration, during which there is little or no evidence of him engaging with the particular subject matter. Newman was not, however, an academic engaged primarily in research for whom the pursuit of the development of his various research projects might be seen as his principal preoccupation. In the three or four years leading up to the commissioning of the work that eventually became *Arians*, Newman's letters, diaries and autobiographical writings reveal a man thoroughly occupied with the teaching and wider tutorial duties at St Alban's Hall and Oriel, together with the pastoral work that went with his incumbency of the University Church. Even in the long vacations of 1828, 1829 and 1830, his diaries provide evidence that his long-planned systematic reading of the Fathers had to be squeezed in between rounds of parish visiting and other pastoral duties, and his familial obligations to his mother, sisters and other relatives. Nevertheless, a number of pieces of work which Newman undertook during this apparent intermission formed a propaedeutic period for the project that became *Arians*, the subject matter of which – the manner in which, through terminological change and the use of the *disciplina arcani*, the Church attempted to deal with the emergence of heresy – provided him with both difficulty and hypothesis.

Newman had conceived his desire to engage in this patristic reading as a way in which ‘to trace the sources from which the corruptions of the Church, principally the Romish, have been derived’,¹²³ and it emerged at a time when his view of the Fathers was hardly complimentary. Indeed, he recorded in the *Apologia* that his attitude was one of ‘a certain disdain for antiquity’ which ‘showed itself in some flippant language against the Fathers in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana’.¹²⁴ Newman’s articles in the *Encyclopedia Metropolitana* had begun in the spring of 1824, at the instigation of Whately, with an article on Cicero.¹²⁵ This first article was well received and Whately had little trouble persuading the editor, Edward Smedley, to commission Newman to write another article that would require him to engage seriously with patristic writing. The subject was the first century neo-Pythagorean philosopher Apollonius of Tyanaeus.¹²⁶ Apollonius was principally renowned as a miracle worker and Newman’s article led him to consider both the likelihood of the reliability of the particular accounts of Apollonius’s miracles and, more widely, the whole concept of the miraculous in general. The latter half of the article is, in fact, an almost separate essay in which Newman seeks to draw a distinction between the miracles of Sacred Scripture and those occurring in pagan religions and the later life of the Church.¹²⁷ Written between June 1825 and the following spring, the language he used in the article with regard to the reliability of patristic witness to the events recalled is dismissive, although his real target – the pagan miracles – is always subject to more explicit disdain.

¹²³ JHN to Jemima Newman, 1 May 1826, in *LD* i, p.285.

¹²⁴ *Apo.*, p.72.

¹²⁵ JHN, ‘Marcus Tullius Cicero’, in *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*, (London: Mawman, 1824), pp.279-294.

¹²⁶ JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanaeus’, in *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*, (London: Mawman, 1826), pp.619-644.

¹²⁷ JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanaeus - Miracles’, in *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*, (London: Mawman 1826), pp.626-644.

Newman sought, in the article, to set up the conditions under which a claim to the miraculous can be sustained, conditions designed to reflect well on the miracles of Sacred Scripture and, by contrast, to enable other classes of miracle to be discounted. In language that pointed forward twenty years to the *Essay*, he entitled one section: ‘On the antecedent Credibility of a Miracle considered as a Divine Interposition’¹²⁸ and, on grounds of antecedent probability concludes that ‘the claims to supernatural power in the primitive Church are in general questionable’.¹²⁹ He then went on to examine the character of the witnesses to miracles, since, he argued, ‘(t)he credibility of Testimony arises from the belief we entertain of the character and competency of the witnesses’.¹³⁰ In his comparison between the miracles of scripture, on the one hand, and those of pagan religions and the primitive and later Church, on the other, he wrote:

*A previous character for falsehood is almost fatal to the credibility of a witness of an extraordinary narrative, e.g. the notorious insincerity and frauds of the Church of Rome in other things, are in themselves enough to throw a strong suspicion on its Testimony to its own Miracles. The primitive Church is in some degree open to a charge of a similar nature.*¹³¹

And again, later:

Men are always ready to believe what flatters their own opinions ... This consideration invalidates at once the testimony commonly offered for Pagan and Popish Miracles, and in no small degree that for the Miracles of the primitive Church.¹³²

This language may convey a certain disdain by association but it can hardly be called flippant. These quotes represent quite the strongest terms Newman used in the entire article and yet it is clear that it was Rome and not the Fathers that he wished to discredit. While the embarrassed recollection of the *Apologia* is, perhaps, a little over-emphasised, nevertheless the entire tone of the article and its heavy reliance, as the

¹²⁸ JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanæus - Miracles’, p.628.

¹²⁹ JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanæus - Miracles’, p.631.

¹³⁰ JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanæus - Miracles’, p.639.

¹³¹ JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanæus - Miracles’, p.640.

¹³² JHN, ‘Apollonius of Tyanæus - Miracles’, p.642.

footnotes attest, on Hume and Bentham,¹³³ certainly support Newman's contention that this was a period in his life when he 'was beginning to prefer intellectual excellence to moral' and 'was drifting in the direction of liberalism'.¹³⁴

In early 1827, as part of an ongoing dispute with his brother Francis, Newman had researched, written and distributed both to his brother and his sisters, a paper on infant baptism.¹³⁵ The paper runs to sixty-six quarto pages and since it professed to treat of the history of the practice, it might have been expected to draw on the patristic study in which he had been engaged. In fact, the paper makes almost no use of patristic material.

Newman's opportunity to embark on a properly systematic reading of the Fathers was served by the delivery from Pusey, then in Germany, of a set of works of the Fathers, which awaited him on his return to Oxford at the beginning of Michaelmas Term, 1827.¹³⁶ It is not at all clear what precisely had been the occasion of Newman asking Pusey to acquire these volumes and his academic duties, taken with an increase in pastoral duties (he was instituted Vicar of St Mary the Virgin, the University church, on 14 March 1828),¹³⁷ prevented the start of the reading until the long vacation of 1828 but by 23 June he had begun to read the Apostolic Fathers.¹³⁸ He had shared his reading plan with Charles Lloyd, the new Bishop of Oxford, formerly Newman's teacher and now his ordinary. Newman recorded Lloyd's encouragement and, in his

¹³³ Although he also relies on Butler's *Analogy*, at least in outlining the place of miracles within the witness of Sacred Scripture.

¹³⁴ *Apo.*, p.72.

¹³⁵ See *LD* ii, p.5, n.1

¹³⁶ '... went to Oxford by this time the Fathers, which Pusey had bought me in Germany had arrived', Not Later than Saturday 13 October 1827, in *LD* ii, p.30.

¹³⁷ Friday 14 March 1828, in *LD* ii, p.62.

¹³⁸ His diary reads: 'MONDAY 23 JUNE 1828 began the Patres Apostolici with Barnabas', in *LD* ii, p.76.

journal for 21 February 1827, gave a tantalising glimpse of his own self-awareness, particularly with regard to the development of his own theological opinions:

Lloyd is the new Bishop of Oxford. He is very kind, and takes great interest in my plan of reading the Fathers; but he says that our theological systems do not agree. They agree more than when I was in class with him, but I do not tell him so.¹³⁹

The following summer was given over to this reading and so was that of 1830, at least after the dispute over the Oriel Tutorship had concluded and he had discharged his filial duties by visiting his mother, aunt and sisters in Brighton.¹⁴⁰ It is clear that he had made sufficient progress in this chronologically systematic reading such that when, in March 1831, he received an invitation from Hugh James Rose to write a history of the Church Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries,¹⁴¹ he was ‘well disposed towards it’, a disposition qualified only by a concern as to whether he had sufficient time to complete the work.¹⁴² The writing of this book, which eventually became *The Arians*, represents the next principal episode in Newman’s engagement with the question of development and the first attempt at proposing a hypothesis to account for the difficulty that he perceived it created.¹⁴³

From the very first, Newman had agreed with Rose’s proposal that any ‘*History of the Councils*’ would only work if it was conceived as an introduction to a theological consideration of the ‘(a)rticles in which the great doctrines of Christianity are treated’.¹⁴⁴ Rose’s conception for the *Theological Library* was that, under the hand of a number of authors, ‘handy little volumes, uniform, and with appropriate

¹³⁹ A.W., p.210.

¹⁴⁰ Thursday 1 July 1830, in *LD* ii, p.246

¹⁴¹ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 9 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321.

¹⁴² JHN to Hugh James Rose, 28 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321f.

¹⁴³ The article was never published as an article but only as *Arians* and is hereafter referred to under that title.

¹⁴⁴ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 9 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321.

embellishments'¹⁴⁵ would be published and which would promote serious theological study amongst Anglican clergy. Newman's articles in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* had recommended him to Rose and his co-editor Lyall, although, as Pattison argues, it seems likely that they laboured under the misapprehension that Newman was a 'moderate' Anglican, like themselves,¹⁴⁶ rather than the 'hot headed man'¹⁴⁷ he conceived himself to be. That Lyall and Rose should be so mis-informed as to Newman's actual views is, perhaps, surprising in view of the correspondence in March 1831 between Rose and Newman. Rose had written to Newman seeking his views on a number of 'controversial Articles'¹⁴⁸ and it had been his purpose, as he later explained, only to ascertain the extent to which Newman would take a position in accordance with 'the principles of the Church of England'.¹⁴⁹ Newman's response was to state baldly that he was 'not aware that [he] differ in any material point from our standard writers',¹⁵⁰ whilst hinting heavily that things were not quite as straightforward as all that:

I should be unwilling to allow any alteration without the concurrence of my own judgement – and, if the change required were great, should cheerfully acquiesce in my M.S. being declined, rather than consent to suppress or modify any part of it which I deemed of importance.¹⁵¹

If Rose and Lyall had expected a conventional history, then it was clear that such was not what Newman intended to produce.

¹⁴⁵ Mozley, T., *Reminiscences Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols., (London: Longman Green and Co, 1882), vol.1, p.247.

¹⁴⁶ Pattison, R., *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and Liberal Heresy*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1991), p.100.

¹⁴⁷ JHN to Harriett Newman, 16 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.367.

¹⁴⁸ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 9 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321.

¹⁴⁹ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 30 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.323.

¹⁵⁰ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 28 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.322.

¹⁵¹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 28 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.322.

In response to Rose's invitation, Newman had set out a detailed plan of the work,¹⁵² with which Rose expressed his contentment¹⁵³ and after a brief correspondence concerning the practical and business arrangements surrounding the project,¹⁵⁴ Newman was able to begin the work in earnest at the beginning of the 1831 Long Vacation.¹⁵⁵ Thirty years later, in the controversy of the writing of the *Apologia*, Newman recalled the effect of the process of this work in fashioning in him an attachment to the principle of antiquity as a guarantor of doctrinal authenticity. He expressed himself in characteristically poetic language:

It was launching myself on an ocean with currents innumerable; and I was drifted back first to the ante-Nicene history, and then to the Church of Alexandria ... The course of reading which I pursued in the composition of my work was directly adapted to develope [sic] it in my mind.¹⁵⁶

Rowan Williams, more prosaically, has suggested that the mechanics of his work on this project had a direct effect on Newman's conception of doctrine and mark a distinct step forward from the position which he had held only four years earlier:

His sense of the legitimacy and the necessity of doctrinal definition seems to have developed actually *in* the process of endeavouring to write Church history; and the various comments in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* directed against those who are lukewarm about dogmatic definition...are the direct fruit of the experience of writing the book, and in some degree, addressed to the Newman of 1827.¹⁵⁷

Rose's original invitation did not specify which councils were to come within its purview, he merely suggested to Newman that: 'as a preliminary to a work on those Articles ... a *History of the Councils*, in which so many of them (one may say *all*) were

¹⁵² JHN to Hugh James Rose, 28 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321f.

¹⁵³ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 30 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.323f.

¹⁵⁴ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 5 April 1831, in *LD* ii, p.324; Francis Rivington to JHN, 21 April 1831, referred to in *LD* ii, p.324, n.1 and in the diary entry for Friday, 22 April 1831 in *LD* ii, p.327.

¹⁵⁵ Wednesday 22 June 1831, in *LD* ii, p.338.

¹⁵⁶ *Apo.*, pp.87f.

¹⁵⁷ Williams, R., 'Newman's *Arians* and the Question of Method in Doctrinal History', in Ker, I., and A.G. Hill, *Newman after a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), ('Newman's *Arians*'), p.263.

discussed would be very valuable'.¹⁵⁸ Newman sought clarification in his response of 28 March 1831¹⁵⁹ and Rose proposed that, since the *History of the Councils* was to be an introduction to one of the articles of the Christian Faith, then: 'The Councils consequently to be dwelt on are those in which the great points of faith were discussed or heresies censured.'¹⁶⁰ The first works that Newman read as he began work on *The Arians* were the secondary accounts rendered by Gibbon and Maimbourg, together with the quasi-canonical *Defensio* of Bishop Bull, on which the final work was so heavily to rely.¹⁶¹ Recognising the ultimately dogmatic purpose of this introductory work, he broadened his reading to include works by the Anglican divines Waterland, Clarke and Horsley.¹⁶² It is not clear why he began with this scheme of reading rather than with a review of the patristic writing with which he was by that time familiar, but the overview these works provided him with served to develop his conception of the project and the work of that summer, interrupted briefly by a holiday in Devon,¹⁶³ significantly altered Newman's original notion of the size and scope of the project. He advised Rose, in August 1831, that the work would need to be of at least three volumes if it were to cover the range Rose had suggested and that they would be better arranged thematically than chronologically.¹⁶⁴ Rose's response to this expanding project was to attempt to rein in Newman. The response has not survived but its existence is attested to in a diary note of its receipt on 8 September 1831¹⁶⁵ and by Newman's 12 September 1831 response, in which he acknowledged 'the service which your letter has been to me in

¹⁵⁸ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 9 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321.

¹⁵⁹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 28 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.321f.

¹⁶⁰ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 30 March 1831, in *LD* ii, p.323.

¹⁶¹ Bull, G., *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae, ex scriptis, quae exstant, Catholicorum Doctorum, qui intra tria prima Ecclesiae Christianae saecula floruerunt. In qua obiter quoque Constantinopolitana Confessio, de Spiritu Sancto, Antiquiorum testimoniis adstritur*, (Oxford: 1685), ('*Defensio*'). Newman cites Bull twelve times in the text of *The Arians* and a further thirty-two times in the notes to the text.

¹⁶² Wednesday 22 June 1831, in *LD* ii, p.338.

¹⁶³ Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, p.43.

¹⁶⁴ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 24 August 1831, in *LD* ii, p.352f.

¹⁶⁵ Thursday 8 September 1831, in *LD* ii, p.358.

disengaging me from the entanglements in which I had become involved by the extent and abundance of my subject'.¹⁶⁶ Nevertheless he still retained a broad vision of the extent of his commission, recognising that it could conceivably include within its conspectus a consideration of the Council of Trent – albeit that Newman recognised that this would require a separate work.¹⁶⁷ Rose does not appear to have responded to this later letter, the lack of a response seemingly being taken by Newman as a green-light to go ahead with the project according to his own instincts.

Throughout the rest of 1831 and into 1832 Newman worked on the project alongside his other duties, which had expanded still further with his appointment as Rural Dean on 1 September 1831.¹⁶⁸ He had come to perceive a particular moral purpose in his work on *The Arians*, a dimension that was never far from his controversialist and apologetic writing for the rest of his life. It was certainly strong enough for him to turn down Whately's second invitation to become Vice-Principal of St Alban's Hall (an office he had given up on becoming a Tutor at Oriel in 1826) and again, when writing to his sister Harriett, in October 1831, he explained his own appreciation of the task at hand in terms that are heavily suggestive of an acute sense of moral purpose. Upon 'Whately's promotion' to Archbishop of Dublin, Newman had expected his friend to invite him 'some time or other to join him at Dublin',¹⁶⁹ – although he later ruefully noted: 'He never did. He knew me better than I knew myself.'¹⁷⁰ His rationale for refusing any such offer that might come is expressed in terms that indicate his awareness of the importance of the work in which he was

¹⁶⁶ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 12 September 1831, in *LD* ii, p.358.

¹⁶⁷ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 12 September 1831, in *LD* ii, p.359.

¹⁶⁸ Thursday 1 September 1831, in *LD* ii, p.357.

¹⁶⁹ JHN to Harriett Newman, 16 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.367.

¹⁷⁰ JHN to Harriett Newman, 16 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.367, n.3.

engaged, its wider context and the part that he, and perhaps only he, had to play. They have an almost prophetic quality:

I think my mind is quite made up that it is my duty to remain where I am; so remain I shall...My reasons for remaining are these: – first, I am actually engaged to Mr Rose, for a succession of works, the composition of which is quite incompatible with the duties of a post about an Archbishop – next, this engagement will be in itself a channel of extensive usefulness, which I should be abandoning just as I had begun it – thirdly the study of theology is very much neglected at Oxford, and I may be doing a peculiar service to the place (by ‘peculiar’ I mean what others will *not* do) by cultivating it – fourthly, if times are troublous, Oxford will want hot headed men, and such I mean to be, and I am in my place.¹⁷¹

He again expressed the moral character of the work to Simeon Lloyd Pope, when he wrote that he was engaged ‘on an extremely important subject’ that was not merely of academic or historical significance but that in so doing he was ‘resisting the innovations of the day, and attempting to defend the work of men indefinitely above me (the Primitive Fathers) which is now assailed’.¹⁷² Quite apart from the evidence that this letter provides for Newman having abandoned what he had perhaps over-claimed was his earlier dismissive and flippant attitude towards the Fathers, it provides a clear and early refutation of Frank Turner’s hypothesis,¹⁷³ that it was the fight against evangelicalism that was the motivating purpose of Newman’s writing rather than against religious liberalism – which is clearly what Newman meant by ‘the innovations of the day’. As Ward observed, the purpose in undertaking the commission:

For Newman himself it was not an exercise of historical research for its own sake, but an essential link in the rational justification of existing Orthodox Christianity for educated men and thinkers – the central object of all his work.¹⁷⁴

To achieve this, Newman had to devise a rhetorical strategy that would, at one and the same time, fix the same character to the errors of the third and fourth centuries

¹⁷¹ JHN to Harriett Newman, 16 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.367.

¹⁷² JHN to Simeon Lloyd Pope, 9 April 1832, in *LD* iii, p.43.

¹⁷³ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*.

¹⁷⁴ Wilfred Ward, *Last Lectures*, (London: Longman Green and Co., 1918), pp.40f.

and to those of the nineteenth. Jay Hammond describes this strategy in detail in his ‘Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy in the Process of Newman’s Conversion 1830-1845’, where he outlines a complex twin dialectic. He argues that Newman’s theology operated around the twin poles of belief/faith, on the one hand, and development/church, on the other. Hammond contends that it is the dialectic between conscience and dogma that defines the belief/faith pole, with that between probability and imagination shaping the pole of development/church.¹⁷⁵ Much of the evidence he considers belongs to the period immediately after the writing of *Arians*. Nonetheless throughout the period from 1830-1845, Hammond maintains that Newman’s:

... own theological preoccupations against liberalism were the primary impetus for his historical study. He looked into the past to help him discern the theological events of the present ... to construct a rhetorical strategy against his adversaries.¹⁷⁶

Newman’s sense of urgent moral purpose was strengthened by the methodological challenge he faced in the process of researching and writing this contemplated *History of the Councils*. In the previously quoted letter to Rose of August 1831, he framed the methodological question before him in terms that would have a profound impact upon not just *The Arians* but upon his repeated attempts at proposing an adequate account of doctrinal continuity in the face of historical evidence of significant development and change. His reading had led him to a definite plan:

For the last six weeks I have given some time to the examination of my materials – and am of the opinion that I shall best answer the object of making an useful work by giving a *connected* history of the Councils – i.e. not taking them as isolated, but introducing so much of Church History as will illustrate and account for them. Do not suppose that I mean to evade the strict discussion of the subjects settled in the Councils – this is the main object of the whole work – but since only the conclusions come to, not the arguments and controversy are

¹⁷⁵ Jay Hammond, ‘Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy in the Process of Newman’s Conversion from 1830-1845’, in Parker, K. and M.J.G.Pahls, eds., *Authority, Dogma, and History: The Role of Oxford Movement Converts on the Papal Infallibility Debates*, (Palo Alto, CA: Academica Press, 2009), (‘Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy’), pp.45-76.

¹⁷⁶ Hammond, ‘Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy’, p.46.

given in the Acts ... to analyze these would be doing nothing. What light would be thrown on the Nicene Confession *merely* by explaining it article by article? to understand it, it must be prefaced by a sketch of the rise of the Arian heresy.¹⁷⁷

Newman felt that he needed to write a work that took proper account of the events and arguments that provided the immediate historical backdrop to the Councils of the early Church and, more significantly in the context of the matter under consideration here, within which the dogmatic statements of the Christian Faith arose. The task Newman had set himself in responding to the invitation to write this *History of the Councils*, the task he attempted to fulfill in writing *Arians*, was neither one of systematic theology nor of history, but one of what he considered to be a truly Ecclesiastical History. His reading had provided no real model for this, as he confided to Samuel Rickards:

The standard Divines are magnificent fellows, but then they are Antiquarians or Doctrinists, not Ecclesiastical Historians – Bull, Waterland, Petavius, Baronius and the rest – of the historians I have met with I have a very low opinion – Mossheim, Gibbon, Milner, etc – Cave and Tillement are highly respectable, but biographers.¹⁷⁸

He had a sense that he was, therefore, on his own and that he had to write a ‘*connected history*’ such that it was both good history and good theology: respecting the norms of each discipline. Newman understood that this meant that what he wrote would have to account for the process that led up to the Nicene symbol and the symbol itself, in such a way that gave proper weight to historically verifiable events, at the same time as reflecting the definitive nature of the revelation of God in the person, acts and teaching of Jesus Christ. His correspondence gives some hint of his awareness of the ever-expanding scope of work that this methodology necessitated. The August 1831 letter to Rose recorded his unease:

¹⁷⁷ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 24 August 1831, in *LD* ii, p.352.

¹⁷⁸ JHN to Samuel Rickards, Oct 30, 1831 in *LD* ii, p.371.

I have a difficulty in combining history and doctrinal discussion, which besides the irregularity which it might occasion in the work by causing frequent digressions, may render it heavy, *load the text with notes at the foot of the page*, and after all prevent the complete investigation and elucidation of various points of doctrine.¹⁷⁹

The seriousness with which Newman expressed this difficulty is sufficient evidence against Stephen Thomas's description of the work as a 'narrative', in which Newman does not engage in the historian's proper task of 'the impartial sifting of evidence' – however such impartiality might be defined, let alone attempted – but 'rather, ... incorporates the historian's interest in causality and origins into a story in which argument and narrative are carefully woven to make the greatest popular appeal'.¹⁸⁰

Newman went through several iterations of a structure for the work that he believed would enable him to resolve the difficulty of giving an account that was properly both historical and theological: each successive plan expanding the size and number of volumes necessary to adequately answer Rose's initial concept. Rose's intervention, in September 1831¹⁸¹ settled the fundamental structural concerns and, in Newman's words in his reply, had disengaged him 'from the entanglements in which I had become involved by the extent and abundance of my subject'.¹⁸² By early 1832, the publishers were chasing him to produce the work¹⁸³ and his letters and diaries for the first half of that year record his determination to finalise it. He recorded that it was completed in a diary entry on Thursday, 7 June 1832,¹⁸⁴ but, as the editors of the third volume of *Letters and Diaries* observe, 'presumably the writing out still remained to be

¹⁷⁹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 24 August 1831, in *LD* ii, p.353.

¹⁸⁰ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.35.

¹⁸¹ Thursday 8 September 1831, in *LD* ii, p.358.

¹⁸² JHN to Hugh James Rose, 12 September 1831, in *LD* ii, pp.358f.

¹⁸³ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 8 January 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.3f

¹⁸⁴ Thursday 7 June 1832, in *LD* iii, p.54.

done'.¹⁸⁵ At the beginning of July, Newman had sent Rose, by way of Rivington and Turrill, the first third of the manuscript.¹⁸⁶ He had intended to deliver the second third directly to Rose when he went to Cambridge on 16 July but his intentions were frustrated by Rose's absence from Cambridge due to illness.¹⁸⁷ In any event the work was finally completed, as Newman's diary records with relief, on 31 July 1832¹⁸⁸ and, from Brighton, just over a week later, he and Rose were in correspondence regarding the latter's editorial observations.¹⁸⁹ This correspondence continued throughout August and September¹⁹⁰ and by October Newman had become anxious. Rose had passed the manuscript to his co-editor William Rowe Lyall, the Archdeacon of Maidstone, and Newman had certainly been aware of this when he had written to Froude in September.¹⁹¹ On 23 October, Newman received a letter from Rose¹⁹² enclosing a letter from Lyall to Rose¹⁹³ which Newman recorded in his diary entry for that day as '*plucking my "Arians"*', that is, rejecting it as unacceptable.¹⁹⁴

Newman's reaction to Lyall's editorial criticism and to Rose's implicit decision not to publish the work as part of the *Theological Library* was dignified and indicated that he could see the force of the editorial stance. Lyall's letter recorded that he had admired the scholarship and style of the work: 'It is full of learning, and the tone and

¹⁸⁵ LD iii, p.54, n.1.

¹⁸⁶ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 5 July 1832, in LD iii, p.65.

¹⁸⁷ JHN to Mrs Newman, 16 July 1832, in LD iii, pp.66f.

¹⁸⁸ Tuesday 31 July 1832, in LD iii, p.74.

¹⁸⁹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 8 August 1832, in LD iii, p.77.

¹⁹⁰ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 16 August 1832, in LD iii, pp.78f; diary entry Thursday 24 August 1832, in LD iii, p.80; JHN to Jemima Newman, 27 August 1832, in LD iii, p.82; JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 13 September 1832, in LD iii, p.94; and diary entry Thursday 27 September 1832, in LD iii, p.97.

¹⁹¹ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 13 September 1832, in LD iii, p.94.

¹⁹² Hugh James Rose to JHN, 21 October 1832, in LD iii, p.104.

¹⁹³ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in LD iii, pp.104f.

¹⁹⁴ Tuesday 23 October 1832, in LD iii, p.103. The expression '*plucking*' refers to the ancient voting practice in the Oxford University convocation, whereby a vote against a proposition was indicated by a member grasping the gown of a proctor as he passed through the assembly to take the vote. See *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, ('OED Online'), entry for 'pluck', definition 8.a., at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2277/view/Entry/145998?isAdvanced=false&result=3&rskey=icYahx&>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

spirit in which it is written are excellent – the style also I like particularly: it is thoroughly *English*, and in many places strikingly good.¹⁹⁵ He had, however, also recognised that it was a poor fit for the *Theological Library*, not least because it was manifestly not the commissioned *History of the Councils* but ‘a History of Arianism’.¹⁹⁶ Newman’s reply to Rose, written on the day of the receipt of Rose’s letter, recognised that this assessment was a fair one and accepting, as he did, that he had ‘completed a history of Arianism’ he sought Rose’s support in getting the manuscript published as a stand-alone work.¹⁹⁷ Newman’s response to the theological criticisms made by Lyall, on the other hand, indicated that here he parted company with his editor. Lyall had suggested that Newman’s argument, which had made much of the *disciplina arcani* and tradition were ‘directly adverse to that which Protestant writers of our church have contended for’.¹⁹⁸ It will be necessary to consider this observation and those made in Lyall’s later letters,¹⁹⁹ in greater detail shortly when the text of the published work is considered. In his response to Rose, however, Newman conceded only to having committed minor solecisms:

Believe me to be quite sensible of the absurdity of committing the paradoxes and mistakes in minor points to which you allude – and, though I ever wish to have the command of my own views and to preserve that individuality of opinion, (so to call it) on which I conceive the prospect of permanent usefulness to depend, yet it is my anxious desire to avoid every position which may give a handle to opponents or to perplex the honest reader who agrees with me in the main.²⁰⁰

Rose promised full support to Newman in attempting to get the manuscript published²⁰¹ and, on 5 November, saw Rivingtons to secure their agreement.²⁰²

¹⁹⁵ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.104f.

¹⁹⁶ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in *LD* iii, p.105.

¹⁹⁷ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 23 October 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.103f.

¹⁹⁸ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in *LD* iii, p.105.

¹⁹⁹ i.e. those of 3 November and 9 November 1832, in *LD* iii, p.112 and p.113, respectively.

²⁰⁰ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 23 October 1832, in *LD* iii, p.103.

²⁰¹ Hugh James Rose to JHN, 29 October 1832, in *LD* iii, p.104, n.1.

Rivingtons wrote to Newman that same day to confirm that they would, indeed, publish the work in an edition of 750 copies and hoped so to do as soon after Easter 1833 as suited Newman.²⁰³ As it was, Newman had agreed to accompany Froude and his father to the Mediterranean over the winter of 1832/3,²⁰⁴ a journey which was to take Newman away from Oxford on 3 December 1832,²⁰⁵ not returning until 9 July 1833,²⁰⁶ and so the work was not to appear until 5 November 1833.

Five days after Newman's return to Oxford, on 14 July 1833, Keble preached the Assize Sermon in St Mary the Virgin, under the title 'National Apostasy'. Newman had been away for much of the period covering the events that had led to Keble's remarks but he was keenly aware of the issues. The Catholic Relief Act of 1829²⁰⁷ had caused trouble enough – Newman's part in the campaign against Peel may have been, in part, at the root of the difficulties he had had with Hawkins over the Oriel Tutorship, each of them having canvassed 'energetically' on opposite sides²⁰⁸ – but the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Act of 1833²⁰⁹ had been more than he, and many of those of like-mind, were prepared silently to bear. Keble's sermon attempted to lay bare the full Erastian nature of the Act and to identify the existential threat it posed to the very conception of the Church of England that he, Newman and others held as being of its essence. There were other events that summer which have a claim to having been the initial catalyst for the movement, the meeting at Rose's Hadleigh Rectory being

²⁰² 6 November 1832, in *LD* iii, p.113, n.3.

²⁰³ Rivingtons to JHN, in *LD* iii, p.113, n.3.

²⁰⁴ Richard Hurrell Froude to JHN, 9 September 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.92f, and JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 13 September 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.93f.

²⁰⁵ 3 December 1832, in *LD* iii, p.121.

²⁰⁶ 9 July 1833, in *LD* iv, p.3.

²⁰⁷ 10 Geo. IV, ch.7.

²⁰⁸ Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, p.32

²⁰⁹ 3 and 4 Will. IV, ch.37.

chief amongst them,²¹⁰ but, not least because he was present and it was given from his pulpit, Newman thereafter held that Keble's sermon was the starting gun for the Oxford Movement.²¹¹ It is ironic to note that the sermon attracted little contemporary notice and its immediate effect appears to have been slight.²¹² Newman's energies were diverted into the movement – although it had not, by this time, attained this or any other name – such that, between his return to Oxford and the eventual publication of the book in November 1833, he made but one further mention of the book in his correspondence in a letter to H.A.Woodgate, and that but a remark in passing.²¹³ These months were a period of intense activity where, amongst other things, Newman planned and organised the first of the *Tracts for the Times*, writing at least six and possibly seven of the first ten, and was heavily engaged in the organisation of the nascent movement. His involvement in this activity forms the subject matter of the next chapter of this dissertation and, in any event, most of the concerns regarding the text of *The Arians* had been settled prior to Newman's departure for the Mediterranean the previous December. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the extraordinary lengths to which he had gone in producing *Arians*, the immediate pre- and post-publication silence in his letters and diaries is surprising, even allowing for the fact that the frenetic activity around the first months of what would come to be called the Oxford Movement had left little time for other concerns.

²¹⁰ Nockles calls the Hadleigh Rectory meeting the Movement's '... famous inaugural conference'. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.124.

²¹¹ *Apo.*, p.100.

²¹² Chapman, M., 'John Keble, National Apostasy, and the Myths of 14 July', in Blair, K., *John Keble in Context*, (London: Anthem Press, 2004), pp.47-58. Chapman claims that '... the Sermon itself was something of a non-event, and was hardly even noticed at the time', here p.47.

²¹³ In JHN to H. A. Woodgate, 7 August 1833, in *LD* iv, p.28. Keble twice refers to it in letters to Newman but Newman's replies make no mention of it. See John Keble to JHN, August <or July> 1833, in *LD* iv, p.19 and 5 November 1833, in *LD* iv, p.86.

III. The text of *Arians*

The work which had originally been conceived as a volume in Rose and Lyall's *Theological Library* with the title *A History of the Councils* was finally published under the full title of *The Arians of the Fourth Century, Their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct, Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church, between A.D. 325, and A.D. 381*, on 5 November 1833. It extended to four hundred and thirty six pages of slightly larger than Octavo, comprising eleven pages of preface and four hundred and twenty five pages of text. It bore a dedication to John Keble and an advertisement that made reference to its genesis as part of Rivington's *Theological Library*, noting that, 'as it seemed, on its completion, little fitted for the objects with which that publication has been undertaken, it makes its appearance in an independent form'.²¹⁴ It was arranged in six chapters, which, when preparing the work for the publication as part of the complete edition published by Longmans from 1878, Newman conveniently grouped into a first part dealing with doctrinal matters, extending to the first two chapters of the original work, and the second part dealing with historical matters, covering the third to sixth chapters of the first edition.

Newman later claimed that, 'What principally attracted me in the ante-Nicene period was the great Church of Alexandria, the historical centre of teaching in those times',²¹⁵ and this attraction certainly appears to influence the text of the *Arians*. In the first chapter, he immediately sets up an opposition between the character of the Church of Alexandria, which he portrays positively, and that of the Church of Antioch, to which he ascribes almost entirely negative characteristics. As soon as Newman has

²¹⁴ *Ari.*, Advertisement.

²¹⁵ *Apo.*, p.88.

introduced the reader to the Church at Antioch, he is confronted by the stark statement that: ‘This ancient and celebrated Church, however, is painfully conspicuous in the middle of the century,’ [i.e. the third century] ‘as affording so open a manifestation of the spirit of Antichrist, as to fulfil almost literally the prophecy of the Apostle in 2 Thess. ii’.²¹⁶ He could hardly be clearer about his position than when he wrote: ‘Antioch is the metropolis of the heretical, as Alexandria of the orthodox party’.²¹⁷ In the following thirty or so pages, Newman never lost an opportunity to point up the adverse characteristics of the Church of Antioch, linking it directly to the development of the heresy of Arianism, by way of Judaism, Sophism and the Antiochene church’s own ‘disputatious character’.²¹⁸ The language applied to Antioch never fails to be loaded with adverse inferences, with terms such as ‘artifice’ and ‘sceptical’,²¹⁹ ‘pugnacious’ and ‘satirical’²²⁰ being typical examples. The vocabulary used about the Church of Alexandria is, in contrast, almost entirely positive. Even the fact that Arius himself was a Presbyter of the Church of Alexandria is excused by reference to the fact that he was ‘educated at Antioch’, and that, ‘so far from being favourably heard at Alexandria, he was on the first promulgation of his heresy, expelled from the church in that city’.²²¹ The Church of Alexandria is described as ‘supplied in especial abundance, both of the materials and instruments prompting to the exercise of Christian zeal’,²²² and its catechetical practices, especially with reference to the use of the principle of reserve, are held up by Newman as the exemplar of the best practice of the early church.²²³ Newman had, therefore, in his introductory remarks set up a duality

²¹⁶ *Ari.*, pp.3f.

²¹⁷ *Ari.*, p.10.

²¹⁸ *Ari.*, p.28.

²¹⁹ *Ari.*, p.29.

²²⁰ *Ari.*, p.30.

²²¹ *Ari.*, p.43.

²²² *Ari.*, p.45.

²²³ *Ari.*, pp.46-54.

between the churches of Antioch and Alexandria whereby comment relating to the former is used apologetically and controversially in the negative sense and relating to the latter in the positive sense. His purpose in so doing would appear to be apologetic: not with reference to the heresies of the early Church but, by analogy, to the ecclesiastical controversies of his own day. Stephen Thomas argues that:

In *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, for the first time, there appears, clearly enunciated, the analogy between heresy and the forces of Newman's own time which he regarded as enemies of church and Christianity. It is indeed, the political aspect of heresy which he takes for his peroration, pointing to the present significance of the past.²²⁴

Newman himself conceived the task in apocalyptic terms, which certainly suggest that he was quite as 'hot headed' as he had suggested to his sister it was intention to be:

Meanwhile, we may take comfort in reflecting, that, though the present tyranny has more of insult, it has hitherto less of scandal, than attended the ascendancy of Arianism; we may rejoice in the piety, prudence, and varied graces of our Spiritual Rulers; and may rest in the confidence, that, should the hand of Satan press us sore, our Athanasius and Basil will be given us in their desired season, to break the bonds of the Oppressor, and let captives go free.²²⁵

This use of the principle of historical parallel was certainly novel, although it was to become a defining characteristic of Newman's controversial style both before, during and after his conversion to Roman Catholicism – indeed, it will be shown in chapter three that it was instrumental in that conversion. Williams, who has noted that one of the major challenges for Newman in writing *Arians* was the lack of a model in other writers for a work of this kind,²²⁶ suggests that, despite the doctrinally and ecclesiologically conservative agenda in *Arians*, this use of historical parallel is 'a

²²⁴ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.38.

²²⁵ *Ari.*, p.422.

²²⁶ Williams, 'Newman's *Arians*', p.265.

disturbingly radical view of the history of theology'.²²⁷ The purposes to which Newman was to put the use of this principle varied with the occasion and with specific controversial issues. Here, in *Arians*, however, it seems clear that, as Avery Dulles observed, it is used to provide:

...an allegory of the Oxford of Newman's day: the Alexandrians represent the Oxonian Platonists, whom Newman supports; his attacks on Antioch are disguised censures of the rationalists of contemporary Oxford.²²⁸

Taking a similar view, Walgrave has suggested that:

Newman's study of the fathers and of the great heresies and schisms of early Church history gradually presented to his view the ancient church as it really was and positions taken up by both sides in the controversies of the patristic era. He found these ideas, principles and standpoints analogous to those of the disputants of his own day.²²⁹

Having introduced the main theological schools by reference to the *dramatis personae* of the churches at Antioch and Alexandria, Newman then went on to describe the practice of the *disciplina arcani* as exhibited in the catechetical practice of the Alexandrian Church.²³⁰ This practice, that of keeping in reserve the specific doctrinal truths of Christianity prior to the baptism of the neophyte, is justified by Newman by reference to the practice of the early Church not so much as a practice but as a principle. Newman defined this *disciplina arcani* as that 'self restraint and abstinence practised, at least partially, by the primitive church in the publication of the most sacred doctrines of our religion',²³¹ and he identified the practice as arising from the proper use of sacred Scripture as the 'vindication',²³² of the church's teaching. He made reference at this point in the text to the work of Hawkins, referred to in detail above, which he describes

²²⁷ Williams, ed., 'Introduction', in JHN, *The Arians of the Fourth Century, Their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct, Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church, between A.D. 325 and A.D. 381*, (Millennium Edition, Gracewing: Leominster 2001), ('Introduction to *The Arians*'), p.XXI.

²²⁸ Dulles, *Newman*, (Continuum: London, 2002), p.3.

²²⁹ Walgrave, *Newman the Theologian*, p.38.

²³⁰ *Ari.*, pp.55ff.

²³¹ *Ari.*, p.55.

²³² *Ari.*, p.56.

as being ‘the key to a number of difficulties which are apt to perplex the theological student’.²³³ Newman contrasts the proper principle of ‘the Church to teach the truth and then appeal to Scripture in vindication of its own teaching’,²³⁴ with the approach of heretics, and here specifically Arians, as neglecting ‘the information provided for them’ by the teaching of the Church, and then attempting ‘themselves a work to which *they* are unable’, that is ‘the eliciting ... a systematic doctrine from the scattered notices of the truth which Scripture contains’.²³⁵

At the heart of the practice of the *disciplina arcani*, for Newman, was the distinction between exoteric and esoteric teaching in the practice of Christian antiquity. Newman argued that, for the ante-Nicene church, the exoteric practice was one of reserve adopted for apologetic reasons, with the esoteric being revealed in the instruction of those already admitted to the community of the Church of those ‘truths reserved for the baptised Christian’, which ‘were not put forward as the arbitrary determinations of individuals, as the word of man, but rather as an *apostolical legacy*, preserved and dispensed by the Church’.²³⁶ The private interpretation of Scripture was insufficient, and indeed likely to lead into error,²³⁷ for, as he had learned from Hawkins, it is for ‘the Church to teach the truth, and then appeal to Scripture in vindication of the truth’.²³⁸ More specifically, and here upon the authority of Irenaeus, Newman argued that:

... we derive the doctrine of our salvation through none but those who have transmitted to us the gospel, *first preaching it*, then (through God's mercy) delivering it to us in the Scriptures, as a basis and pillar of our faith. Nor dare

²³³ *Ari.*, p.55, n.2.

²³⁴ *Ari.*, p.56.

²³⁵ *Ari.*, p.56.

²³⁶ *Ari.*, p.59.

²³⁷ *Ari.*, p.56.

²³⁸ *Ari.*, p.56. See Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.18, at n.75 supra.

we affirm, that their statements were made previously to their attaining perfect knowledge, as some presume to say, boasting that they amend the apostles.²³⁹

Newman, as a good Churchman, was committed to preserving the notion of the sufficiency of Scripture and, therefore, felt it necessary to write that, in his quoting with approbation the words of Irenaeus, ‘it must not be supposed, that this appeal to tradition in the slightest degree disparages the sovereign authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as a record of the truth’.²⁴⁰ Yet, in a passage that goes rather beyond the view expressed by Hawkins, and beyond a strictly *unauthoritative* tradition, Newman asserted that:

In the passage from Irenaeus above cited, apostolical tradition is brought forward, not to supersede Scripture, but in conjunction with Scripture, to refute the self-authorised arbitrary doctrines of the heretics.²⁴¹

The dogmatic content of this tradition, kept secret by the *disciplina arcani*, was, Newman argued, finally revealed and brought to light, when:

It was authoritatively divulged, and perpetuated in the form of symbols according as the successive innovations of heretics called for its publication. In the creeds of the early Councils, it may be considered as having come to light, and so ended; so that whatever has not been thus authenticated, whether such was prophetic information, ... or comment on the past dispensations, ... is from the circumstances of the case, lost to the church.²⁴²

Here then was a potential hypothesis to account for the difficulty of the apparent change from the teaching of the ante-Nicene church to the developed doctrinal language of the Council of Nicaea itself. It was a hypothesis that attempted to account not just for the apparent change but for the reasons behind such a change. The consequence of the operation of the principle of reserve under the *disciplina arcani* was, Newman suggested, that the vocabulary of theological discourse in the period prior to the

²³⁹ *Ari.*, pp.59f.

²⁴⁰ *Ari.*, p.61.

²⁴¹ *Ari.*, p.61.

²⁴² *Ari.*, pp.61f.

‘coming to light’, that is in the ante-Nicene period , would appear inconsistent, ambiguous and incomplete at least ‘from the standpoint of developed orthodoxy’.²⁴³ Nowhere was this inconsistency, ambiguity and incompleteness more to be found than in the language used in the primitive Church to express its Trinitarian beliefs.

For Newman the reconciliation of Trinitarian language used in the ante-Nicene and post-Nicene church was but a particular example of a general problem, and, in the light of his avowed use of the principle of historical parallelism, it was a question that had implications that went wider than concerns about terminological consistency in the teachings of the primitive Church. The apparent differences between the Church of England in his own age and the primitive Church required of him a resolution: he needed to be able to show that the church of third-century Alexandria and nineteenth-century England were one and the same. His problem was the appearance of radical dissimilarity and discontinuity between the two. In his reading for *Arians* and especially in his encounter with the work of Bishop Bull, Newman was drawn to the rule of faith of the fifth century Gallic monk, St Vincent of Lerins. This rule of faith, the so-called Vincentian Canon, was that the Catholic faith was that ‘*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*’.²⁴⁴ Newman’s understanding of the force and application of the Vincentian Canon was to be tested, as will be seen in the subsequent chapters of this dissertation, in his 1834/5 correspondence with the Abbé Jager, fully developed in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*²⁴⁵, and continued to serve him until, in 1839, it came into conflict with another maxim drawn from the Latin Fathers, this time from St Augustine, which led to Newman’s having to

²⁴³ Williams, ‘Newman’s *Arians*’, p.269.

²⁴⁴ Vincent of Lerins, ‘Commonitorium’, 3.4, in *Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953-), Volume 64, p.149.

²⁴⁵ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, (Rivington: London, 1837), (‘*Lectures on the Prophetical Office*’).

radically reinterpret its meaning. All that was in the future at the time of the publication of *Arians*: in 1833 the direct import of this axiomatic rule of faith for Newman was to underline that the faith of the primitive Church had to be the faith of the Church in every age. Newman saw that the requirement was that the Church of England in the nineteenth century could impose nothing to be believed as necessary for salvation upon its adherents than that which the early Church had prescribed, and the corollary was that the Church of England in the nineteenth century had to prescribe as being necessary for salvation the whole of that faith which bound the early Church: the dogmatic nature of the Christian Faith demanded continuity. With this general question in mind, then, the particular problem for Newman with regard to the evidence he had accumulated in *The Arians* was how to explain the apparently radical discontinuity, at least between the terminology used by the ante-Nicene fathers and the language adopted at Nicaea and in the subsequent councils?

Newman's thinking regarding the pedagogical purpose of the use of the principle of reserve under the *disciplina arcani*, taken together with the operation of the notion of economy, went some way to resolving the difficulty. The principle of economy or, as Newman defined it, the 'accommodation to the feelings and prejudices of the hearer, leading him to the reception of a novel or unacceptable doctrine',²⁴⁶ provided him with sufficient room to accommodate the theological imprecision of the ante-Nicene language to the later expression of orthodoxy. Nevertheless a strict application of the principle of economy would also suggest that the person making use of it had 'knowledge possessed but not fully communicated'²⁴⁷ of the doctrine as it later came to be fully expressed, in this case by the Council of Nicaea. The language

²⁴⁶ *Ari.*, p.79.

²⁴⁷ Williams, 'Newman's *Arians*', p.271.

used by, for example, the ante-Nicene father Cyril of Alexandria regarding the substance of God is specifically rejected by the Council and the use of the language adopted by the Council had been specifically rejected by Cyril.²⁴⁸ The clear import of this, for Newman, was that, far from possessing the full Nicene faith, kept in reserve for the purposes of economy, under the rule of the *disciplina arcani*, what was under consideration was a discontinuity in the explicit doctrinal content of belief.

Newman could see further examples of this apparent discontinuity in the various terms used to describe the relationship of the Son to the Father – and indeed, the very use of the term ‘Son’ at all. The rationalisation that Newman offers draws its methodology from the very apologetic and controversial nature of his own work. He proposed that it was not for pedagogical reasons that the principle of economy was used to express doctrines fully conceptually understood but that the systematisation of doctrine itself arises because of apologetic or controversial reasons. As Newman himself wrote: ‘False doctrine forces us to analyse our own positions in order to exclude it.’²⁴⁹ That is to say that the formal expression in dogmatic form of the Christian faith came about, and indeed continued to come about, specifically to counter the emergence of heresy. Williams describes Newman’s understanding of the process thus

... each formulation, even the hallowed word “Son” for the Second Person, and each figure of Scripture is in itself inadequate and calls for some counterbalancing concept or image. Until crises arise, systematization is unnecessary.²⁵⁰

Newman, at this point, understood the process as being one in which, to counter error, the terms used to describe the mysteries of faith have to be refined to create a technical theological language which comes to replace or supersede the broader, less

²⁴⁸ *Ari.*, pp.201ff.

²⁴⁹ *Ari.*, p.180.

²⁵⁰ Williams, ‘Newman’s *Arians*’, p.269.

specific vocabulary of an earlier age. He contended that the process worked thus:

‘There are two characteristics of opinions subjected to this intellectual scrutiny; first, they are *variously* expressed during the process; secondly, they are expressed *technically*, at the end of it’.²⁵¹

The operation of this process allowed Newman to close his survey of the Catholic theology of the ante-Nicene period with an examination of the language used by five ante-Nicenes: Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, Hippolytus and Novatian. His very use of the expression ‘Catholic doctrine’ is itself notable, since the more usual term at the time was to speak of ‘Orthodox doctrine’.²⁵² He concedes that a superficial reading of their works, by reference to the vocabulary of post-Nicene orthodoxy, might make their language suspect of that heresy which was Arian doctrine but that, far from being heretical, ‘the orthodoxy of the five writers in question, is ascertained by a careful examination of the passages from which the accusation has been brought against them’.²⁵³ The very process of the refinement of terms and the adoption of technical vocabulary meant that it was anachronistic to attempt to judge the use of terms in an earlier age by the standards of a later. It allowed Newman the conclusion that whilst the ante-Nicene divines might not have recognised the full expression of Trinitarian orthodoxy in the symbol of Nicaea as, at once, identical with their own beliefs, their expressions of Trinitarian faith and the expressions of Trinitarian faith of the Council of Nicaea were at least compatible one with the other.

²⁵¹ *Ari.*, p.197

²⁵² Newman uses the term ‘Catholic doctrine’ four times in his survey of ante-nicene theology and even closes the section of the chapter with the statement: ‘And thus closes our survey of Catholic Ante-Nicene theology.’, *Ari.*, p.218. See also *Ari.*, pp.197, 207 and 212.

²⁵³ *Ari.*, p.216.

As has been already noted above, Archdeacon Lyall had very serious misgivings about the implications of the account that Newman had given. His views, expressed to Rose in the letter that Rose sent on to Newman, are candid and repay citing at length:

The present system of Orthodox Christianity is grounded upon Scripture under the sanction and continued authority which is furnished by *Tradition*, of which the Councils are the authentic organs – The question is, what is the proper province and the true value of *human authority* in the matter of Divine Revelation? Now, in no way could this question I think be so well handled, as in a general history of the principal councils accompanied with critical remarks upon their proceedings, showing when they had *outstepped* their proper office, and when their authority was *binding* – Of course the *constitution* of the councils, the *manner* in which they conducted their deliberation etc would have formed part of such a work, and the different views taken of the matter by the Churches of England and of Rome, would have afforded ample subjects of illustration – I am here only briefly stating what my own conception would have been of the History of the Councils – if Mr Newman's work shall be published in the *Theological Library*, there are several parts that will require consideration – particularly in those places where he speaks of the *disciplina arcani* – I do not pretend to make my opinion the rule – but Mr Newman's notions about tradition appear to me directly adverse to that which Protestant writers of our own church have contended for – according to them a “secret tradition” is no tradition at all – quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, is the very definition of authentic tradition. Mr Newman's views seem to me more favourable to the Romanist writers, than I should like to put forward in the *Theological Library* – There are also several other passages and expressions which made by [sic]²⁵⁴ hyperorthodox nerves *wince* – a little – and which we must talk about hereafter if Mr Newman's book is published with *our names* appended.²⁵⁵

Although he attempted to defend himself, in a letter to Newman two weeks later, claiming that he had ‘only hazarded an opinion; I did not deliver judgement’,²⁵⁶ what Lyall appears to have recognized is that this is not traditional Anglican theology. In particular, he had recognised that Newman's use of the Fathers differed in many respects from the way in which they had traditionally been used by Anglican Divines.

Anglican scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were rightly revered for their work on the Fathers, yet the use to which patristic writings had been

²⁵⁴ The text says ‘by’ but the sense demands ‘my’.

²⁵⁵ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in *LD* iii, p.105.

²⁵⁶ Archdeacon Lyall to JHN, 3 November 1832, in *LD* iii, p.112.

put in the Church of England, like the theological place of tradition itself, had long been ambiguous. As Quantain demonstrates, the shifting the ground of the disputes about doctrine during the forging of a distinctly Anglican theology in these centuries, had led to an attempt by churchmen to the claim that the consensus of the Fathers was the sure mark of orthodoxy, that such a consensus could be established and that it was a consensus that, conveniently, supported the Anglican view.²⁵⁷ Newman's approach to patristic sources – and the extent to which it was distinctive – will be analysed in greater detail when his contribution to the *Tracts* is considered in the next chapter. For the present purposes it is sufficient to note that Lyall had foreseen that Newman's approach, that of taking the Fathers on their own terms, was perilous. In his suggestion that Newman's view was 'favourable to the Romanist' he was looking beyond the text of *Arians*, to a notion of tradition: not to the unauthoritative tradition of Hawkins' sermon, of the 'Protestant writers of our own church', of Anglicanism, but to the authoritative Tradition as proclaimed by Rome. He had seen what Newman had not: that Newman's reading of the Fathers would need to find a solution to lack of a univocal patristic doctrinal witness which would need more than the Vincentian Canon could supply.

Despite the clarity of the 3 November letter, Lyall was concerned that he had not properly explained his reservations to Newman and, on 9 November 1832, again wrote to Newman further to acquit himself of having charged him with unorthodox positions. It too bears quoting at length:

If I used the word orthodox, it must have been in that improper sense in which a Protestant, or Church of England divine is used to say...I differ almost as widely from the generally received estimate which Protestant writers have made of the

²⁵⁷ Jean-Louis Quantain, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), ('*The CofE and Antiquity*'), pp.5f.

value of Patristical testimony, and of tradition in general, as I do from the views entertained by Romanists – it seems to me, that my own views do not very widely differ from yours on those points – But then my duty as editor is not to sanction my own views, but only those of Protestant churches – to which I think your views of tradition somewhat opposed – indeed I have not been accustomed to consider any tradition has a value, under the conditions implied in your discussion of the *disciplina arcana*... if it were true that the ante-Nicene fathers had not spoken strongly and openly and frequently about these doctrines, it would be difficult not to believe that they had not interpreted Scripture as we do – a supposition that would be almost fatal to the doctrines as it seems to me.²⁵⁸

Lyall had other objections to Newman's work, for example to his having ascribed value to 'the dispensation of Paganism',²⁵⁹ even if on the eminently sound patristic authority of St Clement of Alexandria, but his principal problem with the text was that it implied a change in doctrine against which even the Vincentian Canon itself was not proof. He had identified a trend which he thought sufficiently dangerous for him to want to dissociate himself from the work. To quote Williams, what Lyall had seen was this:

Once grant that not everything is openly professed by ante-Nicene writers, even if the substance of what is believed is the same as that of the Nicene faith, and the appeal to a unanimous voice of the "undivided Church" is significantly weakened: ... Lyall, in short, has correctly seen the spectre of the *Essay on Development* behind Newman's tortuous and sometimes confused pages on the *disciplina arcana*.²⁶⁰

This argument, whilst persuasive and, in many ways, seeming to be the obvious conclusion to be drawn from Lyall's remarks, is not without its critics. Pereiro, for example, holds that such analyses of the Newman of *Arians* are fundamentally anachronistic. He argues that Newman's awareness of development at this early date should be understood strictly according to the rule that true doctrine is fixed and does not develop, whereas heresy is precisely what does arise when the moral flaws of

²⁵⁸ Archdeacon Lyall to JHN, 9 November 1832, in *LD* iii, p.113.

²⁵⁹ *Ari.*, p.89, where Newman is quoting St Clement of Alexandria. Newman had first used the expression in the second University Sermon, preached on 13 April 1830: *USS* ii, p.21.

²⁶⁰ Williams, 'Newman's *Arians*', p.273.

individuals lead them to attempt to go beyond the deposit of faith. He argues that the work on *Arians* and his studies of other early Christian heresies had led Newman to a view that ‘heresy was the mature and natural fruit of an *ethos* characterized by intellectual pride, worldliness, or other moral deficiencies; within heresy, different ethical characters generated different types of error’.²⁶¹ Defining development as ‘the progressive and necessary unfolding of a principle, a concept, or an idea into its proper corollaries’, Pereiro further argues that it was not until much later that Newman countenanced even the possibility of ‘doctrinal development in orthodoxy’²⁶². The role of the *disciplina arcani* in this synthesis is that of place-holder: Newman had not yet come to the point where he could accept that the Church had a binding authority to pronounce on tradition or the meaning of scripture. The *disciplina arcani* may be, at least in the absence of any other available alternative, used as an hypothesis that appears to account for change without having to accept development understood in the terms outlined by Pereiro.

Although recognising that the method Newman employed in *Arians* to give an account of the development of heresy ‘resembled his later theory of development’²⁶³, Pereiro suggests that the close personal engagement of Newman with Blanco White’s personal religious trajectory – from Roman Catholicism to Unitarianism by way of the intellectual Anglicanism of the Oriel Common Room – reinforced the view that it was always heresy that resulted from development not orthodoxy. White’s religious history had indeed made a profound impression on Newman and proved to him just ‘how persuasive liberal heresy can be’.²⁶⁴ Newman shared with Keble a profound dislike of

²⁶¹ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.130.

²⁶² Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.132.

²⁶³ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.131.

²⁶⁴ Hammond, ‘Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy’, p.61.

what they both called ‘paper logic’, not least because they both believed it to lead to overly systematised theology. The Newman of the 1830s, Pereiro contends, rejected this approach because he saw it as grounded in the moral deficiency of pride – exhibited for him in the contemporary example of Blanco White – whereby what was involved was ‘an effort on the part of the human mind to impose its law on revealed truths’.²⁶⁵ It was as accurate an assessment of fourth-century error as it was of nineteenth and the parallel, dangerous as it was, was lost no more on Newman²⁶⁶ than it had been on Archdeacon Lyall.

Pereiro’s argument is both cogent and coherent but fails to take account of the evidence adduced above for the explicit awareness of doctrinal development, orthodox and otherwise, in Newman’s writing in the 1820s. He is, however, surely correct to point to the force of Newman’s conviction that the moral dimension of an individual has a direct influence on how that person will approach the truths of revelation. The evidence would seem to support an ambiguity towards doctrinal development in Newman’s work at the time of writing *Arians*, rather than a clear rejection of orthodox development. In *Arians*, Newman had noted how, in Scripture, ‘(n)o prophet ends his subject: his brethren after him renew, enlarge, transfigure or reconstruct it’.²⁶⁷ This process, he suggested, takes place because of the action of the, albeit divinely inspired, human mind engaging in the natural contemplation of religious truth. Williams sees that this represented a wider awareness of development by Newman, wider certainly than Pereiro will allow, suggesting that, if by development, is meant ‘adumbrating greater truths under the image of lesser, implying the consequence or the basis of

²⁶⁵ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.133.

²⁶⁶ *Ari.*, pp.103f.

²⁶⁷ *Ari.*, p.64.

doctrines in their correlatives',²⁶⁸ then it is nothing more or less than 'the operation of a general principle of our nature'.²⁶⁹ This view supports Newman's own recollection in the *Apologia* of his position, where he, almost wistfully, recalled his preference in the late 1820s for ante-Nicene positions over what he then thought to be the 'unnecessarily scientific' ones of the period after that council.²⁷⁰ As Williams puts it, for Newman at the time of writing *Arians*, 'the advance of dogma is something almost tragic, a poignant ideological puberty', wherein, through:

... the novel and risky business of refining terms, excluding or qualifying what was once acceptable, even baptizing, by clarification, what was once suspect (as with the 'ομοούσιον' itself) we move towards the 'technical' language, superseding the innocent variety of earlier days.²⁷¹

Newman's complete manifesto for this position is to be found early in *Arians*:

If I avow my belief, that freedom from symbols and articles, is abstractedly the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the primitive Church, it is not from any tenderness towards that proud impatience of control in which many exult, as in a virtue: but first, because technicality and formalism are, in their degree, inevitable results of public confessions of faith; and next, because when confessions do not exist, the mysteries of divine truth, instead of being exposed to the gaze of the profane and uninstructed, are kept hidden in the bosom of the Church far more faithfully than is otherwise possible.²⁷²

Tragically poignant or not, it is, nonetheless, still the advance of dogma: it is still development. It might only be:

... a *Verfallstheorie* of dogmatic language, the notion of formulation itself being a kind of betrayal of some richer truth; but it is a necessary fall, a *felix culpa*, given that the Church lives in a history of change, contingency, and human sinfulness, and that the Gospel must be preached in a variety of contexts.²⁷³

The flaw in Pereiro's argument stems from a confusion between Newman's rhetorical strategy, accurately outlined by Hammond, and the purpose to which that

²⁶⁸ *Ari.*, p.62.

²⁶⁹ *Ari.*, p.63.

²⁷⁰ *Apo.*, p.71.

²⁷¹ Williams, *Newman's Arians*, p.270.

²⁷² *Ari.*, p.41.

²⁷³ Williams, *Newman's Arians*, p.270.

strategy was deployed. It is true that Newman had not, by the date of the completion of the manuscript of *Arians* in July 1832, got to a fully worked out notion of the development of doctrine but he could no longer hold that only heterodoxy could develop and he was certainly not describing a process of development that could only take a heterodox turn, when he wrote about the doctrine of the Trinity that:

There will, of course, be differences of opinion in deciding how much of the ecclesiastical doctrine as above described, was derived from direct Apostolical Tradition, and how much was the result of intuitive spiritual perception in scripturally-informed and deeply religious minds.²⁷⁴

Those who are ‘scripturally-informed and deeply religious’ are manifestly not, for Newman, the heretics; they are not those who are marked by the *ethos* identified by Pereiro as characterized by intellectual pride, worldliness, or other moral deficiencies. They are, instead, those who are engaged in a process which might, at this point, only be concerned with the development of the language used to express that faith *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*, rather than to the development of doctrine understood as the development of the conceptual understanding of the data of revelation and contained in doctrinal formulae. Nevertheless, Williams is surely correct when he writes that, for Newman at this time, ‘a crack has been opened in the confident assertion that doctrine does not change, even if only in the recognition that its idiom changes’.²⁷⁵ It is – its limited scope admitted – the beginning of an understanding of a genuine process of development: that is of development as a process that, as already been seen, he defines of ‘the progressive and necessary unfolding of a principle, a concept, or an idea into its proper corollaries’.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁴ *Ari.*, p.195.

²⁷⁵ Williams, *Newman's Arians*, p.270.

²⁷⁶ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.132

When *Arians* went to press, on the eve of the beginning of what became the Oxford Movement, Newman was certainly explicitly conscious of change in doctrinal expression. He saw that this presented a difficulty in his search for continuity in that ‘definite creed’ which he had received into his intellect as ‘impressions of dogma’ and which, he recalled, ‘through God’s mercy, have never been effaced or obscured’.²⁷⁷ He thought, however, that he had a hypothesis that would account for this difficulty in terminological development protected by the *disciplina arcani* and the rule of faith of the Vincentian Canon. Events would prove that the hypothesis could provide but a limited answer.

²⁷⁷ *Apo.*, p58.

Chapter 2

Antiquity, the *Via Media* and a Catholicism of the Word – 1833-8

The events that led to the Oxford Movement are at once a matter of record and also hotly contested. Distant causes, that place it within the conservative reaction to the French Revolution of 1789 and the collapse of the Holy Alliance in the period immediately prior to the European revolutions of 1830,¹ and proximate causes, such as the Peel election in Oxford following Catholic Emancipation² and the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Act,³ can all claim some part in its genesis. So too can the individuals involved, the principal ones, at least, having been blessed with what are, by any standards, a combination of extraordinary intellectual, personal and spiritual gifts that made them a prime example of Hall's epithet, '*Stupor mundi Clerus Britannicus*'.⁴ The extent to which this event or that person influenced the particularities of what came to be called the Oxford Movement is an area of debate that is coloured as much by churchmanship, historiographical assumptions and ecclesiastico-political positions as it is by any other considerations. As Peter Nockles has argued:

For a period, it was simply the need for all conservative forces in Church and State to unite in the face of what seemed then like a common enemy, that helps explain the wide appeal of the Movement at Oxford.⁵

¹ Palmer of Worcester, writing only ten years after the beginning of the Oxford Movement, located the impetus for action precisely in '[t]he first sound of the tocsin of revolution at Paris in 1830'. William Palmer, W., *A Narrative of Events Connected with the Publication of the Tracts*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1843), p.97. See also Aston, N., *Christianity and Revolutionary Europe. c. 1750-1830*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), chapter 8, pp.297-332. Cf. Clark, J.C.D., *English Society: 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure, and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, second edition, 2000), p.418, where concisely he describes the state of flux thus: 'Hereditary rule, primogeniture and religion were [had been] society's organising principles. ... What had changed was that, relatively suddenly, a particular description of a social nexus had been unseated from its intellectual and constitutional hegemony.' See also pp.527-547.

² Particularly the Catholic Relief Act, 1829. 10 Geo. IV, ch.7.

³ Church Temporalities (Ireland) Act, 1833. 3 and 4 Will. IV, ch.37.

⁴ Joseph Hall, 'Bishop Hall's Latin Theology, with Translations', in *The Works of Bishop Hall*, 12 vols., (Oxford: Talboys, 1839), here vol. xi, p.16.

⁵ Nockles, 'Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops', pp.31f.

This highly contested area falls outside the scope of this work, but what falls firmly within it is the part that the beginnings of the Oxford Movement had upon Newman's search for a lasting hypothesis to account for continuity of doctrine in the face of apparent change, of the need for which, as the previous chapter has shown, he was aware by 1832.

The first hypothesis that Newman had proposed – that of terminological development protected by the twin sentinels of the *disciplina arcani* and the Vincentian Canon – had come under serious attack even before *Arians* was published. The Vincentian Canon was uncontroversial enough but the notion of the *disciplina arcani* and the use to which Newman had put it in *Arians* was not. The criticisms which were made of his approach undermined his confidence in the first hypothesis and heavily influenced his search for a replacement. This chapter will, therefore, look first at the critical assault on the *disciplina arcani* and the undermining of Newman's first proposed solution to his 'difficulty', before moving on to a consideration of the effect that his involvement in the early period of the Oxford Movement had on his development of a replacement hypothesis.

That the Oxford Movement had a profound impact on Newman's theological trajectory cannot be denied, neither can the reciprocal effect of Newman's theological trajectory on the growth and course of the movement: he was an integral part of its early years and it of him. Over the course of this chapter, this complex interaction will be considered in connection with the published product of Newman's engagement with the Oxford Movement, primarily in the *Tracts for the Times*, the correspondence with Abbé Jager, and the *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church*. What will emerge

from this analysis is the outline of a hypothesis which Newman believed could provide him with precisely the adequate guarantee of continuity in the face of change that he sought. It was to be found in what has been called a ‘Catholicism of the Word’,⁶ located within the Church of England, taking its Vincentian stronghold in antiquity and understood as the *via media* between Protestant error and Roman corruption.

I. The Assault on the *Disciplina Arcani*

Even before publication, the use to which Newman had put the idea of the *disciplina arcana* in *Arians* had come in for criticism. Reference has already been made in the previous chapter to Archdeacon Lyall’s criticisms and his suggestion that Newman was going well beyond a position conformable with ‘that which Protestant writers of our church have contended for’.⁷ Despite its ‘strikingly intense rhetoric of initiation, revealed-but-concealed mystery, the holy community guarding its integrity against a hostile world’,⁸ Newman’s use of the *disciplina arcana* could command little support even amongst those within the Church of England whose views were, in other matters closest to his own. Despite calling *Arians* ‘the book of a scholar’, a cause for ‘rejoicing’ and a ‘volume ... earnestly and warmly recommended’, Rose could not but take exception to Newman’s position when he reviewed the work for the *British Magazine*:

the only considerable point on which he [i.e. the reviewer – Rose] differs from Mr. N. [i.e. Newman] is, on *Disciplina Arcani*. He cannot bring himself to

⁶ This expression is taken from Chapman, M., ‘A Catholicism of the Word and a Catholicism of Devotion: Pusey, Newman and the first Eirenicon’, in *Zeitschrift für neue Theologieggeschichte/Journal for the History of Modern Theology*, 14 (2007), pp.167-190. He uses it to describe the largely text-based and text-bound religion, initially shared by Newman and Pusey, which the former abandoned in the late 1830s but to which the latter remained attached. The idea is further explored in his ‘Temporal and Spatial Catholicism: Tensions in Historicism in the Oxford Movement’, in Dickinson, C., ed., *The Shaping of Tradition: Context and Normativity*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), pp.17-26.

⁷ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in *LD* iii, p.105.

⁸ Rowan Williams, ‘Introduction to *The Arians*’, p.xxxiv.

think that it was so early, or so widely extensive as Mr. N. does; nor can he think that the authorities to which Mr. N. refers bear him out. They all appear to refer to the 3rd or 4th centuries, and not to the practice of the primitive church.⁹

Newman was grateful for the review – ‘your praise of me has quite overcome me’¹⁰ – but he was also conscious of the reviewer’s criticism. In a passage that hints at the two-fold system of doctrine he would develop in the coming years, here ‘Catholic Verities’ and ‘Theological Verities’ standing duty for what would later become the ‘Apostolical or Episcopal Tradition’ and the ‘Prophetical Tradition’, Newman reaffirms his position:

I find you still discontented with my *Disciplina Arcani*. I had altered it a good deal since you saw it in MS. Indeed re-written it. The whole of that chapter (which I doubt not will get me into trouble) was written at least four times. – I have no reluctance to confess I have made a mistake in what is not one of the ‘Catholic Verities’ – Do you not think the Roman Catholic distinction between them and the ‘Theological Doctrines’ a most useful one? Thus one can symbolize with the Evangelicals. There is no reason one should be ashamed at changing any Theological Doctrine for one’s certainty of them is indefinitely below that which we have of the Catholic Verities – Yet I do not see why I should change. Why is poor Clement not a witness of a *Disciplina Arcani*? in spite of Mosheims[sic.] attempt to give a different direction to his words?¹¹

He was not to have to wait long for the detailed and, having regard to his own sensibilities, perhaps most significantly, episcopally-provided answer to his question.

John Kaye had been appointed Bishop of Bristol in 1820. He held the see in plurality with his mastership of Christ’s College, Cambridge (to which he had been appointed in 1814 when aged only 30) and the Regius chair of Divinity in the same University, to which he had been elected unopposed in 1816. He was translated to Lincoln in 1827, giving up the professorship and, eventually, the mastership. Kaye’s

⁹ Notices and Reviews: The Arians of the Fourth century, their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct’, in *British Magazine*, 5 (1834), pp.67f. Rose was the editor, together with Samuel Roffey Maitland, and Newman’s letter to him of 1 January 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.155ff, here at p.156, presupposes that Rose was the author of the review.

¹⁰ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 1 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.156.

¹¹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 1 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.159.

patristic scholarship has been credited with ‘fostering the general revival in patristic studies which helped incubate Tractarianism’¹², although, as will be shown later in this chapter, that there was a revival implies that patristic scholarship was previously moribund, a contention which is far from obvious. Fittingly for an appointment made on the advice of the Tory Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, once a bishop he quickly aligned himself with the largely Tory high-church Hackney Phalanx.¹³

In 1826 Kaye, in a consideration of Tertullian’s suspicions, had already expressed his view of the *disciplina arcani*. He outlined a position that stood firmly within the Anglican and specifically high church consensus:

Having already delivered our opinion respecting the mischievous consequences which have arisen to the Church from the countenance lent by the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus to the notion of the *Disciplina Arcani* – we shall now only express our regret that Protestant divines, in their eagerness to establish a favourite point, should sometimes have been induced to resort to it.¹⁴

For him, as for Lyall, the appeal to a secret tradition was an appeal to no tradition at all, therefore, when Rose sent him the text of *The Arians* before publication, Kaye returned in detail to a critique of the notion itself and to the particular use Newman had sought to put the *disciplina arcani*.¹⁵ Part of Kaye’s criticism was that Newman had misread Clement and hence misrepresented him. In fact, Newman’s approach to translation may have contributed to this difficulty. Writing to Rose, on 3 January 1834, about an accompanying manuscript of the fifth volume of *Church of the Fathers*, Newman had

¹² John Kaye, Bishop of Lincoln (1783-1853), in *DNB Online* at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/15200>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

¹³ The term ‘Hackney Phalanx’ was first used by Dr Williams Hales, the Rector of Killesandra, Ireland ‘to describe the motley group of London High Churchmen who entertained him on visits to the capital’. Edward Churton, *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, 2 vols., (London: 1861), vol. I, p.97, cited in Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.14 at n.50. The term came to describe pre-Tractarian High Churchmen who were ‘in the years immediately prior to 1828...in the political ascendancy and in effective control of ecclesiastical patronage’. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.64.

¹⁴ John Kaye, *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian*, (Cambridge: J. Deighton and Son, 1826), p.251.

¹⁵ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose, 19 October 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.104f.

admitted to ‘*translations*’ that were ‘not over exactly literal – i.e. word for word critically’, to which he defensively added: ‘The meaning is always his [i.e. in this case Basil’s], as near as I could give it.’¹⁶ In the context of the genre of *Church of the Fathers* this mattered little. These works were intended to offer to the less scholarly reader a selection of translations of patristic writings to create and support the ethos that Newman and his fellow Tractarians thought an absolutely necessary substrate for a proper appreciation and reception of their controversial writings.¹⁷ Translation by strict construction was less important in these works than an approach that might now be called ‘dynamic equivalence’, where the sense of the text is of more concern than terminological or idiomatic fidelity. This freedom with the text, which Kaye had suggested was responsible for Newman’s misdirection about the *disciplina arcana* in Clement, was perhaps a manifestation of a tendency that Rowan Williams identifies in his introduction to the Birmingham Oratory Millenium Edition of *The Arians*: ‘Newman’s own perspectives and proposals are often flawed by a colossally over-schematic treatment and carelessness in detail.’¹⁸

Newman’s response to Kaye was to make initial notes which he then worked up into a memorandum, clearly intended to form part of a reply.¹⁹ The memorandum has a ‘degree of defensive awkwardness’²⁰ which suggests that Kaye’s criticisms had rattled Newman:

If I have any where implied that the *Disciplina* was a strict *rule* I am sorry – I *meant* it rather as a principle and feeling, to be observed, as *far as possible* in *all*

¹⁶ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 3 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.162.

¹⁷ For a consideration of the genre and its effect, see Tennyson, G.B., *Victorian Devotional Poetry: The Tractarian Mode*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981). The most popular work of this kind, published well before the Movement began was John Keble’s *The Christian Year* (London: C and J Rivington, 1827), which had, by 1834, seen twelve editions and was to remain in print for the remainder of the nineteenth century.

¹⁸ Rowan Williams, ‘Introduction to *The Arians*’, p.xxxvi.

¹⁹ Tuesday 7 July 1834, in *LD* iv, p.169, n.1.

²⁰ Williams, ‘Newman’s *Arians*’, p.274.

ages. This I have implied in my remarks on the Evangelists – and I have expressly said so, but cut it out at a friend’s demurring. My notion is that it was *no* strict rule. Had any heathen asked the Apostles, “*What* do you believe about a Trinity?” they would have told – only they did not put it forward – They used their *discretion*. This *first* secrecy was at an end by AD 180 (say) – i.e. the Christian doctrine had gone into the stock of public knowledge as far as the grand outlines were conceived...I grant that the 4th Cent. Fathers systematized about the Arcanum far beyond the Primitive Church.²¹

Benjamin King, in his *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, remarks that there is no evidence of Newman sending Kaye the memorandum and suggests that, even had he done so, it would not have ‘satisfied’ his critic.²² Indeed these notes appear only to have satisfied Newman himself by the use of a device he attempted to construct: suggesting that Kaye’s criticisms were not of his doctrine but merely of his history. Henry Wilberforce had also heard of the attack and wrote to Newman of the criticism in a letter that does not appear to have survived.²³ In his response to Wilberforce, Newman attempted to justify himself by resort to the distinction between the history and the theology:

As to the *Disciplina [arcani]*, Rose objects to my *history* not my doctrine. He says I begin it too soon. So does the Bishop of Lincoln in some notes Rose has sent me from him – indeed he thinks (of course – for, writing for the Theological Library I could not give my authorities) I have made a ‘confusion’ – have not read the books etc etc – Now I have grounds, whether good or bad – and do not mean to knock under. I have begun by being too candid to the Provost and James – what a goose I was! – and they have so taken it, that I will cut candour in future all my life – I have studied the Bishop’s ground before I published, and will give my views, should the book come to a second edition.²⁴

In letter to John Frederic Christie, on 14 January 1834, Newman had already resorted to this defence when he referred to Kaye’s remarks as having:

²¹ JHN, ‘Memorandum of 11 January 1834’, in *LD* iv, p.169, n.1.

²² King, B., *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers: Shaping Doctrine in Nineteenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), (‘*Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*’), p.133.

²³ The letter is to be found in none of the collection of letters from Henry Wilberforce cited in the *DNB*. JHN’s diary for 20 January 1834 records ‘while at Derby I had letters from H.W...’ See MONDAY 20 JANUARY 1834, in *LD* iv, p.178. That the letter referred to Kaye’s criticism can be inferred from JHN’s response, JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 17 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.177.

²⁴ JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 17 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.177.

...been flooring part of my book – viz. the *historical* part of the *Disciplina*. I have got my grounds, though I have not published them – so I suppose if the book comes to a second edition, it will be much larger. So many subjects are touched on in it, it was impossible to give my reasons in a work *intended for* the Theological Library – so I expect to be thought ignorant on points, which I have examined and (rightly or wrongly) decided on.²⁵

Newman was, knowingly or not, thoroughly misrepresenting the Bishop of Lincoln's position, for Kaye objected both to the history and to the theology. In his *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, Kaye expanded upon the criticisms he had offered in his notes to Rose.²⁶ He argued that Newman had incorrectly projected back the uncontested fourth-century evidence of the *disciplina arcana* into the ante-Nicene period and, second, that Newman had conflated this post-Nicene understanding of the *disciplina arcana* with Clement of Alexandria's 'Esoteric system'.²⁷ Kaye had little enough time for Clement's notion, dismissing it as being 'destitute of solid foundation'²⁸, but even such a flawed notion could not, he argued, be identified with the later methodology, as Newman had done in *The Arians*. Furthermore, he contended that Newman's argument risked the 'Romish' error of requiring the present day believer to believe 'as necessary to salvation' doctrines about which there was a 'total silence' in 'the first ages of Christianity'.²⁹ Finally, he was not even prepared to accept the accuracy of Newman's account of Clement. Newman's coupling of the *disciplina arcana* with the principle of economy, the former as the ethos underpinning the operation of the latter, rested on Clement and Kaye explicitly rejected

²⁵ JHN to John Frederic Christie, 14 January 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.174f.

²⁶ John Kaye, *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1835), ('*Clement of Alexandria*').

²⁷ Kaye, *Clement of Alexandria*, p.368.

²⁸ Kaye, *Clement of Alexandria*, p.368.

²⁹ Kaye, *Clement of Alexandria*, p.367.

the connection: ‘The authority of Clement has been quoted in support of a mode of interpretation *κατ’ οἰκονομίαν*, but in my opinion, erroneously.’³⁰

Newman was always particularly sensitive to episcopal criticism, as will be seen in the next chapter when the responses to a number of the *Tracts for the Times*, and especially Tract 90, will be considered. It is no surprise, therefore, that his various defences of the *disciplina arcani* were careful to attempt to answer Kaye’s criticisms. In a letter to Thomas Falconer at the beginning of the controversy, Newman unsurprisingly uses the same language as he had used in his note of 10 and 11 January, claiming that the *disciplina arcani* existed ‘rather as a feeling and principle than as a rule in the early Church’ and ‘the existence in cent. 4 [as] evidence of the existence of the *principle* in the first’.³¹ He was similarly confident of his grounds when he wrote to Keble in February 1834 that:

I have been looking at Faber's Apostolicity of Trinitarianism - and he so entirely agrees with me about the Disciplina Arcani that I am quite easy as to my Lord of Lincoln's strictures.³²

The claim that Faber, a ‘moderate Evangelical’³³ and therefore free of any suggestion of ‘Romish’ tendencies, ‘entirely agrees with me’ was to overstate the case. Faber certainly held that there were those in the ante-Nicene Church to whom the fullness of the Church’s doctrine had been taught and others ‘who were as yet instructed only in the shadow of the Word’³⁴, but he nowhere claimed quite as much for the *disciplina arcani* as did Newman in *The Arians*. In suggesting that those ‘in the shadow of the

³⁰ Kaye, *Clement of Alexandria*, p.397.

³¹ JHN to Thomas Falconer, 27 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.180. This letter was never, in fact, sent.

³² JHN to John Keble, 9 February 1834, in *LD* iv, p.190.

³³ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, p.132. George Stanley Faber (1773-1854). His ‘brand of Anglicanism was strongly evangelical, and he stressed the protestant doctrines of the necessity of conversion, justification by faith, and the sole authority of scripture as the rule of faith’, see *DNB Online* at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/9051>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

³⁴ Faber, G.S., *The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*, 2 vols., (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1832), vol. 2, p.43.

Word' were gradually 'made acquainted with the true Word in the opened heaven',³⁵ Faber was going nowhere near as far as Newman, for whom the move towards a technical, non-scriptural language is identified as an inevitable, almost necessary corollary of the gradual unshielding of teachings previously protected from view by the *disciplina arcana*.³⁶ Faber, although distinctly not of the same party within the Church of England as Lyall, Rose or Kaye, was still keen to maintain 'the classical Anglican apologetic' of an appeal to the belief of the undivided Church, which Rowan Williams argues, Newman in *The Arians*, 'is undermining'.³⁷

The unsent letter to Falconer contained a sentence which is remarkable for the completeness of the conception of development that it contains, given the date of its composition. Newman, when speaking of the relationship between the *disciplina arcana* and the principle of reserve, wrote:

This is the case with the greater part of the theological and ecclesiastical system, which is implicitly contained in the writings and acts of the Apostles, but was developed at various times according to circumstances. I should in a certain sense say this was true of the doctrine of the Trinity – and of the Incarnation as opposed to Nestorianism...Our Creeds, our Liturgies, our canons are for the most part developed and determined by a definite period after the time of the Apostles...³⁸

This clear statement by Newman of the observable fact of the development of doctrine lacked a description of the method by which the development takes place, although the remarks about the Incarnation and Nestorianism hinted at the relationship between development and the need to combat heresy of which Newman would later make much. Neither did it contain any suggestion of when the 'definite period' would come to an end. Nevertheless, the language adopted by Newman is strikingly similar to that

³⁵ Faber, *The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*, vol. 2, p.43.

³⁶ *Ari.*, p.197.

³⁷ Williams, 'Newman's *Arians*', p.276.

³⁸ JHN to Thomas Falconer, 27 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.180.

adopted in his final University Sermon, in the *Essay on Development* and even in the *Apologia*. This is not the theory of development in its finally worked out form but it is very early evidence that, as Selby has argued, ‘a direct link may be traced between the theory of development and the principle of reserve’,³⁹ and it seems to confirm Newman’s claims in letters to his sister Jemima⁴⁰ and to Mrs William Froude⁴¹ that he had held to some notion of doctrinal development since 1831 or so.

In his extensive and painstaking examination of the papers of S.F.Wood, Pereiro dismisses Selby’s assertion and argues that Newman’s rejection of Wood’s ideas about development are *prima facie* evidence that ‘[t]he evidence against Newman having held a theory of development before 1840 is compelling’.⁴² In taking this position, he agrees with Chadwick, who – in the light of the unsent letter to Falconer – incorrectly refers to the final University Sermon as Newman’s ‘first utterance upon the subject’ of development.⁴³ Pereiro further prays in aid Newman’s own stance in the correspondence with the Abbé Jager and in his *Lectures on the Prophetic Office* to contend that ‘it is therefore unlikely that he [Newman] would have professed in 1834 what he would so emphatically deny some months later’.⁴⁴ These rejections and denials of particular presentations of development by Newman, to which this chapter will later return, does not, however, constitute rejection of the idea *tout court*. One resolution of this apparent difficulty may be provided by Chadwick, who observed that, for Newman, who ‘believed in religious progress as little as he believed in secular

³⁹ Selby, R., *The Principle of Reserve in the Writings of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp.72f.

⁴⁰ JHN to Mrs J. Mozley, 23 January 1843, in *LD* ix, p.214.

⁴¹ JHN to Mrs W.Froude, 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, p.297.

⁴² Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.166.

⁴³ Chadwick, *From Newman to Bossuet*, p.89.

⁴⁴ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.165.

progress, and that was not at all',⁴⁵ the use of the term 'development' did not imply the adoption of the sense in which the word was used by 'contemporary evolutionary philosophy'.⁴⁶ Even at this very early stage, Newman was using the term to express what he could not fail to observe: that 'the Church of antiquity herself bore the marks of inner growth in the history of her own thought and life'.⁴⁷ The vocabulary and obvious sense of the letter to Falconer is irrefutable evidence that Newman held to some kind of a theory of development in January 1834, even if only to a theory in which developments in creeds, liturgies and canon, that is development of 'the theological and ecclesiastical system, which is implicitly contained in the writings and acts of the Apostles',⁴⁸ were seen as 'another way of expressing the object of faith' which 'itself remained identical and invariable'.⁴⁹

Newman continued to appeal to both his chronology for and concept of the *disciplina arcani* when, in March 1834 he wrote to Edward Burton.⁵⁰ Burton was seeking Newman's views on the ante-Nicene use of the term *ὁμοούσιον*, and particularly on some arguments put to Burton by Faber on the disavowal of the term at the Council of Antioch in the third century. Newman's argument was that the term was 'not *condemned*, but merely *abandoned*'⁵¹, that is, that the principle of economy meant that, in the absence of a compelling reason to insist upon the use of *ὁμοούσιον* in its formulae, the Fathers avoided it for apologetic reasons:

The effect of objections is surely to make men guarded. Especially Heads of the Church in Council assembled, deposing the Metropolitan himself of the

⁴⁵ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.98.

⁴⁶ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.102.

⁴⁷ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.97.

⁴⁸ JHN to Thomas Falconer, 27 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.180. It is the same point that he was to make, later the same year, in Tract 41, as will be demonstrated in the next section of this chapter.

⁴⁹ Allen, *John Henry Newman and the Abbé Jager: A Controversy on Scripture and Tradition (1834-1836)*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), p.13.

⁵⁰ JHN to Edward Burton, 1 March 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.194-197.

⁵¹ JHN to Edward Burton, 1 March 1834, in *LD* iv, p.195.

place where they meet, and him a shrewd disputant, are not likely to lay themselves open to criticism by volunteering a difficulty. There was no *call* on them to use it.⁵²

Newman was using the same language nearly two years later, when he wrote to Rose: ‘I never meant it was a *Church* rule, but a self-imposed rule for individuals’, and still claiming, increasingly implausibly, that ‘the Bishop of Lincoln grants that Clement holds it’.⁵³ Yet by the middle of the following year, 1836, Newman’s attachment to the *disciplina arcana*, or at least to his earlier claim of patristic authority for its early uses, was less sure. The patristic witness to the sufficiency of scripture, without a tradition protected by the *disciplina arcana* was now ‘an irrefragable argument’.⁵⁴ He had not, however, abandoned his earlier belief, that the *disciplina arcana* was a part of the system of belief in the early Church, arguing as late as September 1838, in words quoted from Hawkins,⁵⁵ that ‘the more fundamental the doctrine ... the more likely would it be rather implied than directly taught in the writings of the Apostles’.⁵⁶

Newman had intended to offer a comprehensive answer to the critics of his use of the *disciplina arcana* in the first edition of *Arians*, in an anticipated ‘much larger’ second edition, as he had initially suggested to Christie.⁵⁷ In a letter to Richard Hurrell Froude, dated 14 June 1834 and dealing with so many different issues that the letter is of exceptional length,⁵⁸ Newman refers to the Bishop of Lincoln’s criticism and to his plan to ‘publish a series of dissertations in a second volume, e.g. “on the disciplina

⁵² JHN to Edward Burton, 1 March 1834, in *LD* iv, p.196.

⁵³ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 15 December 1835, in *LD* v, p.178.

⁵⁴ JHN, *Tract 71*, p.139.

⁵⁵ Hawkins, *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p.64.

⁵⁶ *Tract 85*, pp.4f. This appeared on 21 September 1838.

⁵⁷ JHN to John Frederic Christie, 14 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.174.

⁵⁸ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 14 June 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.268-279.

arcani””⁵⁹ in order to answer Kaye’s charges. Work on other projects intervened and by August 1834 it was clear to him that he would not soon be able to return to the question,⁶⁰ although he still entertained the notion of revision as late as December 1836.⁶¹ Even when at length, three decades later, the idea of a second edition of *Arians* was mooted, Newman, by this time freed from apologetic necessity and in changed confessional circumstances, was able to recognise that *Arians* was ‘a very imperfect work’.⁶² Still later he corrected an admirer: ‘But, please do not call my Volume on the Arians “great” it is not even little ... hitting no mark at all’.⁶³ Nonetheless, he had not taken the opportunity that preparing the text for the 1876 edition afforded to add his ‘series of dissertations’ and the text remained substantially unaltered, Newman explaining to another correspondent who had cited *Arians* approvingly:

When at a comparatively late date I was led to re-publish it, I should have liked to mend it, but I found that if I attempted it would come to pieces, and I should have to write it over again.

In saying this, I have no intention of withdrawing from the substance of what you quote from me; on the contrary, I hold it as strongly as I did fifty years ago when it was written; but feel the many imperfections of the wording.⁶⁴

Newman’s first hypothesis could only account for apparent change in the Church’s doctrine if it was possible to argue that the terminological developments, of which the Nicene language was the most significant example, were the public statements of what had previously been believed always, everywhere and by everyone but which had been shielded from public view, from the written record, by the *disciplina arcani*. As Williams remarks, in the way Newman deploys the *disciplina arcani*, ‘[h]e is on the verge of admitting that doctrine – not merely doctrinal idiom –

⁵⁹ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 14 June 1834, in *LD* iv, p.275.

⁶⁰ JHN to John William Bowden, 10 August 1834, in *LD* iv, p.320.

⁶¹ JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 29 December 1836, in *LD* v, p.399.

⁶² JHN to Malcolm MacColl, 1 February 1867, in *LD* xxiii, p.46.

⁶³ JHN to Robert Charles Jenkins, 27 February 1877, in *LD* xxviii, p.172

⁶⁴ JHN to W.S.Lilly, 27 June 1882, in *LD* xxx, p.105.

changes' even if he remains 'still sufficiently part of the tradition of Bull to believe that the ante-Nicene faith needed only a minimal definition of form and vocabulary to require no further refinement'.⁶⁵ Kaye's criticisms had undermined Newman's assertions in *The Arians* and the language with which Newman attempted to defend them in his correspondence lacked the confidence of the earlier work. Yet he was anxious to hang on to the *disciplina arcani*, if only to attempt to provide an Anglican apologetic that connected the beliefs of the ante-Nicene Church with post-Nicene orthodoxy. His critics, however, Kaye chief amongst them, had shown how this exposed Newman to the risk of a need for an authoritative tradition. This was a position that Newman could not yet permit himself to admit, even if, as Jay Hammond points out, he had been perfectly content as early as 1832 with the view that 'the creeds which made the *disciplina arcani* public "were facts, not opinions" that guided the interpretation of scripture' and 'ensured orthodox dogma'.⁶⁶

II. *Tracts for the Times*

On 14 July 1833, at Newman's invitation, John Keble preached the sermon in St Mary the Virgin at the opening of the Oxford Assizes. Newman remarked in the *Apologia* that he 'ever considered and kept the day, as the start of the religious movement of 1833',⁶⁷ yet, as has been seen in the previous chapter, there is little contemporaneous evidence in his letters and diaries to corroborate the recollection or to suggest that the importance Newman claims to have accorded the occasion was widely shared at the time. The diary entry for 14 July does nothing more than record the bald facts: '6 Trinity Assize Sunday did duty morning and afternoon at St Mary's Keble

⁶⁵ Williams, 'Newman's *Arians*', p.276.

⁶⁶ Hammond, 'Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy', p.58. The embedded quote is from *Ari.*, p.134.

⁶⁷ *Apo.*, p.100.

preached in morning Assize Sermon for me in evening⁶⁸ and his letter to Keble on 5 August 1833 makes not even a passing reference to the event despite being almost entirely concerned with the same subject matter. Although Newman does make several oblique references to the sermon in his letters over the following weeks and months,⁶⁹ his appreciation of the significance of the event as the starting pistol of the Oxford Movement only began to crystallise towards the end of the year, when he was to describe the ‘Assize Sermon...and the Advertisement prefixed to it’ as ‘...the first intimation of what was to follow on our part’.⁷⁰ Newman had returned from the Mediterranean and found himself pitched into precisely the sort of controversy for which his temperament and skills seemed best suited: it was precisely the work for a ‘hot headed man’, to which he had previously looked forward with such eager anticipation.⁷¹

Although he was not present at the meeting at Hugh James Rose’s rectory at Hadleigh in Suffolk, where Palmer of Worcester and Hurrell Froude represented the Oxford voice of those outraged at the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill,⁷² Newman very quickly found himself – or more precisely ensured that he found himself – heavily engaged in organising activities to protest against both the presuppositions and consequences of that legislation. Writing to Bowden, Newman acknowledged the necessity of meetings and committees, petitions to Parliament and addresses to Archbishops, but he believed that his own talents would be better directed through his pen, ‘to rouse the clergy, to inculcate the Apostolical Succession and to defend the

⁶⁸ Sunday 14 July 1833, in *LD* iv, p.5.

⁶⁹ e.g. JHN to Charles Portales Golightly, 30 July 1833, in *LD* iv, p.13, and JHN to John Frederic Christie, 6 August 1833.

⁷⁰ ‘FRAGMENTARY DIARY’, 6 December 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.10-12, here p.10.

⁷¹ JHN to Harriett Newman, 16 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.367.

⁷² JHN to Charles Portales Golightly, 30 July 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.13f.

Liturgy' through the publishing of tracts.⁷³ By the end of 1833 twenty tracts had been published, eleven of which Newman had himself written⁷⁴ and a further thirty were to be published in 1834, eight of them by Newman. He fully recognised their sententious character and their tendency to incite controversy, even amongst those of his party: that was precisely, for Newman, their purpose. Writing in July 1834 to Arthur Perceval, author of Tracts 23, 35 and 36, he observed:

As to the first Tracts, everyone has his own taste. You object to some things, another to others – If we altered to please everyone the effect would be spoiled. They were not intended as symbols é Cathedrâ – but as the expressions of *individual* minds – and individuals feeling strongly, while on the one <other> hand they are incidentally faulty in mode of language, are still peculiarly *effective*.⁷⁵

The purpose of the *Tracts* was quite clear: they represented a conscious attempt to present the Apostolical case in polemical form. In the advertisement that was attached to the publication of a volume of the first forty-six, published by Rivington in 1834, Newman wrote that they were written to deal with concerns that could be briefly described:

The Apostolic succession, the Holy Catholic Church, were principles of action in the minds of our predecessors of the 17th century; but, in proportion as the maintenance of the Church has been secured by law, her ministers have been

⁷³ JHN to John William Bowden, 31 August 1833, in *LD* iv, p.33. By the time Newman came to write *Apologia*, he was less convinced of the value of the structural apparatus of movements, observing, by way of an explanation for the eventual distancing of Rose from the Oxford Movement, due to, amongst other things, his attachment to such apparatus, that 'Living movements do not come of committees'. *Apo*, p.107.

⁷⁴ Because of their controversial nature, there was little or no indication of the authorship on the face of the first tracts. The first tract to bear the initials of its author (Pusey) was Tract 18, published on 21 December 1833, although only two days earlier, in a letter to Frederic Rogers (*LD* iv, p.146), Newman remarked: 'I have a most admirable tract from Pusey, but his name must not yet be mentioned'. The first complete list of authors of the *Tracts* appeared in H. P. Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 3 vols, (London: Longmans, Green, 1894). vol.III, at pp. 473-480. He identified Newman as the author of twenty-nine of the *Tracts* (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 31, 33, 34, 38, 41, 45, 47, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, 82, 83, 85, 88 and 90) and as having revised and completed Palmer of Worcester's Tract 15, as well as having written the various advertisements to the bound volumes. Liddon's scheme of attribution is uncontroversial and is confirmed by the work of Vincent Blehl in his *John Henry Newman: A Bibliographical Catalogue of his Writings*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978), ('A Bibliographical Catalogue'), C52-83, at pp.115-121.

⁷⁵ JHN to Arthur Philip Perceval, 20 July 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.307f, here p.308. He recalled this letter when he gave an account of the *Tracts* in the *Apo*., pp.110f.

under the temptation of leaning on an arm of flesh instead of her own divinely provided discipline ... A lamentable increase of sectarianism has followed; being occasioned (in addition to other more obvious causes) first, by the cold aspect which the new Church doctrines have presented to the religious sensibilities of the mind, next to their meagreness in suggesting motives to restrain it from seeking out a more influential discipline.⁷⁶

In the five and a half months between Keble's sermon and the end of the year, almost every letter of substance that Newman wrote touched upon the issues in controversy and those same issues were also the subject of a series of six letters he wrote to the editor of *Record*, five of which were published, under the signature 'A.CHURCHMAN'.⁷⁷ Newman's diaries and correspondence for 1833 and 1834 provide ample evidence of an almost frenetic activity in support of the nascent Oxford Movement and the effort was not wasted. Peter Nockles has remarked on the wide appeal of the Tracts and notes how 'Tractarian élan harnessed to the restatement of old truths enshrined in the Church's formularies seemed an irresistible combination'.⁷⁸ Even if Newman believed himself to have got into 'all sorts of scrapes with my Tracts – abused in every quarter',⁷⁹ he could see that his efforts in 'the right cause'⁸⁰ were 'going on most prosperously'.⁸¹ He later reflected on this period in the *Apologia* in terms which accord closely with the tone of his correspondence at the time and which provide a useful corrective when looking closely at the texts of Newman's contributions to the *Tracts*:

Nor was it only that I had confidence in our cause, both in itself, and in its controversial force, but besides, I despised every rival system of doctrine and its

⁷⁶ JHN, 'Advertisement', in *Tracts*, vol. I, p.iii.

⁷⁷ The letters were dated 21 October 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.63-65; and 31 October 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.76-78 (The date given is that of publication, per *LD* iv, p.76, n.1); 7 November 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.87-88; 11 November 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.94-96; and 14 November 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.101-103. The sixth was not published, the editor giving his reasons in a note to Newman dated 4 December 1833, in which he remarked that '... the Tracts countenanced by the New Society at Oxford ...' were '... the fruit of something nearly akin to Infatuation'. See *LD* iv, p.136, n.2.

⁷⁸ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, pp.274f.

⁷⁹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 23 November 1833, in *LD* iv, p.120.

⁸⁰ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 15 December 1833, in *LD* iv, p.142.

⁸¹ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 15 December 1833, in *LD* iv, p.142.

arguments...I thought...that the Apostolical form of doctrine was essential and imperative, and its grounds of evidence impregnable. Owing to this confidence...[m]y behaviour had a mixture in it both of fierceness and of sport; and on this account, I dare say, it gave offence to many...⁸²

Establishing the ‘Apostolical form of doctrine’ as ‘essential and imperative’ to the identity of the Church of England dominated Newman’s own contributions to the *Tracts* in 1833 and 1834. If the encroachments of political power were to be resisted in a country where an Erastian conception of the relationship between the Church and State had held sway for such a long time, Newman understood that it was first necessary to carve out for the Church – and especially for her clergy – an ecclesiology that looked back beyond the Crown and Parliament for the source of the Church’s authority. He sought to establish for the Church of England not an independence from the nation of England and its constitutional and political arrangements, indeed Newman explicitly disavowed any such aim whilst countenancing its possibility,⁸³ but rather to remind his readers that the Church of England had a wider context and a source of authority distinct from that which it drew from the State.

In the ‘Advertisement’ that prefaced the first bound edition of the *Tracts*, Newman refers to the Church of England as the ‘English branch’ of ‘the Church of Christ’.⁸⁴ This language stood firmly in the tradition of the High Churchmen and drew upon the understanding of the Caroline Divines of the seventeenth century but Newman deployed it here, however, not to assert the Church of England’s claims to Catholicity – a conventional purpose⁸⁵ – but to introduce its claims to Apostolicity. If he could but

⁸² *Apo.*, pp.113f.

⁸³ JHN to Charles Portales Golightly, 11 August 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.28f, here p.28.

⁸⁴ JHN, ‘Advertisement’, in *Tracts*, vol. I, p.v.

⁸⁵ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, pp.153f.

convince his readers ‘to maintain the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession’,⁸⁶ then it would be possible to resist the ‘sheer Tyranny’, as he characterised them, of the assaults of the State on the prerogatives of the Church of England.⁸⁷ Newman’s accounts of his first introduction to the notion of Apostolical Succession varied. In a letter to Keble, in November 1844, he credits Froude with having been the agent in 1829.⁸⁸ In the *Apologia*, however, as was seen in the previous chapter, the credit is more plausibly given directly to the Oriel Fellow, William James in 1823.⁸⁹ The origins of his first acquaintance with the doctrine may be uncertain but the centrality it was to assume in his contributions to the *Tracts* is not in doubt. Each of the eleven tracts Newman wrote in 1833⁹⁰ dealt either directly or substantially with this issue and the seven from 1834,⁹¹ of which he was the author, also address it. The very first tract *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission* is a reminder to the clergy that the bishops are not merely officers of the Crown but ‘the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES’ and asks ‘on *what* are we to rest our authority, when the State deserts us?’⁹² He supplied his own answer, which revealed the theological premises undergirding his *Tracts*: it is a statement of intent, a manifesto for the *Tracts*, for the Movement and for Newman’s involvement in it:

I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built, - OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT.

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 should succeed them; 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.⁹³

⁸⁶ JHN to R.F.Wilson, 8 September 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.43-45, here p.44.

⁸⁷ JHN to H.A.Woodgate, 7 August 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.27f, here p.27.

⁸⁸ JHN to John Keble, 21 November 1844, in *LD* x, pp.424-427, here p.425.

⁸⁹ *Apo.*, p.67. William James (1787-1861) had been one of Newman’s examiners for the Oriel Fellowship in 1822 and had recommended his election. *LD* x, p.425, n.3.

⁹⁰ i.e. *Tracts* 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 19 and 20.

⁹¹ i.e. *Tracts* 21, 31, 33, 34, 38, 41 and 45.

⁹² *Tract 1: Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission*, in *Tracts*, vol. I, (‘*Tract 1*’), p.1.

⁹³ *Tract 1*, p.2.

This concern to establish the distinctive origins and authority of the Church and the attendant claim to those origins and that authority for the Church of England, caused Newman to have to treat of two matters that would have a significant effect in developing his notion of the *via media*: how to treat those doctrines which are not clearly delineated in Sacred Scripture and what to say of the position of the Roman Communion. If he was to claim for the Church of England this ‘real ground’ in an unassailable ‘apostolical descent’ then it was essential that he offer a cogent account of its attachment to doctrines which it professed and yet which could hardly come up to the standard of proof demanded by the sixth of the Thirty Nine Articles. He also needed to provide a method which, in answering this first question, did not open him up to accusations that he was either claiming for the Church of England or allowing to the Church of Rome the capacity that he believed the latter to assert: that of having the power to add to the deposit of faith.

The Thirty Nine Articles of Religion had been adopted by the Convocation of the Church of England in 1563 and had been finalized in 1571.⁹⁴ Assent and subscription to them had since been a condition of Matriculation at both Universities⁹⁵ and for advancement to Holy Orders in the Established Church. Since 1662 they had been published as part of the *Book of Common Prayer* and, as part of that book, were considered to be part of the defining formularies of the Anglican Church. Their purpose was to establish the doctrine of the Church of England with particular reference

⁹⁴ Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, p.284. For an account of the theological genesis of the Articles, see Chapman, *Anglican Theology*, Chapter 3, ‘Settling Anglican Theology: Elizabeth I, John Jewel and the Thirty-Nine Articles’, pp.43-71.

⁹⁵ Oxford maintained the precept until 1856, whereas, from 1772 Cambridge only imposed a religious test on the taking of a degree and that test itself merely a simple declaration of *bona fide* membership of the Church of England rather than formal subscription to the Articles previously required. See Winstanley, D.A., *Unreformed Cambridge*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), p.313.

to settling the theological controversies of the sixteenth century and to determine its position on the questions of dispute between it and both the Roman Catholic Church and the Anabaptists. The extent to which there was a received reading of the Articles that could be described as acceptable to Anglicans, together with the attempt Newman later made to present a synthesis of them which challenged this received reading, will be considered in the next chapter when the writing of and the reaction to Tract 90 is considered. However, it is necessary here to consider the use Newman made of the articles, and particularly the sixth, in writing the early tracts and in seeking to develop a coherent hypothesis to account for doctrinal change.

The sixth of the Articles was entitled ‘Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scripture for Salvation’, and addresses the question of where the sources of Christian revelation are to be found. It begins:

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.⁹⁶

Like many of the other Articles, the sixth charts a careful course: it is not so much about Scripture as about how doctrine should be formed.⁹⁷ The concern of the sixth article is to lay out correct principles for the use of Scripture in establishing Christian doctrine without conceding anything resembling what was to become the position of the Tridentine *duplex fons*.⁹⁸ It proclaims the sufficiency but not the exclusivity of

⁹⁶ ‘The Thirty-Nine Articles, 1571, 06. Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scripture’, in Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, p.287.

⁹⁷ For a full discussion of the purpose and use to which the sixth article was put, see O’Donovan, O., *On the Thirty Nine Articles: A Conversation with Tudor Christianity*, (London: SCM Press, 2011), pp.45-51. Cf. Oberman, H., ‘Quo vadis, Petre’, in his *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1992), pp.280ff.

⁹⁸ The Tridentine teaching was itself a *via media* between the Lutheran *sola scriptura* and a position argued at the Council of Trent by, amongst others, Giovanni Maria Cardinal del Monte (later Pope Julius III), who proposed that Divine Revelation was to be found ‘*partim in libris scriptis, partim in sine scripto traditionibus*’, (see Schmaus, M., *Dogma 1: God in Revelation*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968),

Scripture and does not deny that there is profit to be had from teaching external to the Canon.⁹⁹ The article later goes on to delimit the Canon in a manner that sides decisively with the Protestant rather than the Roman Catholic side, but the subtlety of the text regarding sufficiency leaves a place for tradition, albeit understood as outside the strict deposit of faith. Relying to a greater or lesser degree on these nuances had been a staple of Anglican divines from Hooker on.¹⁰⁰ For Hooker ‘collecting’ the sense of Scripture involved the careful use of ‘techniques that allow the reader to grasp what is necessary to salvation...Scripture is not always plain but has to be ‘collected’ together’.¹⁰¹ For Newman this meant reading it in the light of the Apostles’ Creed, not because the latter determined what the former meant but that the Creed represented the distillate of the Church’s response to the Scripture. In the mid-1830s Newman was

p.218). Trent instead decreed that ‘*perspiciensque, hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ab ipsius Christo ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae*’. ‘*Decretum primum: recipiuntur libri sacri et traditionis apostolorum*’, Concilium Tridentinum, Sessio IV, 8 April 1546, in Denzinger, H., *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, ed. Peter Hünermann et al., (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2012), pp.369f., para. 1501. The conciliar definition rejects the notion of two separate, complete, sufficient (to use the sixteenth-century terminology) sources: it is *duplex fons* properly construed as the ‘twin founts’ (Sacred Scripture and Holy Tradition) of the single source (Divine Revelation). See Schmaus, *Dogma 1: God in Revelation*, p.218. Cf. Geiselman, J., *The Meaning of Tradition*, (London: Burns and Oates Ltd., 1966), p. 82.

⁹⁹ Indeed the original text of the article as it appeared, as Article 5 in the Forty-Two Articles of 1553, explicitly supported just such a notion. It read: ‘Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it be sometime received of the faithful, as godly and profitable for an order and comeliness: yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an article of the faith, or repute it requisite to the necessity of salvation.’ Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, p.287.

¹⁰⁰ For Hooker’s position on this question, see Hooker, R., *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book 1, chap. xiv, in *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: with an Account of His Life and Death*, arranged by John Keble, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876), (‘Laws’), pp.267-272. The conventional view has been that Hooker was a proponent of a *via media avant la lettre*, Newman and Keble being amongst the most persuasive advocates of position. More recently this has been critically re-examined by, for example, Diarmaid MacCulloch, who, in ‘Richard Hooker’s Reputation’, in *The English Historical Review*, 117 (2002), pp.773-812, notes: ‘... nowhere in any of his writings does Hooker use either the word Anglicanism or the phrase *via media*. That may suggest that the legacy of Hooker is not as straightforward as it has sometimes been portrayed; indeed it may mean that Anglicanism and the *via media* are more interesting and fluid concepts that the complacent version of Anglican historiography has sometimes made them’. (p.773). For a distinct take from the perspective of an Anglican Evangelical, see Atkinson, N., *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, (London: Paternoster Press, 1997).

¹⁰¹ Chapman, *Anglican Theology*, p.114. Chapman later (on p.117) remarks that ‘While this could perhaps be regarded as consonant with the *sola scriptura* of the Reformation, it undoubtedly pushes the idea to its limits.’

certainly not going beyond Hooker. In addressing, in the *Tracts*, the question of how to provide an account of those doctrines that were considered to be a settled and binding part of the Anglican system – not least in the face of the attacks of *sola scriptura* Evangelicals – and yet for which little scriptural support could be garnered, Newman took a conventional line in asserting scriptural sufficiency:

You wish to have my opinion on the doctrine of "the Holy Catholic Church," as contained in Scripture, and taught in the Creed ... It seems that true doctrine and warm feelings are not enough. How am I to know what *is* enough? you ask. I reply, *by searching Scripture* ... Let us join issue then on this plain ground, whether or not the doctrine of "the Church," and the duty of obeying it, be laid down *in Scripture*.¹⁰²

It was a view of the doctrinal value of Sacred Scripture that would have seemed entirely uncontroversial to the standard Anglican Divines.

In the eighth Tract, 'The Gospel a Law of Liberty', published in October 1833,¹⁰³ Newman conceded that sufficiency was but one aspect of the question and sought to address the paucity of scriptural support for 'the ecclesiastical system under which we find ourselves'. He argued that far from being a matter of surprise, it was a direct consequence of the very relationship between Christ and His Church:

When a man gives orders to those whom he thinks will mistake him, or are perverse, he speaks pointedly and explicitly; but when he gives directions to friends, he will trust much to their knowledge of his feelings and wishes, he leaves much to their discretion, and tells them not so much what he would have done in detail, as what are the objects he would have accomplished... Accordingly, there is no part perhaps of the ecclesiastical system, which is not faintly traced in Scripture, and no part which is much more than faintly traced.¹⁰⁴

He returned to the same point in December 1833 in the nineteenth tract to be published, the tenth Newman himself had written, where the matter of the proofs for Apostolical Succession are directly under consideration. Newman conceded that whilst:

¹⁰² *Tract 11: The Visible Church – Letter 1*, in *Tracts*, vol. I, ('*Tract 11*'), pp.1f.

¹⁰³ *Tract 8: The Gospel a Law of Liberty*, in *Tracts*, vol. I, ('*Tract 8*').

¹⁰⁴ *Tract 8*, p.1.

MEN are sometimes disappointed with the proofs offered in behalf of some important doctrines of our religion; such especially as the necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in order to constitute a Minister of CHRIST. They consider these proofs to be not so strong as they expected, or as they think desirable.¹⁰⁵

Yet he asserted that:

...such persons should be asked, whether these arguments they speak of are in their estimation weak as a guide to their own practice, or weak in controversy with hardheaded and subtle disputants. Surely, as Bishop Butler has convincingly shown, the faintest probabilities are strong enough to determine our *conduct* in a matter of duty ...[w]e should reply (and most reasonably too), that, *considering the undeniable fact* that ordination has ever been thought necessary in the Church for the Ministerial Commission, our interpretation is the most probable one, and therefore the safest to act upon¹⁰⁶

This tutorist appeal to probability was to form a significant part of his defence of those Anglican teachings or those doctrines of the wider Church held by Anglicans that could rely on little obvious, explicit scriptural support. It was an early deployment of an apologetic and epistemological tool to which he was to have frequent resort for the rest of his life: that of antecedent probability. He was to go further in *Tract 34* when considering the various rites and customs of the Church which could make little or no claim to a pedigree *sola scriptura*. Indeed, he quoted St John Chrysostom at the head of the tract in a way that would appear to leave behind the ground he had shared with Hawkins: ‘He who is duly strengthened in faith, does not go so far as to require argument and reason for what is enjoined, but is satisfied with the *tradition* alone.’¹⁰⁷ Taking as his point of departure St Paul’s words in 1 Corinthians 9: 2-16 concerning obedience to ‘customs’ of the Church – in that case the cutting short of the hair of men and the head covering of women in church – Newman argued in *Tract 34* that St Paul’s authority itself attached to various Anglican practices, such as the baptism of infants, for which scriptural evidence was wanting. Hooker had used the same reasoning to

¹⁰⁵ *Tract 19: On Arguing concerning the Apostolical Succession*, in *Tracts*, vol. I, (*‘Tract 19’*), p.1.

¹⁰⁶ *Tract 19*, p.2.

¹⁰⁷ *Tract 34*, p.1.

justify the use of ‘rites and customs serving for the seemliness of church-regiment’ and cited as his authority the position taken by Whitaker in his controversy with Bellarmine.¹⁰⁸ Newman’s position here then, once again, stands in a classical Anglican tradition but whereas both Whitaker and Hooker were concerned to establish with certainty, the fact of these ‘rites and customs being known to be Apostolical’,¹⁰⁹ Newman was prepared to be satisfied with probability:

These instances, then, not to notice others of a like or a different kind, are surely sufficient to reconcile us to the complete ritual system which breaks upon us in the writings of the Fathers. If any parts of it indeed are contrary to Scripture, that is of course a decisive reason at once for believing them to be additions and corruptions of the original ceremonial; but till this is shown, we are bound to venerate what is certainly primitive, and probably is apostolic. It will be remarked, moreover, that many of the religious observances of the early Church are expressly built upon words of Scripture, and intended to be a visible memorial of them, after the manner of St. Paul’s directions about the respective habits of men and women, which was just now noticed. .¹¹⁰

Newman readily granted that this question of scriptural sufficiency was not a new one to the Church, nor even a controversy dating only to the Reformation, and later, in *Tract 34*, he cited both Tertullian¹¹¹ and St Basil¹¹² in support of ‘a tradition of observances independent of Scripture’ dating to apostolic times and founded originally on a *disciplina arcani* by which ‘Apostles and Fathers who modeled [sic] the Churches, were accustomed to lodge their sacred doctrine in mystic forms, as being secretly and silently conveyed’.¹¹³ Newman had outlined a presumption in favour of the binding nature of primitive tradition, unless a particular observance was actually contrary to the

¹⁰⁸ Whitaker, W., *Disputatio de sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis papistas, inprimis Robertum Bellarminum Iesuitam ... pontificium in collegio Romano, & Thomam Stapletonum regium in Schola Duacena controversiarum professorem: Sex quaestionibus proposita et tractata*, (Cambridge: Ex officina Thomae Thomasii, florentissimae Cantabrigiensis Academiae Typographi. 1588), quaest. 6, cap.6, cited in Hooker, *Laws*, bk. 1, ch.xiv, para.1.

¹⁰⁹ Hooker, *Laws*, bk. 1, ch.xv, para.1.

¹¹⁰ *Tract 34: Rites and Customs of the Church*, in *Tracts*, vol. I, (*‘Tract 34’*), p.4.

¹¹¹ *Tract 34*, p.5.

¹¹² *Tract 34*, pp.6f.

¹¹³ St Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, para.66, as quoted in *Tract 34*, p.7.

warrant of scripture, in the sentence from *Tract 34*, already quoted, and relied upon the following passage from St Basil:

Of those articles of doctrine and preaching, which are in the custody of the Church, some come to us in Scripture itself, some are conveyed to us by a continuous tradition in mystical depositories. Both have equal claims on our devotion, and are received by all, at least by all who are in any respect Churchmen. For, should we attempt to supersede the usages which are not enjoined in Scripture as if unimportant, we should do most serious injury to Evangelical truth: nay, reduce it to a bare name.¹¹⁴

This same tradition of religious practice, Newman suggested, operated under a dual dispensation of implicit scriptural sanction and explicit traditional prescription.

rites and ordinances, far from being unmeaning, are in their nature capable of impressing our memories and imaginations with the great revealed verities; [they are] far from being superstitious, are expressly sanctioned in Scripture as to their principle, and delivered to the Church in their form by tradition.¹¹⁵

It is admitted that *Tract 34* was concerned primarily with such ‘rites and ordinances’, but the link made between the impressions created by the rites and the ‘revealed verities’, taken together with the citation from St Basil with its reference to ‘sacred doctrine’ is sufficient evidence that Newman saw the principle as having a wider doctrinal application not limited merely to liturgical or devotional custom. This was certainly to go beyond Hooker, who had been careful to distinguish between ‘rites and customs’ and ‘supernatural necessary truth’.¹¹⁶ Newman was reluctant to make that distinction and in *Tract 45* asks: ‘*who made us judges of essentials and non-essentials? how do we determine them?*’¹¹⁷

Whilst continuing to hold to the notion of scriptural sufficiency, in terms that he believed to be entirely conformable to Article VI, Newman had, with this argument in

¹¹⁴ St Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, para.66, as quoted in *Tract 34*, pp.6f.

¹¹⁵ *Tract 34*, p.7.

¹¹⁶ Hooker, *Laws*, bk.1, ch.xiv, para.4.

¹¹⁷ *Tract 45: The Grounds of our Faith*, in *Tracts*, vol. I, (*‘Tract 45’*), p.4.

Tract 34, provided a rationale within which even a doctrine as central to Christianity as the Trinity – ‘necessary doctrine, doctrine the very highest and most sacred’ – for which he willingly conceded there was ‘though *most conclusive*’ but ‘indirect and circuitous’ scriptural proof,¹¹⁸ could be accommodated. In *Tract 45*, published first on St Luke’s Day, 18 October, 1834, he went further and asked: ‘Where is this solemn and comfortable mystery formally stated in Scripture, as we find it in the creeds?’¹¹⁹ The absence of the standard of proof demanded by Article VI had been quoted to him as a reason to doubt the received teaching on Episcopacy – which he describes as ‘but a case of *discipline*’¹²⁰ rather than ‘a case of *doctrine*’¹²¹ – by those, Newman implied, who would never seek to doubt the doctrine of the Trinity, the scriptural evidence for which was equally scanty. He was later to state with rhetorical force and clarity in *Tract 71*, under the title *On Controversy with the Romanists*, what ‘[t]his majestic evidence’ was and in what this certainty of doctrine that the approach gave him consisted:

It is a very great mercy that the Church Catholic all over the world, as descended from the Apostles, does at this day speak one and the same doctrine about the Trinity and Incarnation, as it has always spoken it, excepting in one single point, which rather *probat regulam* than interferes with it, viz. as to the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON. With this solitary exception, we have the certainty of possessing the entire truth as regards the high theological doctrines, by an argument which supersedes the necessity of arguing from Scripture against those who oppose them.¹²²

Newman’s argument explicitly depended on the witness of antiquity to apostolical origins and on a consensus of the witnesses who asserted its Catholicity. It was an argument grounded in a theological method of historical parallelism that was to characterise both Newman’s and the other Tractarians’ work. It was ‘exactly the sort of history that he [Newman] liked best – a presentation of the past that gave a clear

¹¹⁸ *Tract 45*, p.6.

¹¹⁹ *Tract 45*, p.6.

¹²⁰ *Tract 45*, p.5.

¹²¹ *Tract 45*, p.6.

¹²² *Tract 71: On Controversy with the Romanists*, in *Tracts*, vol. III, (*‘Tract 71’*), p.132.

moral for the present'.¹²³ The moral for the present is put by Newman into the mouth of the imaginary 'Laicus' in *Tract 41*:

I think I quite understand the ground you take. You consider that, as time goes on, fresh and fresh articles of faith are necessary to secure the Church's purity, according to the rise of successive heresies and errors. These articles were all hidden, as it were, in the Church's bosom from the first, and brought out into form according to the occasion. Such was the Nicene explanation against Arius; the English articles against Popery: and such are those now called for in this Age of schism, to meet the new heresy, which denies the holy Catholic Church.¹²⁴

His interlocutor 'Clericus' concurs and, looking back on this tract, when preparing the Uniform Edition for Longmans Newman noted that, 'Here, as above, the principle of doctrinal development is accepted as true and necessary for the Christian Church.'¹²⁵ Pereiro's comment that 'the picture does not seem as simple as Newman painted it many years after the events'¹²⁶ carries the implied accusation that the 1885 gloss is anachronistic eisegesis, yet the sense of the text of the tract is straightforward enough to acquit Newman of the charge. The device of the dialogue between *Clericus* and *Laicus* is direct enough and it is clear that *Clericus* was intended to stand for Newman himself. The words of *Laicus*: 'I think I quite understand the ground you take' confirm that the process described is the opinion not of *Laicus* but of *Clericus*. This expression of a notion of the development of doctrine by Newman in 1834, before his exchange of correspondence with S.F. Wood, does not fit with Pereiro's thesis that it was Wood who introduced and eventually convinced Newman of the reality of development. Nonetheless, it is difficult to read the passage any other way than that it admits of a notion of development. The objection that Newman subsequently condemned the

¹²³ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, p.31. For a treatment of Newman's historical method, see Hammond in 'The Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy'. Cf. Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, pp.56-58, and Fergusson, T., 'The Enthralling Power: History and Heresy in John Henry Newman' in *Anglican Theological Review*, 85 (2003), pp.641-662.

¹²⁴ *Tract 41*, p.5

¹²⁵ *Tract 41*, in *Tracts for the Times*, (London: Longmans Green, 1878), p.40. Blehl notes, in *A Bibliographical Catalogue*, pp.74 and 117, without offering an explanation for the discrepancy, that in *VM* this tract is referred to as *Tract 40*, although originally published as *Tract 41*.

¹²⁶ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.165.

Roman Catholic idea of development, as he understood it, in his correspondence with the Abbé Jager is no objection at all. It is clear from the correspondence with Jager that Newman appeared to believe that the Roman Catholic concept of development consisted in a Magisterial positivism constrained by little more than Papal ambition and it was this he was anxious to reject. However, arguing that in opposing the Roman Catholic position as he conceived it, Newman opposed the idea of development altogether is simply not sustainable when the evidence of the tracts and the unsent letter to Falconer¹²⁷ is considered. Pereiro makes no reference in *Ethos* to this letter.

Pereiro's criticism is one with which Thomas concurs, suggesting that the later Newman overlooks the confusion in the work of the earlier between 'essential' 'articles of faith' ...and local, disciplinary 'articles of religion'.¹²⁸ The difficulty of distinguishing between these two was to form a considerable part of the rhetoric of the dispute with the Abbé Jager and was a problem not unique to Newman among Anglican divines, Daniel Waterland having engaged with the matter a hundred years earlier.¹²⁹ Chadwick, Pereiro and Thomas are, however, committed *a priori* to the thesis that Newman did not come to recognise the idea of development of doctrine (as opposed to the development of heresy) until a period later than that currently under consideration: for Chadwick, Newman only 'crossed the Rubicon' between 1841 and 1843.¹³⁰ Pereiro argues that 'It is beyond dispute that a theory of development had already taken shape in Newman's mind by 1840,¹³¹ and Thomas claims that it belongs in the period immediately prior to his conversion to Roman Catholicism.¹³² The evidence examined

¹²⁷ JHN to Thomas Falconer, 27 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.180.

¹²⁸ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.185.

¹²⁹ Beimer, *Newman and Tradition*, pp.9f.

¹³⁰ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.120.

¹³¹ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.171.

¹³² Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, pp.236-247

in the previous chapter and throughout this and the succeeding chapter of this dissertation suggests that they cannot be right. Indeed, the passage here in *Tract 41* outlines an approach that, whilst admittedly is not the principle of doctrinal development in the final completeness of its 1845 form, is, nonetheless, a clear expression of Newman's awareness of development. Furthermore, it is a significant move forward from mere textual development and, although the notion of the *disciplina arcani* is not entirely dispensed with, the hypothesis now seems to depend more on apostolicity and the catholic consent of antiquity than on the operation of the principle of reserve in the manner Newman had suggested the previous year in the unsent letter to Falconer.¹³³ The question remained, however: was this any bulwark against the claims of Roman Catholicism?

If it were possible that the 'very highest and most sacred doctrines' such as that of the Trinity, doctrines certainly falling within the definition of 'necessary to salvation', could be dependent, for their content, not on the plain words of Scripture but were rather derived, at least in their form, from non-scriptural tradition, then it seemed to many that the door had been left open for the claims of the Roman Catholic Church to exercise the teaching office of that non-scriptural tradition. Conscious from the first that he would be accused of opening that door to 'the solicitations of Romanism',¹³⁴ Newman was anxious to spell out his differences with Roman Catholic claims, or at least what he and most of his readers believed them to be. He did so from the very beginning, when, in the Advertisement to the first volume of the *Tracts*, he proclaimed the purpose of the *Tracts* and by extension the Oxford Movement, as having 'the object

¹³³ JHN to Thomas Falconer, 27 January 1834, in *LD* iv, p.180.

¹³⁴ JHN to H.A.Woodgate, 7 August 1833, in *LD* iv, p.27.

of contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines' in order to, amongst other things, 'repress the extension of Popery'.¹³⁵

Having, in *Tract 11*, asserted the doctrine of the visible Church and conceded that schism is wrong, even sinful, in the remainder of the tract he set out in some detail the doctrine of the Visible Church as One and as Divinely willed, citing scriptural authority for this position. :

Moreover Scripture directly insists upon the doctrine of the Visible Church, as being of importance. E.g. St. Paul says;—"There is *one body*, and one SPIRIT, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one LORD, one faith, one baptism, one GOD and FATHER of all." Ephes. iv. 5, 6. Thus, as far as the Apostle's words go, it is as false and unchristian, (I do not mean in degree of guilt, but in its intrinsic sinfulness), to make more bodies than one, as to have many Lords, many Gods, many Creeds.¹³⁶

At the end of *Tract 11* the obviousness of the apparent flaws is stark. If the purpose of Newman's early tracts was firmly to establish Anglican claims to Apostolical Succession, then it was necessary to deal with the criticism that this made the Church of England in some way dependent upon Rome. Newman could see that the criticism had two limbs: that Apostolical Succession could only have come to the Church of England from her Roman Catholic antecedents such that her current position as separated from the communion of Rome suggested, at the very least, that she was in schism and, secondly, that Rome's claims to the capacities attendant upon Apostolical Succession, to Popery, which surely included what he called an infallible teaching authority, were at odds with the Anglican position. In his next contribution, *Tract 15*, Newman confronts the problem head on:

WHEN Churchmen in England maintain the Apostolical Commission of their Ministers, they are sometimes met with the objection, that they cannot prove it without tracing their orders back to the Church of Rome; a position, indeed,

¹³⁵ *Tracts*, vol. I, p.v.

¹³⁶ *Tract 11*, p.3.

which in a certain sense is true. And hence it is argued, that they are reduced to the dilemma, either of acknowledging they had no right to separate from the Pope, or, on the other hand, of giving up the Ministerial Succession altogether, and resting the claims of their pastors on some other ground; in other words, that they are inconsistent in reprobating Popery,
It is intended, in the pages that follow, to reply to this supposed difficulty.¹³⁷

The ‘flat denial of the alleged’¹³⁸ fact that the Church of England initiated the schism with Rome is the cornerstone of the argument that follows. It is an argument that draws heavily upon a hermeneutic of continuity that would become a staple of Tractarian historiography. Newman contended that the Church of England was one and the same body that had subsisted in England before the Reformation:

The English Church did not revolt from those who in that day had authority by succession from the Apostles. On the contrary, it is certain that the Bishops and Clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation, and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of those kingdoms from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation, while at the same time they gradually removed from the minds of the people various superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages, and which, though never formally received by the judgment of the whole Church, were yet very prevalent.¹³⁹

The argument appears to be that it is Rome that is in schism from the Apostolical Church’ by virtue of her ‘tyranny and usurpation’: that the Papal attempt ‘to gain power over the whole Church’ and ‘to lord it over GOD’S heritage’¹⁴⁰ put Rome, not England, in the wrong. Furthermore, the ‘various religious and ecclesiastical usages’¹⁴¹ forced upon the Church in England and Ireland by this Papal aggression made it a religious duty for the English Church to take the action they did:

... our Bishops, at the time of the Reformation, did but vindicate their ancient rights; were but acting as grateful, and therefore jealous champions of the honour of the old Fathers, and the sanctity of their institutions ... And, if England and Ireland had a plea for asserting their freedom under any

¹³⁷ *Tract 15*, p.1.

¹³⁸ *Tract 15*, p.3.

¹³⁹ *Tract 15*, p.4.

¹⁴⁰ *Tract 15*, p.6.

¹⁴¹ *Tract 15*, p.6.

circumstances, much more so, when the corruptions imposed on them by Rome even made it a duty to do so.¹⁴²

Rome had neither the legitimate interest of patriarchal authority over England¹⁴³ nor had it kept to Apostolical doctrine, he argued. Therefore, even with its orders derived from the same source as those claimed by Rome, the Church of England had, in Newman's conception, the duty of submission neither to Rome nor to the corruptions in practice and 'false doctrine and error which Romanists now maintain' and which 'adulterated the sincerity of the Christian verity, and brought the Church into miserable bondage'.¹⁴⁴ Lest his readers be left in any doubt of the extent of Newman's differences from it, at least since the time of Trent, he describes the Roman Communion as 'heretical', as having 'apostatized' and having bound 'itself in covenant to the cause of Antichrist'.¹⁴⁵ By the end of 1833, in *Tract 20*, whilst still protesting 'the very enmity I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel',¹⁴⁶ Newman was able to express this ecclesiology clearly: the Church of England was to be understood 'as a true branch of the Church universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal error. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical'.¹⁴⁷

The emergence of this ecclesiology of the Church of England as the *via media* between Protestant error and Roman Catholic excess in the thought of Newman marked a decisive step in his attempt to develop a replacement hypothesis to account for the difficulty of change and continuity. The clear commitment to a doctrine of the visible

¹⁴² *Tract 15*, p.9.

¹⁴³ *Tract 15*, p.6. A somewhat improbable claim abandoned by the end of 1834, when, in *Tract 38*, Newman puts into the mouth of his cipher Clericus a distinction between Geneva and Rome: 'I like foreign interference, as little from Geneva, as from Rome. Geneva at least never converted a part of England from heathenism, nor could lay claim to patriarchal authority over it.' JHN, *Tract 38, Via Media No.I*, in *Tracts*, vol.1. ('*Tract 38*'), p.27.

¹⁴⁴ *Tract 15*, p.10.

¹⁴⁵ *Tract 15*, p.10.

¹⁴⁶ *Tract 20*, p.1.

¹⁴⁷ *Tract 20*, p.3.

Church as a prerequisite for the invisible¹⁴⁸ represented a further move away from Newman's Calvinist youth. He set out his first complete attempt at expressing the meaning of this *via media* in *Tracts 38* and *41*¹⁴⁹, which, together with *Tract 71*, were to be incorporated into the second volume of the collection published in two volumes under the title *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* in 1836.¹⁵⁰ The *via media* of these tracts was no *via negativa*: it is not conceived of as not this, nor that; not Protestant nor Catholic. It was, instead, presented by Newman in entirely positive terms. In proposing this synthesis, Newman was adopting the position he believed to have been taken by Hooker and the Caroline divines. Newman writes of the Church of England's position as a positive choice: 'The glory of the English Church is, that it has taken the VIA MEDIA, as it has been called. It lies *between* the (so called) Reformers and the Romanists'.¹⁵¹ It was 'not a matter of compromise but a positive position, witnessing to the mystery and the universality of God and God's kingdom working through the fallible, earthly *ecclesia Anglicana*'.¹⁵² England alone had kept to the deposit of faith, Newman argued, whereas the continental Protestants and domestic non-conformist Dissenters had mistakenly fallen into the error that was the natural product of *sola scriptura*. Rome's error, Newman observed, had been to seek to add to the faith: the 'presumption' of 'adding to the means of salvation set forth in Scripture... the Church of Rome has added other ways of gaining heaven'.¹⁵³ Newman maintained that the *via media*, to which the Church of England had remained faithful, had protected

¹⁴⁸ *Tract 11*, p.2f.

¹⁴⁹ *Tract 41: Via Media No.II*, in *Tracts*, vol.1. ('*Tract 41*').

¹⁵⁰ JHN, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church: illustrated in lectures, letters and tracts written between 1830 and 1836*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1836), in 2 vols. The critical edition of *the Via Media of the Anglican Church* edited by H.D.Weidner, reveals the extent of the alterations Newman made to the text of the various lectures, letters and tracts between the first edition in 1836 and the second in 1837. See Weidner, H., ed., JHN, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church: illustrated in lectures, letters and tracts written between 1830 and 1836*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990). The work was further revised in 1841 and again for the Uniform Edition for Longmans in 1885.

¹⁵¹ *Tract 38*, p.28.

¹⁵² Booty, 'Standard Divines', in Sykes et al., *The Study of Anglicanism*, p.176.

¹⁵³ *Tract 41*, p.37.

it from the dangers attendant upon other systems of theology. Whereas the decrees of Trent had driven Rome away from the right path, the Thirty-Nine Articles – no body of divinity – had ensured the Church of England remained true:

Our Articles are one portion of that accumulation. Age after age, fresh battles have been fought with heresy, fresh monuments of truth set up. As I will not consent to be deprived of the records of the Reformation, so neither will I part with those of former times. I look upon our Articles as in one sense an addition to the Creeds; and at the same time the Romanists added their Tridentine articles. Theirs I consider unsound; ours as true.¹⁵⁴

The vocabulary of ‘fresh battles’ and ‘fresh monuments of truth set up’ placed alongside the language of ‘accumulation’ and not parting with the records ‘of former times’ hints strongly at the positive and practical nature of the *via media* and places it within the context of Newman’s search for a coherent explanation for continuity in the face of change: for a stronghold in antiquity protected from the twin errors of self-will and the corrupting influence of ecclesiastical power. As he expressed it in *Tract 45*:

EVERY system of theology has its dangers, its tendencies towards evil. Systems short of the truth have this tendency inherent in themselves, and in process of time discover it, and work out the anticipated evil, which is but the legitimate though latent consequence of their principles. Thus, we may consider the present state of Geneva the fair result on the long run of the system of self-will which was established there in the sixteenth century. But even the one true system of religion has its dangers on all sides, from the weakness of its recipients, who pervert it. Thus the Holy Catholic doctrines, in which the Church was set up, were corrupted into Popery, not legitimately, or necessarily, but by various external causes acting on human corruption, in the lapse of many ages.¹⁵⁵

Such was Newman’s position at the end of 1834, on the eve of a controversy which was to hone his notion of the *via media* and ground it thoroughly within the tradition of the Anglican Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Before looking at this controversy in the correspondence with the Abbé Jager and the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* which were its direct product, it is first

¹⁵⁴ *Tract 41*, pp.31f.

¹⁵⁵ *Tract 45: The Grounds of our Faith*, in *Tracts*, vol.1, (‘*Tract 45*’), p.1.

necessary to consider the use Newman had made of patristic sources in the tracts of 1833 and 1834 and on the purposes which underlay his publication of other patristic material during that period.

III. Newman's early Tractarian use of the Fathers

In his 2009 *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, Jean-Louis Quantin sought to examine in detail, take on and deconstruct, the widely accepted '*idées reçues*'¹⁵⁶ of Tractarian historiography that there had been a constant practice within the Church of England stretching back to Cranmer, Jewel and Hooker whereby the Fathers of Christian antiquity had been the constant subject of particular study and were appealed to in support of this doctrine or that. Writing in 2001, Arthur Middleton – in a work Quantin dismisses as one of '*haute vulgarisation*',¹⁵⁷ – claimed that 'the *appeal to the Fathers* has been a seminal feature of the Anglican theological tradition since the sixteenth century' and is chiefly responsible for the 'peculiar character' of Anglicanism.¹⁵⁸ In making this claim, Middleton was doing no more than echo the opinion of the seventeenth-century Maurist, Dom Denys de Sainthe-Marthe:

. . . those of the English people that are called Episcopalians, and who compose the greatest part of the State ... profess to hold the Fathers in much greater respect than other Protestants do.¹⁵⁹

Quantin's thesis is, however, that no matter how widely held this view is, the reality is less obvious and more complex. Furthermore, Quantin argues that Sabine

¹⁵⁶ Quantin, *The CofE and Antiquity*, p.1.

¹⁵⁷ Quantin, *The CofE and Antiquity*, p.7.

¹⁵⁸ Middleton, A., *Fathers and Anglicans: The Limits of Orthodoxy*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 2001), pp.6f.

¹⁵⁹ de Sainte-Marthe, D., *Histoire de S. Gregoire le Grand, Pape et Docteur de l'Eglise*, (Rouen, 1697), p.383, in Quantin, *The CofE and Antiquity*, p.1.

Baring-Gould's suggestion that Anglicans derived 'their definite orthodoxy...from Catholic tradition and the study of the Fathers'¹⁶⁰ was little more than a conventional platitude hallowed by frequent repetition. Quantin suggests that the evidence simply does not support Newman's claim that:

...our Divines at and since the Reformation have betaken themselves to the extant documents of the early Church, in order to determine thereby what the system of Primitive Christianity was; and so to elicit from Scripture more completely and accurately that revealed truth, which though revealed there is not on its surface, but needs to be *deduced* and *developed* from it.¹⁶¹

He seeks to demonstrate that the reality is neither as static nor as univocal as Newman here suggested. However, whether Newman's position constituted quite the 'audacious feat of legerdemain' in re-presenting 'the English Reformation and, all its tomes, as a sort of patristic revival',¹⁶² as Stephen Thomas suggests, is quite another thing. It was certainly not 'legerdemain' to suggest that Hooker and the other standard Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had regularly sought to marshal proof-texts from the Fathers to provide evidence for the antiquity of particular teachings that formed part of the Anglican system. On the contrary, as Peter Nockles has observed, it was a staple of the theological method of the Old High Churchmen that the opinions of Christian Antiquity were to be treated as 'a corroborative testimony to the truth of the Church of England's formularies and the teaching of her standard divines'.¹⁶³ What Quantin and Nockles agree on is that the Tractarian myth of the rediscovery of the Fathers, that they had rescued Anglicanism by going back to the authentic theological methods of their sixteenth and seventeenth-century forebears, is

¹⁶⁰ Baring-Gould, S., *The Church Revival: Thoughts thereon and Reminiscences*, (London: Methuen, 1914), p.75.

¹⁶¹ JHN, 'Preface to the Catechetical Lectures of St Cyril of Jerusalem', in R.W.Church, ed., *Library of the Fathers*, no.2., (Oxford: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1839), p.x.

¹⁶² Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.200.

¹⁶³ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.114.

simply not supportable: ‘The Fathers were not “rediscovered”: they had never been forgotten’.¹⁶⁴

Quantin argues that the manner in which the Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth century had deployed patristic authority – and which had been taken up by the Old High Churchmen,¹⁶⁵ – ‘was an art of manipulating authorities, as part of what might be called a technology of truth’.¹⁶⁶ The Fathers stood as witnesses, and nothing more, to ‘what is agreeable to the teaching of the Old or New Testament’ and evidence of ‘what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from this selfsame doctrine’.¹⁶⁷ Whilst such an approach might have satisfied those who were content to accept as *fait accompli* the appeal to the Fathers that had been made by the Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was not an approach that could provide Newman with sufficient material to construct what he believed to be the necessary bulwark against what he understood as an Erastian attack on the Apostolical authority – and therefore the divine origin – of the Church of England. It was, he believed, precisely the limitation imposed by the self-denying ordinance against going beyond conventional High Church patristic proof-texting that had opened the Church of England up to the predations he had witnessed. This, at least, would appear to be the import of his aside about ‘Conservatism’ in his March 1834 letter to Henry Wilberforce¹⁶⁸ and his letter to Hugh James Rose later in the same month.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴ Quantin, *The CofE and Antiquity*, p.15 and Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.109.

¹⁶⁵ Quantin, *The CofE and Antiquity*, p.15.

¹⁶⁶ Quantin, *The CofE and Antiquity*, p.18.

¹⁶⁷ ‘Canon 6: Concerning Preachers, from the Canons of 1571’, in Henry Gee and William John Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, (New York: Macmillan, 1896), (*Documents Illustrative of English Church History*), p.476.

¹⁶⁸ JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 10 March 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.201f, here p.202.

¹⁶⁹ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 17 March 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.206f.

Other authors of the *Tracts* and other members of the Movement might have been content to follow conventional practice with regard to the use of the Fathers but it did not serve to create the imaginative impression of antiquity that Newman intended to deploy through the use of historical parallelism in order to serve his apologetic purpose. That Newman was able to adopt such a methodology was in part due to the unconventional route by which he first became familiar with the Fathers. Nockles identifies this route as beginning with Newman's early reading of Joseph Milner's *History of the Church of Christ*, to which reference has been made in the previous chapter, rather than by the more conventional Anglican starting point in the study of the Caroline divines.¹⁷⁰ Gareth Bennett concurred about the methodology but located the source somewhat later in Newman's reading: in what he believed to be the distorting influence of George Bull, whose work, and particularly the *Defensio*, Newman took up in preparation for the writing of *Arians*.¹⁷¹ Newman's own recollection, in the *Apologia*, was of the decisive influence of Bull in leading him 'to consider that Antiquity was the true exponent of the doctrines of Christianity and the basis of the Church of England' and the heavy reliance in *Arians* on the authority of Bull gives support to this memory.¹⁷² Whether it was Milner or Bull who were primarily responsible, 'the seeds of Newman's divergence of approach to antiquity from that of the Caroline Divines and old High Churchmen' had been sown in the impression on his imagination made by the 'age of martyrs',¹⁷³ and he would utilise this familiarity with the Fathers, deployed as his natural 'hot headed',¹⁷⁴ skills as a controversialist dictated,

¹⁷⁰ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.111.

¹⁷¹ Bennett, G., 'Patristic Tradition in Anglican Thought 1660-1900', in Gassmann, G., and V. Vajta, eds., *Tradition in Luthertum and Anglikanismus: OEcumenica 1971/2*, (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972), p.82.

¹⁷² *Apo.*, p.88.

¹⁷³ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.112.

¹⁷⁴ JHN to Harriett Newman, 16 October 1831, in *LD* ii, p.367.

to provide a model of a living church – the church of antiquity – that he wished to see reproduced in the nineteenth century.¹⁷⁵

This model of a living church was to be created, Newman believed, not only in the apologetic form of the *Tracts* but also in literary forms that would create impressions as much upon the imagination as the intellect. Newman had conceived of a poetic contribution in order ‘to bring out certain truths and facts, moral, ecclesiastical, and religious, simply and forcibly’ as early as November 1832.¹⁷⁶ Appearing in Rose’s *British Magazine* under Newman’s suggested title ‘*Lyra Apostolica*’ from June 1833, Newman eventually wrote forty six of the one hundred and seventy nine poems to appear. The tone he adopted and the use to which he put the Fathers in these poems is well illustrated by the verses he wrote whilst en route to Algiers the previous December¹⁷⁷ but which were not to appear in the *British Magazine* until August 1834.¹⁷⁸ Entitled ‘Athanasius’, Newman nonetheless marshaled Cyprian, Chrysostom and Ambrose in addition to the eponymous hero in verses that suggested that he understood precisely that the Church of England was in time of trial:

When shall our northern Church her champion see,
Raised by high heaven’s decree,
To shield the ancient faith at his own harm?
Like him who stayed the arm
Of tyrannous power, and learning’s sophist tone,
Keen-visioned Seer, alone.

The many crouched before an idol-priest,
Lord of the world’s rank feast.
In the sad night, mid the Saints’ trial sore,
He stood, then bowed before
The sacred mysteries; he their likeliest sign,
Weak vessel yet divine.

¹⁷⁵ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.113.

¹⁷⁶ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 26 November 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.119f., and here p.120.

¹⁷⁷ JHN to Mrs Newman, 19 December 1832, in *LD* iii, p.155-162.

¹⁷⁸ Blehl, *Bibliographical Catalogue*, p.84.

Cyprian is ours, since the high souled primate laid
 Beneath the traitorous blade
 His silvered head. And Chrysostom we claim
 In that clear eloquent flame
 And learned zeal in the same woe, which shone
 Bright round a Martyr's-throne.

And Ambrose' pastoral might we celebrate,
 Tho' with unequal fate,
 When in dark times our champion crossed a king.
 - But good in every thing
 Comes as ill's cure. Dim Future! shall we NEED
 A Prophet for truth's creed?¹⁷⁹

The poetry may not be of the first rank but the reader could be left in no doubt as to Newman's message, addressed as much to the imagination as to the intellect, nor to his intention of eliciting a sympathetic hearing by 'catching people when unguarded'.¹⁸⁰ As Ker observes, Newman 'had been unable to help comparing unfavourably the divided and threatened Church of England with that fresh vigorous Power of the first centuries'.¹⁸¹

The *Tracts* and poems or 'ballads'¹⁸² of the *Lyra Apostolica* were accompanied by *Records of the Church*,¹⁸³ a series of translations of patristic material, 'extracts from Eusebius etc.,...little stories of the Apostles, Fathers etc., to familiarize the imagination of the reader to an *Apostolical state* of the Church'.¹⁸⁴ Newman was not responsible for the translations, those being the work of '[s]everal Ch[rist] Ch[urch] men',¹⁸⁵ but he

¹⁷⁹ JHN to Mrs Newman, 19 December 1832, in *LD* iii, p.156.

¹⁸⁰ JHN to John William Bowden, 17 November 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.108-110, here p.109.

¹⁸¹ Ker, *John Henry Newman*, p.56.

¹⁸² JHN to John William Bowden, 17 November 1833, in *LD* iv, p.109.

¹⁸³ *Records of the Church*, 1-18 in *Tracts 1*, and 19-25 in *Tracts 2*.

¹⁸⁴ JHN to John William Bowden, 17 November 1833, in *LD* iv, p.109.

¹⁸⁵ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 15 December 1833, in *LD* iv, pp.140-142, here p.141. Newman later noted '[NB. Liddell, Thornton, Scott of Balliol?]', *LD* iv, p.141, n.5. Henry Liddell (1811-1898) in *DNB Online*, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/16640>>, [accessed 16 September 2013]>. Robert Scott (1811-1887), in *DNB Online*, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/24907>>, [accessed 16 September 2013]. At the time of Newman's letter to Froude, Liddell was still at Christ Church before his election the following year to a fellowship at Balliol. These two are best known for their jointly compiled Greek-English Lexicon, first published in 1843. Liddell was later Dean of Christ

was responsible for their publication and it is considered probable that he furnished them with their introductions, accompanying notes and conclusions.¹⁸⁶ Writing to Froude in December 1833, he recorded that ‘[w]e have 12 Numbers out of Records of the Church’,¹⁸⁷ seven of these were translations of Ignatius of Antioch’s letters and four others accounts of the martyrdom of Ignatius, of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, of James the Apostle and of Polycarp.

Newman continued with this concentration on the issue of persecution. In August 1833 Newman sent Rose a series of letters about the fourth century for publication in the *British Magazine*.¹⁸⁸ Three were on the way Ambrose of Milan withstood imperial pressure and the fourth was on the opposition of Basil of Caesarea to the Emperor Valens’ incursions into the Church. The parallels could not have been clearer, as King notes:

The tone of impending persecution of the English church was there from the beginning of the first Ambrose article, for political reform “makes it a practical concern for every churchman to prepare himself for a change, and a practical question for the clergy, by what instruments the authority of Religion is to be supported, should the protection and patronage of the government be withdrawn”¹⁸⁹

At the beginning of the Oxford Movement, during the meeting at Rose’s rectory, Arthur Perceval had set the nascent movement within the context of a time of persecution, albeit in his case the historical parallel was with the death of Charles I.¹⁹⁰

Church. Thornton refers to Charles Thornton (1810-1839), youngest son of the abolitionist and Clapham Sect member, Henry Thornton (1760-1815), in *DNB Online*, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/27357>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

¹⁸⁶ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, p.31, n.15.

¹⁸⁷ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 15 December 1833, in *LD* iv, p.141. For dating and attribution of the Records see Imberg, R., *In Quest of Authority: The ‘Tracts for the Times’ and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-41*, (Lund: Lund University Press, 1987), p.23, n.12.

¹⁸⁸ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 16 August 1833, in *LD* iv, p.30.

¹⁸⁹ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, p.32, quoting JHN, *HS*.i, p.339.

¹⁹⁰ Perceval, A., *Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1842), p.2.

With the publication of *Records*, Newman had used the same ‘sense of persecution’ as ‘the impetus for action’,¹⁹¹ but had moved the parallel to Christian antiquity. It was to prove a decisive move, both for the future of the Movement and for Newman’s own theological trajectory.

IV. The Correspondence with the Abbé Jager

Jean-Nicolas Jager (1790-1868) was a Roman Catholic priest of the Diocese of Nancy, who, in the summer of 1834, had met Newman’s acquaintance Benjamin Harrison.¹⁹² Harrison, a Christ Church don, was already the author of three of the *Tracts*.¹⁹³ Jager was interested in the position of the Church of England and had read some of the *Tracts*, together with Bishop Milner’s, *The end of religious controversy*,¹⁹⁴ a ‘classic statement of the Roman-Anglican controversy from the Roman side’.¹⁹⁵ He was also familiar with Lepappe de Trevern’s *Discussion amicale sur l’établissement et la doctrine de l’Église anglicane et en général sur la Réformation*.¹⁹⁶ Jean François Marie Lepappe de Trevern had been a French emigré clergyman living in exile in England during the period of the imposition, in post-revolutionary France, of the Civil

¹⁹¹ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, p.30.

¹⁹² Harrison had been a pupil of Newman’s brother Francis and, in June 1832 he was recommending him to Samuel Rickards as a tutor for Lord Maidstone. Newman there described him as ‘a treasure...a man of the deepest and soundest principles’. JHN to Samuel Rickards, 5 June 1832, in *LD* iii, p.53, and n.4. The meeting took place during Harrison’s visit to Paris whilst ‘arabicizing with De Saci’. JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 12 November 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.359-363, here p.360.

¹⁹³ *Tract 16: Advent; Tract 17: The Ministerial Commission: A Trust from Christ for the Benefit of His People; and Tract 24: The Scripture View of the Apostolical Commission*, all in *Tracts*, vol. I. He also wrote *Tracts 49: The Kingdom of Heaven*, in *Tracts*, vol. II.

¹⁹⁴ Milner, J., *The end of religious controversy, in a friendly correspondence between a religious society of Protestants and a Roman Catholic divine. Addressed to the bishop of St. David’s, in answer to his lordship’s Protestant catechism*, (London: Thomas Burgess, 1824).

¹⁹⁵ Allen, L., ‘Introduction’, in Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.5.

¹⁹⁶ Lepappe de Trevern, J.F.M., *Discussion amicale sur l’établissement et la doctrine de l’Église anglicane et en général sur la Réformation*, 2 vols., (London: 1817).

Constitution of the Clergy¹⁹⁷ and, because of his presumed familiarity with England and its national church, the book, which had been written as his licentiate thesis at the Sorbonne, was seen in France as a reliable guide and served as ‘a handbook of Anglican beliefs for French writers over several decades’.¹⁹⁸ Jager had also read Bishop John Jebb of Limerick's *Pastoral Instructions*.¹⁹⁹ This book, first published in 1815, contained a tract initially largely written by Alexander Knox which, by 1831, Jebb had expanded. Called *A tract for all times, but most eminently for the present: Peculiar Character of the Church of England; as distinguished, both from other branches of the reformation, and from the modern Church of Rome*, it picked up on a theme that had emerged in the correspondence between Knox and Jebb. The former had commented to the latter, in a letter of 1813: ‘What perverse influence the nickname of Protestant has had upon our Church ... It will perhaps be at length discovered, that there is a *medium* between the two extremes.’²⁰⁰ The letter and both the title and theme of the tract expressed a notion which, as Allen noted, ‘anticipated the Via Media by two decades’.²⁰¹

When Harrison wrote to Newman from Paris on 1 September 1834 suggesting that Newman might ‘gratify the Abbé’s wish ’ and enter into an ‘amicable controversy’

¹⁹⁷ Bellenger, D.A., *The French Exiled Clergy in Great Britain after 1789: A Working List*, (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1986), p.178.

¹⁹⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.5. Allen claims that Lepappe de Trevern was Bishop of Vannes before being translated to Strasbourg. This is incorrect. Before going to Strasbourg as Archbishop in 1826, he had been the bishop of the restored Diocese of Aire for three years. Allen’s confusion may have arisen because Lepappe de Trevern was a Breton, born in Morlaix. See *Catholic Hierarchy*, at <<http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/blpdt.html>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

¹⁹⁹ Jebb, J., *Sermons, on subjects chiefly practical, with illustrative notes and an appendix, relating to the character of the Church of England, as distinguished both from other branches of the Reformation, and from the modern Church of Rome*, 1st edn., (London: Cadell and Davies, 1815) and 3rd edn., (London: Cadell, 1831).

²⁰⁰ Alexander Knox to John Jebb, in Forster, C., ed., *Thirty years correspondence between John Jebb and Alexander Knox*, 2 vols., (London, 1834), here vol.2, p.122.

²⁰¹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.6.

about the *Tracts*,²⁰² Harrison had already resolved to participate in such an exchange. His involvement was, as Allen remarked, clearly entered into with the intention of ‘withdrawing from the controversy as soon as possible and persuading Newman to take his place’.²⁰³

Jager’s first challenge was published in Migne’s new newspaper *L’Univers religieux*²⁰⁴ on 30 August 1834 and Harrison replied three weeks later, on 18 September.²⁰⁵ In these initial exchanges Harrison and Jager limited themselves to identifying a measure of common ground in acknowledging the place of Tradition within Christianity, whilst disagreeing about where it was to be found and how it was to be applied. They both accepted the rule of the Vincentian Canon but, whereas for Jager it was a rule that argued for binding ecclesiastical authority in determining the locus and content of Tradition,²⁰⁶ for Harrison it was ‘an invitation to make a judgment about what Tradition is, on the evidence’.²⁰⁷ Faithful to the Anglican consensus, its historic formularies and standard Divines, Harrison, whose two letters were published under the cover of anonymity,²⁰⁸ argued that Tradition existed only as an unauthoritative, interpretative tool of the sole authoritative source, Scripture, and that of

²⁰² JHN to Hugh James Rose, 4 September 1834, in *LD* iv, p.326, n.2.

²⁰³ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.4.

²⁰⁴ Jacques-Paul Migne (1800-1875) was a priest, translator, editor and publisher of extraordinary industry. He is remembered for his *Patrologiae cursus completus*, comprised of the *Series Graeca* (‘PG’) and the *Series Latina* (‘PL’), which eventually ran to 386 volumes, published between 1844 and 1858, however his interests were wider than patristic scholarship. For an account of his life and work see Bloch, R.H., *God’s plagiarist : being an account of the fabulous Industry and irregular commerce of the Abbé Migne*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

²⁰⁵ For the chronology of the publication of the exchanges between Harrison and Jager in *L’Univers religieux* and between Newman and Jager, first in *L’Univers religieux* but from March 1835 in its associated weekly, *Le Moniteur religieux*, see Allen, *Newman and Jager*, pp.4-6. This present work relies on the text of the various contributions to these exchanges as published in Allen, *Newman and Jager*.

²⁰⁶ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.23.

²⁰⁷ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.22.

²⁰⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.4.

what it consisted was chiefly an historical question.²⁰⁹ Jager's position was consistent with the Tridentine synthesis of the *duplex fons* and he contended for the position of the Church's Magisterium in defining the content of Divine Revelation.²¹⁰ Such was the position by the end of October 1834 when Harrison had succeeded in 'entangling'²¹¹ Newman in the controversy.

Newman did not see at first that the correspondence would amount to much and indeed the manner in which he left off the controversy – simply allowing it to lapse when he failed to send off the second part of his second letter to the Abbé²¹² – suggested that he did not understand at any time throughout its duration that it would occupy 'a crucial position in his intellectual history'.²¹³ Nevertheless, as he explained in a letter to Jager which he did not send, Newman considered it 'a duty' to become embroiled in the exchange and wondered 'who was likely to undertake this service if [he] declined it'. He wrote: 'I consider I ought not to decline the challenge, believing as I do that truth is on my side.'²¹⁴ In the event, his initial prediction – 'I do not expect any thing will come of it'²¹⁵ – could not have been less accurate because, as Allen observed, 'the key text of the *Via Media*, and the main idea behind the *Essay on Development*, are directly derived from this controversy'.²¹⁶ 'The often uncomfortably acute enquiries of the tenacious Abbé'²¹⁷ enabled Newman to express 'a distinction, drawn possibly for the first time by [him] and later to play a great part in his work,

²⁰⁹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.22.

²¹⁰ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.26.

²¹¹ JHN to Archdeacon Froude, 25 October 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.346f., here p.347.

²¹² Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.8.

²¹³ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.1.

²¹⁴ JHN to the Abbé Jager, end of October 1834, in *LD* iv., p.350.

²¹⁵ JHN to Archdeacon Froude, 25 October 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.346f., here p.347.

²¹⁶ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.3.

²¹⁷ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.186.

between apostolical tradition transmitted by bishops, and prophetic tradition'.²¹⁸

Newman had been initially dismissive of Jager, calling him 'so weak that so far [the controversy] is no fun',²¹⁹ and later 'the most ignorant of men and the most inconsequent of reasoners'.²²⁰ Later still, picking up on Jager's prolixity, he described him as 'a chattering French Abbé, who says three words where one would do', yet he recognised the 'stimulus for reading' the Fathers that the exchange provided.²²¹

Newman saw that the correspondence at least served the purpose of his becoming more thoroughly acquainted with the issues, or 'to get up the controversy', as he put it, and to show that he was not 'a papist'.²²² He later felt obliged to play down the significance of the exchange and deny its crucial role in developing his theology,²²³ but, in writing the *Apologia*, he was prepared to acknowledge his debt to this episode in terms that certainly reflect the textual reliance of the *Prophetic Office* on the Jager letters,²²⁴ into which 'great portions' of those letters were 'incorporated'.²²⁵

Newman's first letter to Jager had been published in *L'Univers religieux* on Christmas Day 1834, accompanied by Jager's reply – which was typeset in larger print

²¹⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.7.

²¹⁹ JHN to John William Bowden, 5 February 1835, in *LD* iv, pp.24f., here p.25.

²²⁰ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 16 July 1835, in *LD* v, pp.99f., here p.100.

²²¹ JHN to Robert Isaac Wilberforce, 30 August 1835, in *LD* v, pp.133f., here p.133.

²²² JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 16 July 1835, in *LD* v, p.100.

²²³ JHN to the Abbé Jager, 1845 or 1846, in *LD* xi, p.81, see especially n.2 for reference to the note of 20 February 1868.

²²⁴ JHN, *Apologia*, p.140.

²²⁵ JHN, *Via Media*, vol.i., p.xi. The correspondence is, as Allen has claimed, undoubtedly 'not only in the mainstream of the perennial debate between Gallicans and Anglicans on the nature of the Church, but also part of the detailed picture of the Anglican Church which was continuously presented to French Catholic readers between 1830 and 1850'. Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.3. It certainly gives the lie to Tristram's dismissal of 'the astonishing insularity of Tractarian Oxford'. Henry Tristram, 'In the lists with the Abbé Jager', in *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays*, (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1945), pp.201-22, here p.203. Tristram's view seems even more unsupportable in the light of Pusey's early awareness of German Protestant Biblical scholarship or Newman's reading of French and German authors (albeit, for the latter, in translation) in preparation for *Arians*, noted in the previous chapter.

than Newman's letter.²²⁶ This publishing sleight of hand was indicative of the control of the process Jager was to exert throughout the correspondence.²²⁷ Newman's first reply was printed on successive days at the end of January 1835. This was answered by Jager in three letters published between 30 January and 18 March of that year.²²⁸ The first part of Newman's second response was published in *Le Moniteur religieux* in two sections, the first in December 1835 and the second in February 1836, alongside Jager's seventh letter and the *de facto* close of the correspondence.

Newman's argument in the correspondence with Jager sought to draw a distinction, with which the Abbé had been hitherto unfamiliar,²²⁹ between the fundamental articles of faith, 'doctrines ... necessary for Church Communion', and other traditional teachings. The former, which Newman saw as identical with 'the articles of the Creed' were to be proved from Scripture, even if mediated through Tradition, and had about them a fixed content, 'ever one and the same, admitting of no addition and imperishable'.²³⁰ To the Tradition through which this 'fundamental creed',²³¹ was handed on, Newman gave the name 'Apostolic Tradition', later 'Episcopal Tradition'. Of this 'fundamental creed', Thomas, who is here as elsewhere, perhaps, over-anxious to point up the shortcomings of Newman's argument,²³² suggests

²²⁶ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.6.

²²⁷ Jager wrote to Harrison in early 1836 to announce that he intended to publish the entire correspondence in book form containing his own answer to Newman's second response as the final word in the debate even before he had received the second part of Newman's second response (which was, in the event, never sent). The book appeared later that year as *Le Protestantisme aux prises avec la doctrine catholique, ou Controverses avec plusieurs ministres anglicanes, membres de l'Université d'Oxford*, (Paris: Debécourt, 1836), ('*Le Protestantisme*'). It seems not inconceivable that Newman's decision to let the correspondence lapse was not unconnected with this precipitate and unilateral action. See Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.8.

²²⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.6.

²²⁹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.186.

²³⁰ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.36.

²³¹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.40.

²³² Thomas uses terms such as 'rather confusing', which he adopts following Sykes, S., *The Identity of Christianity*, (London: SPCK 1984), p.100, 'structural incoherence' and 'grotesque elaborate precision'. Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.186.

that Newman ‘does not clarify its relation to the various Creeds which came into existence in the Early Church’.²³³ Although the correspondence with Jager does not make this relationship clear, in a letter of July 1835 in which Newman summarized the state of the debate for the benefit of Froude, he is quite clear: ‘I will receive as necessary for Church Communion all the articles conveyed by [Apostolical Tradition]. *But I do already.* They are the Apostles’ Creed’.²³⁴ Newman had already confirmed to Jager that those doctrines necessary for Church Communion were identical to the ‘doctrines necessary for salvation’.²³⁵ In the same letter, Newman ascribed to this Apostolical Tradition an authority that seemingly went beyond the received reading of Article VI or the strict limits he had encountered in Hawkins:

But here we come to the other sense of Tradition, viz that strict Traditio from one hand to another, from definite person to definite person, official and exact, which I may call *Apostolical* or *Episcopal*. I will allow that such a Tradition does carry its sanction with it as fully as Scripture does.²³⁶

In the essay he contributed to the *British Critic* in July 1836, occasioned by the publication of the *Brothers Controversy*,²³⁷ Newman was to write:

This, then, is what is meant by Catholic tradition;...not by arguing and deducing from Scripture...but as being a separate apostolic information, parallel with Scripture, verified by, but not subsisting in it.²³⁸

²³³ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.187.

²³⁴ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 20 July 1835, in *LD* v, pp.102-104, here p.103.

²³⁵ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.40.

²³⁶ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 20 July 1835, in *LD* v, p.103.

²³⁷ Longley, C.T., and R. Davenport, *The brothers' controversy: being a genuine correspondence between a clergyman of the Church of England and a layman of Unitarian opinions: chiefly on the questions how far belief is an act of the will; on the use of reason in the study of the Bible; and how far it is the duty of unlearned Christians to examine or implicitly abide by the religion of their education*, (London: Fellowes, 1836).

²³⁸ JHN, ‘The Brothers’ Controversy, being a genuine Correspondence between a Clergyman of the Church of England and a Layman of Unitarian Opinions.’, in *The British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, (‘*British Critic*’), 20 (1836), pp.166-199, here p.194. The article was rewritten and published, in the Uniform Edition as ‘Apostolical Tradition’, *Ess* i, pp.102-137, where this passage, as might be imagined, had been rhetorically strengthened, by the then Roman Catholic Newman, to read: ‘Granting that Scripture does not force on us its full dogmatic meaning, that cannot hinder us looking for that meaning elsewhere. Perhaps Tradition is able to supply both interpretation and dogma...an Apostolical Tradition, supplementary to and interpretative of Scripture.’ Here p.115.

Here he was writing against Hampden whose appointment to the Regius Chair of Divinity at Oxford had been made in February and whom Newman considered to be entirely unsuitable to hold the post.²³⁹ It is, however, a clear statement of the theology he had been laying out in his letters to Jager.

Newman had suggested, in his first letter, a second strain of Tradition ‘in matters of doctrine not fundamental and of discipline’, which here he calls ‘pure Tradition’.²⁴⁰ By July Newman was calling this ‘*prophetical Tradition*’, which, in terms that would hardly have surprised Hooker, he told Froude was:

... the voice of the body of the Church, the received system in the Church, the spirit circulating through it and poured out through the channel of its doctors and writers ... the system taught, interpretative, supplementary, applicative, of the Scripture doctrine.²⁴¹

In the first part of Newman’s second letter he elaborates the point. The ‘Prophetic Tradition’ permeates:

... the body of the Church like an atmosphere ... This is that body of teaching which is offered to every individual according to his capacity ... although it be not necessary to submit to it without proof.²⁴²

This Tradition is not unproblematical, as Jager was quick to point out in terms that were not dissimilar to Froude’s criticism of them.²⁴³ Newman’s distinction between articles of faith and articles of religion – the former fundamental, necessary for

²³⁹ In the note to ‘Apostolical Tradition’, as it appeared in *Ess.i*, p.137, Newman describes the essay as ‘being a continuation of a series of protests’ against Hampden’s theology. It had been sent to Rose, for the *British Critic* on 12 February 1836, hard upon Hampden’s election to the Divinity chair. JHN to Hugh James Rose, 12 February 1836, in *LD v*, p.233. See Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, pp.125f. Newman’s relationship with Hampden had been strained from the first, Hampden having beaten Newman to the chair of Moral Philosophy in March 1834. JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 10 March 1834, in *LD iv*, p.201. The two exchanged hostile and ill-tempered letters in May and June of 1835 following Newman’s circulation in the Oriel Common Room of a pamphlet, written by Henry Wilberforce and published anonymously. *LD v*, pp.73f. and 83-85.

²⁴⁰ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.36.

²⁴¹ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 20 July 1835, in *LD v*, p.102.

²⁴² Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.95.

²⁴³ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.107. Cf. Richard Hurrell Froude to JHN, 17 July 1835, in *LD v*, p.100-102, here p.101.

salvation, provable from Scripture and the ground of communion; the latter ‘ecclesiastical doctrines which are not fundamental’²⁴⁴ – immediately begs the question of which doctrines belong in which category. Newman’s earlier inclusion of the Nicene *ὁμολόσιον* in the latter category, suggesting that there was a distinction to be drawn between ‘general doctrine’ of Nicaea and its terminological expression,²⁴⁵ had drawn from his interlocutor the ‘blunt demand for him to spell out what the fundamentals are’,²⁴⁶ and when, in the second letter he repeated the assertion, it was clear that Newman’s distinction had limitations in the way it could deal with the problem of heresy.

Jager believed that the answer to this problem lay in the authority of the Church.

He wrote:

No doubt, there is a difference between apostolic tradition and prophetic exposition. The prophets or the doctors of the Church are obliged to define, to comment, to develop the mysteries of religion, and to put them within the people's reach. But as Vincent says, they must do it 'while preserving the same doctrine, the same sense, the same judgment'. When you develop a truth, you do not change it, on the contrary, you give it more force, more lustre, greater scope. That is what the Fathers and the Doctors of the Church did. The Church took care to warn those who had the misfortune to stray from the apostolic doctrine in their explanations, she pointed out their errors, and condemned them when necessary. And so apostolic tradition has remained pure and intact until our own day, and will remain so until the end of time.²⁴⁷

In the light of the use by Newman of an exactly parallel argument, citing the same Vincentian authority, in the Introduction to the *Essay*,²⁴⁸ it comes as ‘[l]ittle wonder that Jager thought he had some effect on Newman's idea of development’.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁴ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.189.

²⁴⁵ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.86.

²⁴⁶ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.189.

²⁴⁷ Jager, *Le Protestantisme*, p.424.

²⁴⁸ *Dev.*, pp.7ff.

²⁴⁹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.18.

There are other parallels between the correspondence and Newman's later work which reveal just how significant an effect the controversy had on him. The very idea of the Prophetic Tradition, even if confined within the parameters Newman had applied to it, opened the door to development because, as Allen contended: 'The notion of a developing agency is obviously contained in this idea of a prophetic tradition.'²⁵⁰ Indeed, although Newman was to assert that 'to develop is not to create',²⁵¹ Allen was surely also correct to argue that:

While proclaiming the stability of Anglican doctrine and at the same time being aware of change, Newman brings forward at various times interpretations of change which gradually expand and are clarified under his hostile gaze until at last he finds that this elaboration of arguments to render change and development explicit is beginning to act as a justification of it.²⁵²

Pereiro suggests that to read this awareness of change within the prophetic tradition as a support for the idea of development is to invert the argument. He contends that Newman's purpose in allowing for change here is to 'exclude' the development of doctrine.²⁵³ Again, this would appear to be confusing the notion of the development of doctrine with the specifically Roman Catholic conception of it as Newman then perceived it. Indeed, it would appear that Pereiro himself is aware of this confusion for, immediately after asserting that because, as Allen says, at the time of the Jager correspondence, for Newman, 'the object of faith ... itself remained identical and invariable',²⁵⁴ he admits that what was in issue was not whether there were developments in doctrine but whether 'they could be imposed by the Church, as truths to be believed by the faithful'.²⁵⁵ Despite his assertion that '[t]he evidence against

²⁵⁰ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.16.

²⁵¹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.95.

²⁵² Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.12.

²⁵³ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.167.

²⁵⁴ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.13.

²⁵⁵ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.167.

Newman having held a theory of development before 1840 is compelling',²⁵⁶ – an assertion which was considered and called into question in the previous chapter in connection with the link between the principle of reserve and that of development identified by Selby²⁵⁷ – Pereiro here explicitly admits that Newman did indeed hold a theory of development earlier than the exchange with Wood, at least in embryo, and certainly by the time of the Jager correspondence. What he is justified in arguing is that the theory of development which Newman demonstrably held at that time was one different from that which he understood the Abbé and Rome to be proposing.

Newman's misconceptions of the Roman position have been alluded to earlier. Despite Jager's careful, if prolix, explanation, Newman still seemed to think that the Roman position allowed an untrammelled licence to positive action to develop doctrine by Magisterial *fiat*. It was some time until he was to accept that this was not the Roman position, in fact not until after his engagement with Wiseman that will be considered in next chapter. However in his later years, in the period around and after the First Vatican Council, Newman was to encounter more than enough Roman Catholics who appeared to held to precisely such a notion.

In view of later developments, perhaps the most surprising parallel which Newman draws in the controversy with Jager is that between the position of the Church of England and that of the Donatists. In the first part of his second letter he admits that Anglicans stand in the same position with regard to the Roman Communion as the Donatists did to the undivided Catholic Church of the fourth and fifth centuries: i.e. judged by the whole Church to be in the wrong. Newman excuses the Church of England from the same fate for reasons of the uncertainty of ecclesial authority rather

²⁵⁶ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.166

²⁵⁷ Selby, R., *The Principle of Reserve*, pp.72f.

than doctrinal content: ‘We are ... in that stage of doubt on the *universality of the teaching*, and *many bishops* share our views.’²⁵⁸ Newman’s purpose in engaging with the Abbé had been to defend the Church of England and to expose the Roman system. It is not surprising then, given the polemical purpose of the correspondence, that in this exchange Newman was not to see the inconsistency of his position. In the next chapter the effect of his study of various heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries on his view of the case will be examined: suffice for the present to record Allen’s comment:

Indirectly, then, the conjunction which so startled him in 1839, of Donatists, Anglicans, and St. Augustine, had been present to his mind in 1835; without producing the dramatic effect it had later. In this point too, though, Jager might well make a claim that his arguments had, however circuitously, produced their effect.²⁵⁹

Newman was to refine his problematical terminology in order to deal with the unresolved problem of what was fundamental and what was not when he returned to the matter in a review of the series of lectures Wiseman had given at St Mary Moorfields in Lent 1836.²⁶⁰ Newman had reprised many of the arguments from the Jager correspondence in a series of lectures given in the Adam de Brome Chapel of the University Church throughout 1835 and responding to Wiseman’s lectures gave him further opportunity to examine the material. In so doing he chose to revise his vocabulary and to use words that Thomas has described as being ‘more immediately communicative’: words such as ‘necessary’ or ‘essential’ instead of ‘Fundamentals’ and choosing to avoid the problematical distinction between ‘essential’ and ‘saving’ on which Jager had pressed him so hard.²⁶¹

²⁵⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.104.

²⁵⁹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.20.

²⁶⁰ JHN, ‘Wiseman’s *Lectures on the Church*’, in *British Critic*, 20 (1836), pp.373-403, (‘Wiseman’s *Lectures on the Church*’). Wiseman’s lectures were published as *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, 2 vols., (London: 1836).

²⁶¹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.192.

In the Wiseman review, and even more so in the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, Newman mapped out a *via media* that was both faithful to the tradition of Hooker, Laud and Stillingfleet²⁶² and yet contained his own distinctive idea. The *Lectures on the Prophetical Office* represented Newman's definitive presentation of the material from the controversy with Jager. He wrote to Maria Giberne that he had 're-written some parts of it an incredible number of times', but that he seemed 'to be making way very remarkably here, in Apostolical views ... may it be supernatural'.²⁶³ That the work as first published continued to enjoy Newman's confidence can be reasonably inferred from the fact that the only change he was to make to the work, when the third edition appeared in 1877,²⁶⁴ was the addition of a preface in which he sought to clarify:

... first, how far and with what argumentative force these Lectures, published just forty years since, bear upon the teaching in faith and morals of the Catholic Church, against which they were more or less directed; and next what satisfactory answer can be given in explanation of the main charges in which they issue.²⁶⁵

The product of the controversy with the Abbé was in an ecclesiological concept of the *via media* understood as expressing '...the wisdom required to decide correctly the virtuous middle course between alternate vices in the life of the Church'.²⁶⁶ Whereas Rome had defined 'points of faith *beyond* Scripture', adding to the 'points necessary to be believed in order for salvation', the Church of England, alone it would seem, had maintained 'what is agreeable to Scripture doctrine', and, using Hooker's expression, 'what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from this

²⁶² JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude, 12 November 1834, in *LD* iv, pp.359-363, here p.360.

²⁶³ JHN to Miss M.R. Giberne, 27 November 1836, in *LD* v, pp.384f., here p.385.

²⁶⁴ JHN, *The via media of the Anglican church : illustrated in lectures, letters, and tracts written between 1830 and 1841*, 2 vols., (London: Pickering, 1877-1882), vol.i, pp.xv-xciv. ('*Via Media: Preface to 3rd edn.*')

²⁶⁵ JHN, *Via Media: Preface to 3rd edn.*, p.xv.

²⁶⁶ Allen, W., 'Newman's Model of the Church', in Davies, M., ed., *A Thankful Heart and a Discerning Mind: Essays in Honour of John Newton*, (Dursley: Lonely Scribe, 2010), p.172.

selfsame doctrine':²⁶⁷ It was this doctrine which could be determined by reference to the written testimony of Scripture and the writings of the Fathers of the ancient and undivided Church. It was no accident that Newman chose here to quote the words of the sixteenth-century canon.²⁶⁸ It was a conscious statement of Anglican orthodoxy, redolent of Hooker's assertion regarding Tradition, that: '[n]either may we in this case lightly esteem what hath been allowed as fit in the judgment of antiquity, and by the long continued practice of the whole Church'.²⁶⁹ Newman was proposing a church – proposing, for as he admitted in the preface to the *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, 'the *Via Media*, viewed as an integral system, has never had existence except on paper'²⁷⁰ – which took a *via media* between the 'infidelity' of Protestantism, whether of the Continental variety or of domestic Dissent, and Roman 'corruption of the gospel': a church 'Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Roman'.²⁷¹ As Peter Nockles has noted, in seeking to establish this 'integral system', Newman was attempting 'to supplement the existing incoherent [Anglican] system' so that the Church of England could 'literally ... represent the church of antiquity in doctrinal fullness' in order 'to compete with the Church of Rome'.²⁷² In the hands of Pusey this would eventually resolve into what Nockles has dubbed a 'patristic fundamentalism',²⁷³ but that would take place long after Newman had been forced to abandon the position. For the time being, the apostolicity of this *via media* would be found in its fidelity to the Scripture doctrines of the written witnesses of Christian antiquity; it would be a Catholicism not guaranteed by Rome but by Scripture and the Fathers; it would be a Catholicism of the Word.

²⁶⁷ JHN, 'Wiseman's *Lectures on the Church*', p.379.

²⁶⁸ 'Canon 6: Concerning Preachers, from the Canons of 1571', in Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, p.476.

²⁶⁹ Hooker, *Laws*, p.30.

²⁷⁰ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, in VM. i, p.16.

²⁷¹ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, in VM i, p.20.

²⁷² Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.130.

²⁷³ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.145.

Chapter 3

From a Catholicism of the Word to a Catholicism of the Church – 1839-42

Almost as soon as it was proposed, the theory of the *Via Media* as the guarantor of the Catholicism of the Word began to creak under the strain of Newman's continued scholarly examination and re-examination of the Christological heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries. As an ecclesiological construct, notwithstanding his comments about its essentially untried nature,¹ it served to bolster Newman's position in the Church of England and to provide him with some rational justification for his continued prejudice against the Church of Rome.² Nevertheless, its utility to him, even in this latter regard, was to fail as he struggled further to make sense of the early history of Christian doctrine. The structural deficiency in the argument, proposing a *via media* between the 'most simplistically dogmatic and the nihilist-relativist' without examining fully the properly ecclesiological consequences was, as Cameron argues, at the heart of the weakness.³ It was one which arose from Newman's conviction at this point that those two extremes did not exist in the early Church and so the ecclesiological dimensions that might need to be fleshed out if the theory were to hold did not suggest themselves to him.⁴ Indeed Dietz has suggested that the fatal flaws in the *Via Media* are to be found in the fact that as a 'multi-faceted proposition' it begs a whole series of questions that Newman consciously avoided attempting to answer since, she argues, he

¹ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, in *VM* i, p.16. See also JHN, *Apologia*, pp.70f and 73f.

² As late as February 1841, Newman wrote: '...while Rome is what she is, union is impossible...Rome must change first of all in her spirit. I must see more sanctity in her than I do at present. Alas! I see no marks of sanctity – or if any, they are chiefly confined to converts from us.' JHN to J.R.Bloxam, 23 February 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.41-43., here p.4.

³ Cameron, E., *Interpreting Christian History: The Challenge of the Churches' Past*, (Oxford: Blackwells, 2005), p.6.

⁴ *VM* i, p.16

knew that the answers would lead him Romeward.⁵ Whether or not that is so, the use against him of his own favoured rhetorical device of historical parallelism together with several events in the life of the Church of England in which Newman was to a greater or lesser extent a protagonist were to reveal that the construct, when tried, lacked the robustness needed to survive. These weaknesses ensured that, by 1842, he could see that the claims of this Catholicism of the Word were largely illusory. He had suspected as much even as the theory was first beginning to take shape in his writings. In the *Via Media*, he had written: ‘what has been said is but a dream, the wanton exercise, rather than the practical conclusion of the intellect’.⁶ Newman came to believe that this hypothesis was dependent upon a heavily confessional predetermined reading of history and that the untried nature of the theory in real life was a direct result of what he came to believe was its unreality. As Stephen Thomas observes:

The collapse of the ‘Via Media’ did not happen just because events turned against him, but also because he found his position inadequate to an ever-increasing, erosive, inner criticism: the *experimentum crucis* to which he refers in the *Apologia*.⁷

This chapter first looks at how Newman’s continued study of heresy undermined the foundations of his Catholicism of the Word, before moving on to a consideration of the effects on him of a series of articles by Nicholas Wiseman in the *Dublin Review*. It contends that the intermediate solution of ‘possession’ which he proposed in response to Wiseman was little more than a place-holder which was unable to stand the double assault of the response within the Church of England to Newman’s *Tract 90*, especially from the bishops, and the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric. It argues that Newman came to see that the dichotomy that he had originally posed between

⁵ Dietz, K., *John Henry Newman and the Fathers of the Church: the Birth of an Ecclesiology*, unpublished STD Thesis, Pontifical University of St Thomas, Rome, 2007, p.92.

⁶ VM, vol.i, p.331.

⁷ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.202.

Catholicity and Apostolicity was false. It will show that, in order to provide a sustainable hypothesis which could offer an account of the evidence of change that did not undermine his commitment to the principle of continuity in the doctrine of Christianity, Newman came to an emerging awareness of the necessity of the Church as a living organ of authority. In so doing Newman laid out, in correspondence with his brother Francis, the outlines of what would become his theory of development: one which was able to offer the possibility of determining whether a change was, to use the terminology Newman was to adopt in *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, an authentic development or a corruption.

I. Researching the Monophysites

The notion of the Church, with its four creedal notes, but particularly its catholicity and apostolicity, anchored in the presumed univocal written testament of Christian antiquity lay at the heart of the ‘supreme confidence’ which Newman later recalled had characterised his own ‘controversial *status*’ within the Church of England at the beginning of 1839.⁸ The presumption of this unanimous testimony, which gave the theory of the *via media* its capacity to dismiss both Roman corruption and Protestant infidelity with equal ease, had become a given for Newman as he looked forward, at the beginning of the Long Vacation of 1839, to returning to the material of early heresies. Indeed it had, if anything, been reinforced by Newman’s studies of heresy prior to 1839. Even as far back as his work on *Arians*, Newman had proceeded on the basis that the voice of orthodoxy was demonstrably univocal and his 1835 study of

⁸ *Apo.*, p.180.

Apollinarianism had especially singled out for criticism the ‘speculations of a self-willed and presumptuous intellect’ in the face of that ‘which Scripture had prescribed, and the Catholic Church witnessed’.⁹ Newman believed that it was heresy that was pluriform and heresiarchs who were inconsistent, even self-contradictory in their positions: it was to be expected that contradictions, inconsistencies and incoherence would be found in the historical record of heresy. No such evidence was to be expected in the historical record of orthodoxy because it was always faithful to its Apostolic root even as it became more explicit, even as ‘fresh and fresh articles of faith’ were necessarily defined ‘to secure the Church's purity’ against ‘the rise of successive heresies and errors’.¹⁰ ‘Truth alone is consistent with itself’, he had written in *Lectures on the Prophetical Office*.¹¹ When Newman turned to examine the history of the Monophysite heresy his conviction that such a simplistic distinction could be drawn between the development of heresy and the clarification of orthodoxy was to be fatally undermined.

Newman’s correspondence in July 1839 records his evident pleasure in being in residence at Oriel alone during the Long Vacation of 1839 for the opportunities it gave him to return, after a gap of four years, to a systematic reading of the Fathers. In his letter to Isaac Williams he delighted in the prospect it afforded:

I am solus in College and am likely to be – a comfort I have not had for several Long vacations – It is my hope to be able to return to my own subject, the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, which I have read little or nothing about since 1835.¹²

⁹ JHN, *Apollinaris’ History*, p.11, in BOA B.2.5.

¹⁰ JHN, VM ii, p.40. It was to this remark that JHN added the note in the Uniform Edition ‘[Here, as above, the principle of doctrinal development is accepted as true and necessary for the Christian Church.]’

¹¹ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office*, in VM i, p.37.

¹² JHN to Isaac Williams, 1 July 1839, in LD vii, p.99.

Less than two weeks later he wrote in reply to Frederic Rogers that although his correspondent had ‘no business to ask me whether I have got on with my reading in so short a time’, he had done ‘satisfactorily’ and despite having ‘wasted some days in doing nothing’:

I have got up the question of the parentage, etc., of the works given to Dionysius the Areopagite. I have got up the history of the Eutychian controversy, got hold of the opinions of Eutyches, and the turning point of the controversy (no easy matter in Theology), have read through the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, have got up St Leo’s works, and (though last, not least) have at length, by further reading and hunting about, *proved*, as I think, what I have long believed, that the word *Persona*, or *Πρόσωπον*, was not a technical word in the controversy of the Incarnation till after 350-360.¹³

This remarkable level of industriousness was, he told Rogers, to be followed by reading through the Monophysite controversy and the Nestorian in order ‘at once to finish Dionysius’. Writing the same day to Robert Wilberforce he explained that he hoped to ‘be able to finish an Edition of Dionysius of Alexandria’ which he ‘long had on hand for the University’¹⁴ and in a further letter to Isaac Williams, Newman recorded that he ‘had got through more than I had expected’.¹⁵ He also promised Williams a paper for the Theological Society, perhaps the untitled eleven page manuscript on the Monophysite controversy dated 1839.¹⁶ This was one of three works on the subject which Newman produced over that summer. These provide the first written evidence of his growing unease with the *via media* as ‘an approximation to a required solution’¹⁷ to the problem of reconciling what had by now become, to Newman, the clear evidence of doctrinal change with the fundamentally static nature of the truths of revelation.

¹³ JHN to Frederic Rogers, 12 July 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.104ff.

¹⁴ JHN to R.I.Wilberforce, 12 July 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.106f.

¹⁵ JHN to Isaac Williams, 18 July 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.110f.

¹⁶ BOA B.2.8.c.

¹⁷ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, in *VM* i, p.31.

The three unpublished papers on the Monophysite controversy which are dated to the summer of 1839 are of differing character and length. The untitled manuscript referred to above is the shortest of the three and, indeed has the character of a paper intended to be heard rather than simply read: the longest entitled *The Monophysite Heresy* and dated 23 August 1839,¹⁸ at eighty-three manuscript pages is the longest of Newman's works to remain unpublished and is a systematic account of the origins and character of both Eutychianism and Monophysitism, as well as more general observations on the nature and character of heresy. The third document is found in a privately printed paper, also containing Newman's 1835 paper *Apollinarianism*.¹⁹ In the manuscript held in the Birmingham Oratory Archives the fourteen pages on the Monophysite controversy begin with a prefatory note in Newman's own hand that makes clear its connection with *The Monophysite Heresy*: 'The following is an abstract of a MS of this date, with Notes and References.'²⁰ Of the three works, it is the longest, *The Monophysite Heresy*, which, unsurprisingly, provides the fullest account of Newman's thinking concerning this particular controversy but also clear evidence of the effect that his reading had had on his confidence in the theory of the *via media*.

In the opening pages of *The Monophysite Heresy*, Newman mapped out the origins of the heresy in the reaction within the Egyptian church to the challenge of Arianism: as an over-reaction to the attack on Christ's divinity that the Antiochene heresy posed. Stephen Thomas observes that *The Monophysite Heresy* picked up where Newman 'left off when treating of Apollinarianism':²¹ both in terms of the chronology – Newman here began the paper with an explicit dating of its *terminus post*

¹⁸ JHN, *The Monophysite Heresy*, in BOA B.2.9, ('*The Monophysite Heresy*').

¹⁹ JHN, *Apollinarianism*, in BOA B.2.9.a. The pages on Monophysitism at pp.17-31.

²⁰ BOA B.2.9.a., at p.17.

²¹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.208.

quem in 361²² – and in terms of ‘its method and schematising the heresy’. Thomas’s point here is to argue that Newman’s own recollection, in the *Apologia*, is fundamentally unreliable. Thomas argues that, unlike many other passages in the *Apologia*, Newman’s version of events here is not supported by contemporaneous evidence: he cites no letters or other works in support of his memory. The language of the *Apologia* is dramatic. Newman wrote that ‘It was during the course of reading that for the first time a doubt came upon me of the tenableness of Anglicanism.’²³ He went on:

My stronghold was Antiquity; now here, in the middle of the fifth century, I found, as it seemed to me, Christendom of the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries reflected. I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The Church of the *Via Media* was in the position of the Oriental communion, Rome was where she is now; and the Protestants were the Eutychians.²⁴

Surely, Thomas argues, if Newman’s reaction to his Long Vacation reading had indeed been so dramatic, then:

... what particularly provokes suspicion is that Newman does not support this splendid piece of self-dramatisation by any corroboration of letters or memoranda of the time – something he always does in the *Apologia* – by drawing upon what was by 1864 a large personal archive.²⁵

Benjamin King, in *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, follows Thomas’s line, commenting: ‘Yet the connection that Newman claims to have seen thereafter, between the Donatist-Anglican analogy and Monophysitism, hardly appears in Newman’s work at the time.’²⁶ He remarks, in a footnote that:

The only connection that Thomas can find in late 1839 is the ‘might seem’ of the first sentence of this quotation from the 1840 article ‘The Catholicity of the English Church’: ‘The Monophysites got possession of whole districts, and might seem, if any men, identified with the local Churches in those districts’ –

²² JHN, *The Monophysite Heresy*, p.1.

²³ *Apo.*, p.208.

²⁴ *Apo.*, pp.208f.

²⁵ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.205.

²⁶ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, p.162.

the point being that Anglicanism ‘might seem’ to be identified with a district too’²⁷

It would appear, however, that King has over-simplified the rather more subtle argument that Thomas advances and overlooks those allusions in *The Monophysite Heresy* that Thomas concedes might support Newman’s own record. Commenting that ‘[w]hat Newman does *not* draw upon to substantiate his reminiscences are the papers on Monophysitism which he actually wrote in 1839’,²⁸ Thomas argues that this is because ‘they present a very different picture ... from that which he put forward in 1845, 1850 or 1864’.²⁹ It is Thomas’s contention that, driven by ‘the exigencies of later rhetorical strategies’ the accounts of the events of the summer of 1839 Newman produced in the *Essay on Development, Difficulties of Anglicans* and the *Apologia* are ‘a later rhetoricisation of past experience’.³⁰ Yet, in his analysis of *The Monophysite Heresy* – an analysis King seems to overlook entirely – Thomas points to exactly the kind of contemporaneous corroboration whose absence he claims and even offers an explanation of its tentative character, recalling that:

The sense that Newman might have been, as early as 1839, beginning unhappily to find points of correspondence between himself and the Monophysites emerges most clearly in the opening pages of *The Monophysite Heresy*.³¹

Thomas, in fact, does not accept this, opting instead for what he calls the ‘more probable solution’: that Newman did see the parallel between Monophysitism and the church of *via media* but not until later in 1839 when he encountered Wiseman’s *Dublin Review* article.³² However, Thomas’s treatment of that later episode is, as will be seen in the next section of this chapter, deeply problematical and, in drawing a conclusion

²⁷ King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, pp.162f, at n.90.

²⁸ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.205.

²⁹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.205.

³⁰ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.204.

³¹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.206.

³² Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, pp.218f.

that completely ignores or is unaware of evidence in two letters from Newman in the autumn of 1839, denies both Newman's own recollection and contradicts Thomas's own 'more probable solution' here.

It is Thomas's governing theory in *Newman and Heresy*, that the habit of historical parallelism and engagement in the polemic of his day provides the only proper hermeneutic for understanding Newman's treatment of heresy. Indeed, *Newman and Heresy* is a detailed and largely convincing analysis of Newman's intellectual history as an Anglican seen from this perspective. Occasionally, however, it seems as if this theory is read back into events rather than established by reference to them and here is one such. In looking at the works on Monophysitism, Thomas appears to be simply not prepared to countenance Newman's own assertion in the *Apologia* that, rather than being engaged in a controversial project, in his reading over the Summer of 1839 he 'was absorbed in the doctrinal question'.³³ If, however, Newman's recollection of his doctrinal preoccupation is correct, then comment on sixteenth or nineteenth-century parallels would be of at least secondary importance, if not entirely out of place. Thomas's insistence here on seeing a methodology and purpose in Newman's work on the Monophysites that prejudicially pre-determined his approach to the historical record is, at best, confused. He has offered an explanation from *The Monophysite Heresy* which is at least as probable as his own 'more probable solution' and one which corresponds to Newman's own recollection. That this explanation does not easily cohere with Thomas's over-arching theory seems a poor reason to discount it. To dismissively describe the account in the *Apologia* as a

³³ *Apo.*, p.208.

‘splendid piece of self-dramatisation’³⁴ is to fail to recognise that, as Ker has argued, ‘Newman had every reason at the time to keep quiet about this devastating bombshell for fear of unsettling his Tractarian followers’.³⁵

Both Thomas and King, in his *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, offer persuasive evidence that the work on the Monophysites was a continuation of Newman’s 1835 work on Apollinarianism. The letters from Newman to Williams, Rogers and Wilberforce in July 1839 suggest that that was precisely how Newman himself saw it.³⁶ The parallels which he had drawn in 1835, in both *Apollinaris’ History* and in *Letter XVI* entitled *Apollinaris* in his *Letters on the Church Fathers* which appeared in the *British Magazine* in July 1836,³⁷ were used explicitly to support Newman’s Tractarian position. They highlight how Apollinaris, although initially faithful to Athanasius, had, through the exercise of private judgment, gradually slipped into error and heresy. It is clearly a criticism by historical parallel of liberalism in religion, as Thomas observes: ‘This could almost be Blanco White: the rationalism, though the outcome of an unregenerate *ethos*, is tragically concealed from its exponent by delusion.’³⁸ When writing for publication, lest the parallel was lost on the reader, Newman ended the account by spelling out the implications of the parallel. The story of Apollinaris illustrated, for him, that the Tractarian insistence on the need for precise definitions of faith was the only bulwark against the infidelity of liberalism. The historical parallels Newman had drawn in 1835 served to bolster his Tractarian position,

³⁴ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.205.

³⁵ Ker, I., ‘Newman, Councils and Vatican II, in Ker, I., and T. Merrigan, eds., *Newman and Faith*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2004), p.122, n.12.

³⁶ JHN to Isaac Williams, 1 July 1839, in *LD* vii, p.99; JHN to Frederic Rogers, 12 July 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.104ff; JHN to R.I. Wilberforce, 12 July 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.106f; and JHN to Isaac Williams, 18 July 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.110f.

³⁷ JHN, ‘Letters on the Church Fathers: Letter XVI’, in *British Magazine*, 1 July 1836, 10 (1836), (‘*Letter XVI*’), pp.35-41.

³⁸ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.144.

whereas those he recalled having seen in 1839, undermined it. Such parallels could hardly be said to support Newman's 'supreme confidence' in his 'controversial *status*' nor yet to enhance his 'great and still growing success, in recommending it to others'.³⁹ A certain reserve in communicating any doubts that his reading had occasioned was only to be expected, as Thomas concedes:

To include the parallel between the Monophysites and the Tractarians in his 1839 writings would have been to turn his guns on his own friends, allies and disciples, and on the position which he still publicly stood for. He was not yet ready to do that.⁴⁰

Scarcely less problematical than his refusal to accept Newman's account of the 1839 parallel is Thomas's analysis of text of *The Monophysite Heresy*. He sees clearly that Newman's account of the 'topology' of the various heresies:

... hints at a frightening sense of closeness here: if Syria was the seat of rationalism and humanitarianism, then did its antithesis, 'Egypt' – he cannot quite bring himself to write 'Alexandria' – the home of Clement, Athanasius and Cyril, eventually spawn the most perduring and divisive heresy in the history of the early Church?⁴¹

He also notes Newman's 'certain sympathy with the Monophysite *ethos*',⁴² quoting him as observing:

As the Monophysite heresy is contrary to Arianism in doctrine, so, as might be expected, is it in its ethical character. It was far more subtle, specious and attractive to pious minds.⁴³

He goes so far as to suggest that here 'an ominous, though dim, recognition of the face in the mirror has been registered'.⁴⁴ Thomas then goes on to identify, in Newman's:

... meticulously fair distinction between Eutychianism and Monophysitism ... a quite new sense of the danger of a moderate position – of a 'Via Media' – in dogmatic controversies ... Newman, then, was confronted with a moderate position eschewing both Eutychianism proper and Chalcedonian orthodoxy,

³⁹ *Apo.*, p.180.

⁴⁰ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.218.

⁴¹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.206.

⁴² Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.206.

⁴³ JHN, *The Monophysite Heresy*, p.2.

⁴⁴ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.207.

which maintained itself by the highly self-conscious and theoretical adoption of fine distinctions.⁴⁵

Yet he still notes that whilst Newman ‘*may* have seen a parallel between this and his own “Via Media” ... , he did not remark on it’.⁴⁶

Newman’s analysis of the Monophysite heresy as essentially conservative, that is of resisting of dogmatic innovation, provides Thomas with his final hint in *The Monophysite Heresy* at the disquiet the reading had engendered in Newman. He notes that between 1833 and 1839 Newman had ‘so often expressed’⁴⁷ the view that innovation was the mark of heresy, whereas here he was forced to observe that it was the Monophysites who ‘claimed but the use of what was already received’.⁴⁸ The parallel with the Tractarian position that Rome had added to the faith, which Newman had argued throughout his correspondence with the Abbé Jager, is clear and, although admitting that it cannot have been lost on Newman, nevertheless, Thomas comments: ‘But, again, although we may imagine that this may have disturbed Newman, he makes little of it.’⁴⁹ This is to ignore the obvious import of Newman’s letter to Rogers on 22 September 1839. Written shortly after he had read the Wiseman article and, as will be shown in the next section, realised the force of its argument, Newman observed to his friend that ‘the whole history of the Monophysites has been a sort of alterative’.⁵⁰ The term ‘alterative’ has the clear meaning of a medicine acting upon internal processes rather than causing an external reaction.⁵¹ Thomas suggests that this letter is nothing more than further evidence that it was the occasion of Wiseman’s article ‘rather than the

⁴⁵ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.207.

⁴⁶ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.207.

⁴⁷ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.207.

⁴⁸ JHN, *The Monophysite Heresy*, p.58.

⁴⁹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.208.

⁵⁰ JHN to Frederic Rogers, 22 September 1839, in *LD* vii, p.154.

⁵¹ See the entry in the *OED Online* at

<<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2277/view/Entry/5778?redirectedFrom=alterative&>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

scholarly researches of his closet some weeks before'⁵² that first began to undermine Newman's belief in the church of the *via media*, although, as will be shown in the next section, Thomas is ultimately not prepared to concede even that. The choice of a particular word with such a specific meaning and the relative proximity in time to the events recalled, supports the contention that the account in the letter to Rogers is the more probable and that Newman's later recollections, although admittedly written with rhetorical purpose, are reliable. It seems at least as likely as any other explanation, particularly in the light of the evidence – so ably marshalled by Thomas himself – in the text of *The Monophysite Heresy*, and Newman's near contemporaneous recollection in the letter to Rogers, that it was indeed Newman's Monophysite researches that were the first intimation to him of the parallel he was soon to see more starkly.

It is important to record, at this point, that Newman's reading of the fifth century controversies shared with his earlier work on those of the previous century that sense of a necessary but unwelcome '*Verfallstheorie* of dogmatic language' commented on by Williams in his essay 'Newman's Arians'.⁵³ However, by the time of *The Monophysite Heresy*, this goes beyond merely a change in the language to an acknowledgement that the understanding of the underlying 'richer truth' has itself moved, 'superseding the innocent variety of earlier days'.⁵⁴ Newman's theological sympathies, again in parallel to fourth-century controversy, were with the doctrinal formulae of the *status quo ante*: then with Cyprian now with Cyril. But it is not the Christological questions that primarily absorbed Newman in 1839. As Daley observes:

⁵² Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.219.

⁵³ Williams, 'Newman's Arians', p.270.

⁵⁴ Williams, 'Newman's Arians', p.270.

What is interesting in Newman's reading of these fifth and sixth century controversies over Chalcedon is that his attention is focussed almost exclusively on the questions they raised about the teaching authority in the Church.⁵⁵

It was a focus that would come to dominate Newman's search for a hypothesis to account for the difficulty of doctrinal development in the years that remained to him as an Anglican.

II. Wiseman's *Dublin Review* Article

In a three part article, published in the April and October 1838 and the August 1839 editions of the Catholic quarterly periodical, the *Dublin Review*, Nicholas Wiseman published a review of the *Tracts* which sought to undermine the basis upon which the principles of the Oxford Movement had been constructed. Wiseman's aim was to demonstrate as illusory the claim of the authors of the *Tracts*, amongst them Pusey, Keble and Newman, that the Church of England was a legitimate branch of the universal Church, enjoying the rights, powers and privileges of that Church, and in full possession of its sacramental and doctrinal economy through a share in apostolic succession.

On 19 September 1839, Newman was shown the article and the effect on him was profound, something he recorded both in correspondence at the time and in retrospective recollection.⁵⁶ That a single piece of controversialist apologetic should have such a dramatic effect on Newman seems extraordinary and demands explanation. His reaction would, in the absence of his Monophysite researches, suggest that the

⁵⁵ Daley, B., 'Newman and the Alexandrian Tradition', in Merrigan, T., and I. Ker, eds., *Newman and Truth*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2008), pp.147-188, here p.179.

⁵⁶ JHN to Frederic Rogers, 22 September 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.154f, and JHN, *Apologia*, pp.116ff.

claim on Newman of the hypothesis of the *via media* was fragile in the extreme. It is critical to understanding how Newman came to abandon the church of the *via media*, with its claims to Apostolicity grounded in the Catholicism of the Word, to establish why he should have reacted so strongly to the article and its claims. Particular attention must be given to the manner in which Wiseman put his case and to Newman's theological preoccupations at the time, both of which made him particularly susceptible to the argument in the article. Furthermore, if the article had such an effect on Newman, its effect on the other leaders of the movement needs to be considered. In order to be able to attempt to address these issues, it is necessary to look closely at both the form and the substance of Wiseman's article, at Newman's entries in his diaries at this point, his correspondence and his other works, together with the correspondence of the other Tractarians. This analysis demonstrates that Newman's reaction was determined in no small measure by Wiseman's compelling use of a methodology that closely echoed Newman's own. Considering the particular theological questions that had occupied him in the early part of 1839 and the distinctive nature of the ecclesiology of the *via media*, Newman's reaction to Wiseman's article will be shown to be almost unavoidable and the lack of reaction in the other leaders of the Movement scarcely surprising. Furthermore, although, in the later months of 1839 and in 1840, Newman appeared to regain much of his prior confidence in Anglicanism, it will show that the ultimate effect of Wiseman's article was to force Newman to recognise that the Church of England could not provide him with the hypothesis he needed to account for the difficulty of doctrinal development.

Founded in 1836, *The Dublin Review* was a Catholic quarterly with which Nicholas Wiseman was intimately connected. Wiseman had been awarded his DD

after public examination before he was quite twenty-two years old, a Roman Professorship at twenty-five, and became Rector of the Venerable English College in Rome at twenty-seven.⁵⁷ He was to be consecrated a Bishop at the unusually early age of thirty seven and later, in 1850, became the first Archbishop of Westminster and the first Cardinal resident in England since the death of Pole nearly three hundred years earlier. On a brief return to England in 1835, Wiseman had been concerned about the small number of English Catholics capable of, or interested in, entering into discussion with non-Catholics. In establishing, the *Dublin Review*, which he edited jointly with Michael Quinn and Daniel O'Connell, he hoped to provide a means of addressing Catholic issues and of responding to non-Catholic critics. The *Dublin Review* soon acquired a wide readership and by the autumn of 1839 it was not in any sense surprising that former Oxford acquaintances of Newman such as Henry Manning, then a Rural Dean in Sussex or Robert Williams, a banker, barrister and Tory MP for Dorchester, would be reading it and drawing Wiseman's articles to his attention.

The article that both Manning and Williams placed before Newman in September 1839⁵⁸ was a paradigmatic example of what Wiseman had intended the *Dublin Review* to achieve. It was a serious engagement by a Catholic author (in this case Wiseman himself) with the ideas and discourse of non-Catholics: in this case the theology of the *Tracts* and particularly with the notion of Apostolical Succession which underpinned, both for Newman and the other Tractarians, the notion of the *via media*.⁵⁹

⁵⁷For a hardly impartial account of Wiseman's stratospheric trajectory, see Ward, W., *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, (London: Longmans, Green, 1897). See also Fothergill, B., *Nicholas Wiseman*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1963); and Schiefen, R., *Nicholas Wiseman and the Transformation of English Catholicism*, (Shepherdstown, WV: Patmos Press, 1984).

⁵⁸ Williams in person on 19 September 1839 and Manning by letter, H.E.Manning to JHN, 17 September 1839 at LD vii, pp.154f.

⁵⁹ For the background to this revival in Anglican claims to Apostolical Succession see Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, pp146-183.

The subject of Apostolical Succession held a central place in the *Tracts*, occurring in the titles of no fewer than five⁶⁰ and central to the treatment of the particular subject matter in twenty-nine others. Taken together with the branch theory and the *via media*, this was the ground that Wiseman set out to occupy.

In the article, published in three parts in 1838 and 1839, Wiseman purported to review the *Tracts*. The review was not, however, a simple literary assessment of the *Tracts* but a systematic, concerted and sustained attack upon their theology. It was not, however, an attack conceived aggressively. Wiseman wrote:

The times, Heaven knows, are sufficiently bad. It is a work of charity to try to mend them. The collection of Tracts...which forms the three volumes⁶¹ before us, was published for this purpose. As a well-intentioned attempt, it deserves our sympathy.⁶²

This was not a case of Wiseman patronising the ‘well-known knot of divines at or from Oxford’,⁶³ still less damning them with faint praise. He not only knew the quality of his interlocutors but also respected them, within limits:

Will they succeed? We firmly believe they will: nay, strange to say, we hope so. As to patching up, by their prescriptions, the worn-out constitution of the poor old English Church, it is beyond human power.⁶⁴

Wiseman recognised that he would have to take on the arguments of these interlocutors using the self-same methods with which they had first advanced them. While Catholic apologetic since the sixteenth century had most often been expressed in the categories and language of the controversies of that century, Wiseman realised that if he were to achieve his purpose, he would have to go further back. Newman, in his *Lectures on Justification*, had done the same to present an approach to the classic

⁶⁰ *Tracts 4, 15, 19, 24 and 74*

⁶¹ Volumes IV and V had not yet been published.

⁶² Wiseman, N., ‘Tracts for the Times’, in *Dublin Review*, 4 (1838), (‘*DR*, IV’), pp.307-335, here p.307.

⁶³ *DR*, IV, p.308.

⁶⁴ *DR*, IV, p.308.

Catholic/Protestant difference regarding faith and good works. To deal with the present issue, Wiseman would do the same. ‘Antiquity and authority are their watchwords’,⁶⁵ he noted and so those would be the tools he used to counter them.

In the first two parts, Wiseman concentrated on arguments from authority to attempt to prove that ‘the Anglican Church could not sustain any claim on her part to a share in apostolical succession’.⁶⁶ He believed that, in doing so, he had proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the Church of England was, at the very least, in a state of schism from the Catholic Church. In the third part it was his intention to deliver the *coup de grace* to the ecclesiology of the Tractarians, using the witness of antiquity, demonstrating that the Church of England was not just in a state of schism but, ‘according to the principles of the ancient Church’, that such a state of schism ‘is a state of sin, of outlawry, and deprivation’.⁶⁷ The third part begins with a restatement of what Wiseman claimed to have achieved in the earlier parts and rehearsal of the methodology he had adopted thus far, including those concessions that he had made to Anglicanism, ‘(i)n order to simplify the controversy’.⁶⁸ He went on to make a further concession: that for the sake of progress he was prepared to lay aside any charge of heresy against Anglicans and proceed solely on the basis of the charge of schism. Although he by no means conceded that Anglicans were not heretics, and believed that it was practically improbable that a schismatic should remain long a schismatic without falling into heresy,⁶⁹ Wiseman recognised that to insist on this position would be to introduce a deeply controversial and emotive issue that need not be addressed in

⁶⁵ DR, IV, p.308.

⁶⁶ DR, 7 (1839), (‘DR, VII) pp.139-180, here p.140.

⁶⁷ DR, VII, p.141.

⁶⁸ DR, VII, p.139.

⁶⁹ DR, VII, p.141, where he cites both Augustine and Jerome as authority for this position.

fulfilling his present purpose. He wrote that his objective in this third article was to demonstrate that the counsels of antiquity were against even the possibility of the Branch theory and that his chosen method would be to examine the question ‘by the light of antiquity, and judge it entirely by the rules laid down and determined by the fathers of the primitive Church’.⁷⁰

Wiseman took as his example the case of the conflict between St Augustine and the Donatists. Whilst he was at pains to lay out the ecclesiological terms of the controversy, he gave no detailed account of the underlying historical background or doctrinal differences at issue. Whilst this, at first glance, might appear to be an oversight or a lack of thoroughness on his part, it is, in truth, the methodological key to the theological core of his argument. Wiseman confined his argument tightly to an attempt to use the voice of antiquity to convict the English Church of schism: all other issues, doctrinal, sacramental or historical, were surplus to his apologetic requirements. That is not to say that he did not use particular parallels to drive home the point: he drew a parallel between the position of Lucilla, whose opposition to Caecilian had done so much to occasion the Donatists crisis, with that of Anne Boleyn as an agent of the schism,⁷¹ as he does the issue of the confiscation of sacred vessels by the Donatists with the dissolution of the monasteries⁷² and that both justified their actions by reference to supposed corruptions.⁷³ He even notes that both the Donatists and the Tractarians insisted on being called Catholics⁷⁴ and that both held themselves to be a ‘branch’ of the Church Catholic.⁷⁵ Wiseman’s examination of the Donatist controversy was, he

⁷⁰ *DR*, VII, p.143.

⁷¹ *DR*, VII, p.144.

⁷² *DR*, VII, pp.144f.

⁷³ *DR*, VII, pp. 149, 150 and 155.

⁷⁴ *DR*, VII, p.146.

⁷⁵ *DR*, VII, p.160.

contended, applicable to the case of Anglicanism even if some of the details of the parallels are somewhat strained or distorted because the fundamental parallel is not dogmatic but ecclesiological.⁷⁶ This methodology allowed Wiseman to look in detail at the manner in which the Catholic Fathers dealt with the Donatists and then let the parallels speak for themselves with regard to the position of the Anglican Church.

The primary means by which the Catholic Church attempted to deal with the Donatists, was in denying the latter's claim to be a part of the Catholic Church. This response was, Wiseman said, 'simple and clear'⁷⁷ and consisted in demonstrating 'the fact of the Donatist Church, however numerous its bishops and its people, being excluded from communion by other Churches'.⁷⁸ Wiseman quotes both Optatus and then Augustine in his letters against Parmenianus, Petilianus and Cresconius 'as sufficient to prove that the Churches in communion must be true to the exclusion of all that stand in separation from them'.⁷⁹ He then noted that, just as the Donatists justified their separation from Catholic communion on the grounds of the alleged corruption of the Catholic Church, so did Anglicans. Citing both the *Book of Homilies* and John Jewel's, *The Apology of the Church of England*, as precise parallels with the Donatist argument, Wiseman quoted St Augustine as authority. He wrote:

Either the Church was so corrupted before your reformers came, that it had ceased to be the Church of God, or not. If it was, then had Christ's promise failed, which secured perpetuity to his Church; if not, whence did those who separated from it derive their authority?⁸⁰

This argument, it seems, was sufficient for Wiseman:

These passages hardly require any comment; any reader of ordinary judgment will see how St Augustine must, upon his principles, have judged the case of the

⁷⁶ DR, VII, p.143.

⁷⁷ DR, VII, p.148.

⁷⁸ DR, VII, p.148

⁷⁹ DR, VII, p.149.

⁸⁰ DR, VII, p.153.

English Church... These principles, if applied to the modern controversy, will go a great way towards deciding the respective positions of the Catholic and Anglican Churches.⁸¹

This must hold, he argued, even if the doctrinal differences are not in any sense parallel between the case of the Donatists and the Anglicans, since it is necessary that there is some method by which such differences, whatever they may be, can practically be judged. Antiquity, in the person of Augustine, provided just such a method: ‘*Qua propter securus iudicat orbis terrarum, bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum in quaecumque parte orbis terrarum.*’⁸²

The remaining twenty five pages of Wiseman’s article are given over to working out the consequences of this primary argument and dealing with any possible objections he can foresee. Wiseman continued to resort to the authority of the Fathers to show that ‘it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the See of Rome, and who are not’.⁸³ In support of this contention, Wiseman quoted not only Augustine but Ambrose, Jerome, Aurelian, John of Constantinople, Gregory the Great and even the Third Council of Carthage, which warned Catholics to be on their guard against Donatist Bishops, ‘*ne quis Donatistorum cum honore suo recipiatur sed in numero laicorum*’.⁸⁴ The overall impression reading the article is of Wiseman delivering an almost interminable series of patristic blows against the ecclesiological arguments of the Tractarians and any possible justification for them. The style is consistent and utterly relentless, indeed, Wiseman admitted as much: ‘We here close our article, not

⁸¹ DR, VII, p.153.

⁸² DR, VII, p.154, quoting from St Augustine, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, bk.III, ch.IV, para.24, in Migne, PL, 43, p.101.

⁸³ DR, VII, p.163.

⁸⁴ DR, VII, p.175.

from want of materials, but from fear of wearying.’⁸⁵ He had set out to use the voice of antiquity against the arguments of the Tractarians and he believed that he had successfully done so:

The voice of antiquity is, therefore, clear and loud upon the claims to apostolical succession of any Church involved in schism, that is, which is not in communion with other Churches, and especially with that of Rome. Implicated in a crime which no possible circumstances can justify; exercising their functions, even when validly, still without profit to the souls of men; styled wolves rather than shepherd; admitted into the Church only as laymen – can bishops so characterized have been considered by the ancient Church descendants and representatives of the apostles?⁸⁶

Although he had already seen it, Newman’s attention was again drawn to Wiseman’s article on 19 September 1839 by Robert Williams. The tone of Williams’ correspondence with Newman suggests that, despite his own achievements, he still related to Newman in many ways as a student over-eager to impress a don. On a visit to Oxford he showed Newman the article. Newman’s recollection of the event in the *Apologia* records that, on first reading he ‘did not see much in it’⁸⁷, until Williams drew to his particular attention ‘the palmary words of St Augustine ... *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*’.⁸⁸ He wrote that the effect on him of hearing Williams repeat those words time and again was as the effect on Dick Whittington hearing the bells of London calling him to return or of Augustine hearing the child’s voice repeating the phrase ‘*Tolle lege, tolle lege*’.⁸⁹ Newman recorded that Augustine’s words ‘gave a cogency to the Article, which had escaped me at first. They decided ecclesiastical questions on a

⁸⁵ *DR*, VII, p.180.

⁸⁶ *DR*, VII, p.175.

⁸⁷ *Apo.*, p.211.

⁸⁸ *Apo.*, p.211.

⁸⁹ *Apo.*, p.212.

simpler rule than that of Antiquity; ... here then Antiquity was deciding against itself ... the theory of the Via Media was absolutely pulverized'.⁹⁰

The kind of 'corroborative evidence from the period in question' that Thomas finds lacking in the account of the parallel with Monophysitism,⁹¹ is, however, available with regard to the account of the effect on Newman of the Wiseman article. For example, Newman's letter to Frederic Rogers on 22 September 1839, in which he wrote of the effect of reading the article, Newman admitted:

I have had the first real hit from Romanism which has happened to me...I seriously think this is a most uncomfortable article on every account... there is an uncomfortable vista opened which was closed before.⁹²

It is language strikingly similar to that recalled by Henry Wilberforce in an article for the *Dublin Review* in 1869, where he records Newman as having confided to him an 'astounding confidence' in October 1839, that 'for the first time since I began the study of theology, a vista has been opened up before me, to the end of which I do not see'.⁹³ Wilberforce also recalled Newman as being resolved of the importance of a reply to Wiseman: 'It is quite necessary that I should give a satisfactory answer to it, or I shall have the young men around me ... going over to Rome.'⁹⁴ The necessity of a response he had certainly alluded to in the letter to Rogers and he makes similar remarks in a letter to S.F.Wood on 29 September 1839, where he refers to his desire to persuade Keble to answer the article and to hear Pusey's views on the matter.⁹⁵ In November, Newman wrote to Bowden in clear terms:

⁹⁰ *Apo.*, p.212.

⁹¹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.219.

⁹² JHN to Frederic Rogers, 22 September 1839, in *LD*, vii, pp.154f.

⁹³ Henry Wilberforce, 'F.Newman's Oxford Parochial Sermons', in *Dublin Review*, n.s., 12 (1869), ('*DR(new)*, 12'), pp.309-330, here p.327.

⁹⁴ *DR(new)*, 12, p.327.

⁹⁵ JHN to S.F.Wood, 29 September 1839, in *LD*, vii, p.156f. For a consideration of the wider Tractarian engagement with the competing claims of Catholicity and Antiquity in the development of doctrine see James Pereiro, '*Ethos*', pp.130-185.

You should read the late article in the Dublin – it is the best thing that Dr Wiseman has put out. It is paralleling the English Church and the Donatists; and certainly the parallel is very curious – the only question is whether Augustine’s notions are Catholic on this point – *he* certainly does seem to make for Dr W.⁹⁶

Later in the same month, writing this time to Robert Williams – a letter written but not sent – Newman used similar language to that he had used earlier to Wood and which Henry Wilberforce recalled.⁹⁷ Here he suggests that he has yet to have the ‘view’ that might lead to Rome, whereas he had earlier suggested to Wood and, assuming that his (Wilberforce’s) recollection is accurate, to Wilberforce, that he had already seen the ‘vista’, even if he was not sure where it was to lead. Nevertheless, and allowing for his intent in urging caution on Williams, the imagery Newman chose is sufficiently consistent to provide corroboration for Wilberforce’s recollection. His later recollection in *Apologia* is of an almost evanescent experience: what Newman had seen was, as he was later to say, a ghost:

The heavens had opened and closed again. The thought for the moment had been, “The Church of Rome will be found right after all;”[sic] and then it had vanished. My old convictions remained as before.⁹⁸

It is not only the use of language that prefigures Newman’s later work and that it should have been written but not sent, that is remarkable about the letter to Williams. The nervousness it conveys is also striking. In it Newman can offer Williams no better an argument against Wiseman than the risk of private judgment leading one into making a move that might later be wrong. Such prudential caution, such care in the exercise of private judgment is characteristic of Newman – in many respects, the *Apologia* is an extended account of that caution – but here, particularly if Turner’s argument is correct that Newman’s preoccupation at the time was the behaviour of the

⁹⁶ JHN to J.W.Bowden, 4 November 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.176-178, here p.177.

⁹⁷ JHN to Robert Williams, 10 November 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.180f., here p.180.

⁹⁸ *Apo.*, p.213.

younger members of the Oxford Movement (an argument that can hardly account for Newman not having sent the letter to Williams),⁹⁹ it seems inadequate. Newman appears to have recognised the unsatisfactory nature of the letter. Sending it to Wood, he wrote: ‘I have stupidly written the inclosed [sic] on half a sheet, and have so miserably written it that you will be plagued by reading it.’¹⁰⁰ If Turner’s thesis is to be maintained, and the effect of the Wiseman article had been not nearly so dramatic as has been claimed, the weakness of the unsent letter to Williams, written when Newman was composing his response for the *British Critic*, an article certainly complete by 29 November 1839,¹⁰¹ is inexplicable.

Stephen Thomas offers a different account. In looking to discount Newman’s account of the effect of the Monophysite research and in suggesting that it was only after receiving the ‘hit’ from Wiseman that Newman came to see ‘an analogy between the “Via Media” and Monophysitism’,¹⁰² Thomas accords the Wiseman article a greater significance than does Turner. Nevertheless, he too seems determined to overlook the language Newman used. Newman had not claimed that his research into the Monophysites had changed his entire view of the *via media*. In writing to Rogers on 22 September 1839, Newman made the explicit claim that the Monophysite research had been ‘a sort of alterative’ to which Wiseman’s article was the ‘dose’.¹⁰³ It is a very precise expression, admitting only of tight construction. Newman was not suggesting that the Monophysite parallel had been a major crisis but that it had

⁹⁹ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.337.

¹⁰⁰ JHN to S.F.Wood, 10 November 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.181f, here p.181.

¹⁰¹ JHN to Mrs John Mozley, 29 November 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.187.

¹⁰² Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.218.

¹⁰³ JHN to Frederic Rogers, 22 September 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.154f., here p.154.

unsettled him such that the force of the Wiseman article was able to do real damage.¹⁰⁴

In the absence of other evidence that calls into question the reliability of each and every recollection of an individual, even a recollection of an experience less than six weeks old – and Thomas adduces none – this is exactly the sort of evidence that accords with the ‘common sense ... view that individuals have private access to their own experiences’ the recollection of which is indeed ‘uncriticisable’.¹⁰⁵ It was, indeed, precisely the interior unsettling of his position caused by the ‘alterative’ of the Monophysite episode that made possible the exterior reaction to the ‘dose’ of the Wiseman article.

Newman’s own account of the effect of the Wiseman article on him in the *Apologia*, albeit an account of theological controversy later recollected in tranquillity, would appear, on the basis of the contemporaneous evidence, to be substantially accurate. Early the following year, Newman wrote again to Bowden. Using imagery that, as will be seen, would reoccur in the *Essay*, Newman leaves no doubt as to the magnitude of the effect upon him of Wiseman’s article:

As to Dr Wiseman’s article I do not think you have hit the point of it. It made a very great impression here – and, to say what of course I would only say to such as yourself, it made me for a while very uncomfortable in my own mind. He maintains first that the present *look* of Christendom is such, that St Austin or St Basil coming among us would say at once, ‘*That* is the Catholic Church – and *those* are heretics –’ meaning Rome and us respectively.¹⁰⁶

The previous month Newman had written to Pusey:

Since I read Dr W’s article I have desponded much – for, I said to myself, if even I feel myself pressed hard, what will others who have either not thought so much on the subject or have fewer retarding motives?¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ See Ferguson, T., ‘The Enthralling Power: History and Heresy in John Henry Newman’, *Anglican Theological Review*, 85 (2003), pp.641-662, here, especially, pp.654-659.

¹⁰⁵ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.218.

¹⁰⁶ JHN to J.W.Bowden, 21 February 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.240-242, here p.241.

¹⁰⁷ JHN to E.B.Pusey, 15 January 1840, in *LD* vii, p.214.

The evidence from Newman's letters, diaries and literary output suggests that one significant reason why the effect on him was comparatively so intense may have been that he had been occupied with purely theological questions for well over a year prior to his exposure to the article, whereas the other Tractarian leaders had quite other preoccupations. Pusey had spent the four years up until 1839 with children of fragile health and an increasingly incapacitated wife, who died in May of that year. His own correspondence at the time is unsurprisingly filled with touching sorrow, although he does find time late in the year to advert to the Wiseman article.¹⁰⁸ Seeking evidence in support of the Anglican position against Wiseman, Pusey enquired of Manning: 'Do you know any other (other than Hammond on Schism) good clear book, shewing that the absence of inter-communion does not involve schism?'¹⁰⁹ Several weeks later he asked Manning to research evidence regarding the relative sizes of Eastern Orthodox Churches with the purpose of further attacking Wiseman's premise.¹¹⁰ These are the only extant letters of Pusey on the controversy and they are all to Manning, who had clearly been struck by the Wiseman article when it was first published. By the time he received the letters from Pusey, Manning had already written to Newman expressing his concern that he was 'half glad to find it, and three-fourths afraid of it'.¹¹¹ By coincidence, Newman received Manning's letter on the very same day that Williams had shown him the article. Keble's correspondence at the time is filled with the parochial concerns of the Vicar of Hursley and with the ill-starred scheme for the Church of the Holy Saviour, Leeds. In none of his correspondence does he make any reference either to the Wiseman article or the effect that it was having on Newman or anyone else. Similar practical considerations fill the letters at this time of the other

¹⁰⁸ Pusey to Manning, 11 December 1839, in Liddon, Henry, ed., *Correspondence of Dr Pusey*, in *Liddon Bound Volumes*, Dr Pusey's Library, Pusey House, vol.109, ('LBV, 109'), p.39.

¹⁰⁹ Pusey to Manning, 26 December 1839, in Liddon, *LBV109*, p.40.

¹¹⁰ Pusey to Manning, 4th February 1840, in Liddon, *LBV109*, p.41.

¹¹¹ H.E.Manning to JHN, 17 September 1839, in *LD.*, vii, p.153.

Oxford men such as the Wilberforces and Gladstone: Newman's life at the time contained none of these distractions. Newman had become editor of the *British Critic* in February 1838 (Skinner describes the publication having been 'commandeered'¹¹² in a kind of Tractarian *putsch*) and set about turning it into the organ of Tractarian opinion that some already assumed it was.¹¹³ The *Tracts* continued, Newman gave a further series of lectures in the Adam de Brome Chapel at the University Church¹¹⁴ and he was, as has been seen, engaged in a reading of the Fathers which fully occupied his time. It seems reasonable to conclude that, in the absence of the distractions of pastoral or familial duties and, therefore, fully 'absorbed in the doctrinal question',¹¹⁵ the effect of Wiseman's article was much greater upon Newman than it could have been on the other Tractarians.

Another significant reason for Newman's reaction, and a further reason to distinguish him from Pusey and Keble, was his own theological history. Whereas the other two were profoundly grounded (Keble from childhood) in High Church ecclesiology, Newman had had to work his own way to it. Pusey and Keble were the direct inheritors of the ecclesiological tradition of Hooker, carried down to them through the Caroline divines and the Non-jurors of the seventeenth century and by those such as Jones of Nayland who had kept the flame of High Church tradition alive following the suppression of Convocation and the dry season of eighteenth-century Latitudinarianism. The operative ecclesiological model was that of the seventeenth-

¹¹² Skinner, S., *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), ('*Tractarians and the Condition of England*'), p.31.

¹¹³ Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, p.158f.

¹¹⁴ Later published as *Tract 85*, in *Tracts*, vol.IV.

¹¹⁵ *Apo.*, p.208.

century unity of King, Church and State,¹¹⁶ justified for Pusey on the basis of Divine act witnessed by history and for Keble on the authority of Sacred Scripture. The Church of England they might dearly wish to have reformed in a very particular way, but it was their Church and they saw it as a given. Newman was from a different stable. Despite his remark that he did ‘not expect anything so blessed again, Charles is the King, Laud the Prelate, Oxford the sacred city, of this principle’,¹¹⁷ this was not an ecclesiology with which he had grown up. The convert to Anglican Calvinism who, through the Fathers, pastoral ministry amongst the humble parishioners of St Clement’s and the company of the other Tractarians had become a sacramental catholic,¹¹⁸ had every reason to adopt this ecclesiology. He did adopt it, but as a theoretical system in abstract rather than as one first experienced as a concrete lived-reality. Because his ecclesiology was, at this point, primarily an intellectual construct, he was concerned to ensure a ‘harmony of parts’¹¹⁹ within his theoretical model. This meant that he faced a problem. The fact that branch theory resulted in ‘Popery in Rome and Zwingli-Lutheranism in England ... was a difficulty for Newman, although not for Palmer or the old High Churchmen’,¹²⁰ or even Keble and Pusey, for whom it was a lived, experienced and largely comfortable reality. Newman’s theological development had led him to attempt to work out his ecclesiology from first principles and this attempt contained within it the seeds of its own downfall. His reading of the Fathers and his Mediterranean journey of 1832/3 had brought about a realization that ‘there was something greater than the Established Church, and that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic’.¹²¹ If there was indeed this ‘something greater’ it was a work of necessity

¹¹⁶ Cf. Skinner, *Tractarians and the ‘Condition of England’*, pp.87-133.

¹¹⁷ Skinner, *Tractarians and the ‘Condition of England’*, p.121.

¹¹⁸ Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, pp.21-23.

¹¹⁹ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.174.

¹²⁰ Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.174.

¹²¹ *Apo.*, p.95.

for Newman to establish what it was and how the Church of England was related to it. That task had given him the Church of the *Via Media* and, whilst the theory of the *Via Media* held, all was well and good, but the combined efforts of Eutyches and Wiseman had left it looking decidedly fragile. It was the development of his understanding of patristic ecclesiology, confirmed by his reading of Wiseman, that compelled him 'to acknowledge that his theory of the *via media* had failed...such was the realization that shattered Newman's Anglo-Catholic allegiance'.¹²²

It was to be another six years before he finally submitted to the logic of what he had first confronted in the Long Vacation of 1839. Nevertheless, from the moment Williams' insistent repetition of Augustine's words had made such a firm impression upon him, Newman was set on a very particular course. It was one that Newman's own theological history, personal circumstances and controversialist methodology had predisposed him to take and '[t]he stomach-ache, the leak, the vista, the shadow of a hand, the ghost, the rising spirit, the opening heaven, like the Monophysite in the mirror and the incantatory power of the words themselves, convey Newman's subtle movement'.¹²³ The evidence in the documentary record is such that the very particular effect that the article had on Newman should provoke little surprise, notwithstanding the scepticism of Kingsley, Thomas and Turner. Nicholas Wiseman had written such an article, in such a manner and at such a time that Newman was almost bound to have reacted in the way he did.

Newman did not long languish in the uncertainty that Wiseman's article had provoked. He was later to describe his state of mind as one of excitement and recalled

¹²² Dulles, A, *Newman: The Anatomy of a Conversion*, in Ker, I., ed., *Newman and Conversion*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1997), p.29.

¹²³ Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and his Age*, p.190.

that: ‘After a while, I got calm, and at length the vivid impression faded away.’¹²⁴

Indeed the language of the *Apologia* concerning this period is amongst the most vivid in that entire work. He wrote:

I had seen the shadow of a hand upon the wall. It was clear that I had a good deal to learn on the question of the Churches, and that perhaps some new light was coming upon me. He who has seen a ghost, cannot be as if he had never seen it. The heavens had opened and closed again. The thought for the moment had been, ‘The Church of Rome will be found right after all’; and then it had vanished. My old convictions remained as before.¹²⁵

The imagery is, as has been shown, consistent with that used in contemporaneous comment and correspondence,¹²⁶ but the passage contains within it an apparent difficulty. How, if the impressions had been so very vivid, did they vanish?

The answer may be found in the allusions Wilberforce recalled and which are encountered in the correspondence with Rogers and Wood. Wiseman’s article had caused Newman to be concerned at the possibility that its arguments would cause ‘young men around [him]...going over to Rome.’¹²⁷ Newman’s reference, in the *Apologia*, to the sermon ‘Divine Calls’, provides further evidence of his state of mind at the time, within which such impressions could be both experienced so powerfully and yet fade from view. Newman’s conception of faith as an act of the will, assisted by Divine grace is succinctly but powerfully captured in the passage of the sermon that he quotes in the *Apologia*:

O that we could take that simple view of things, as to feel that the one thing which lies before us is to please God! What gain is it to please the world, to please the great, nay even to please those whom we love, compared with this? What gain is it to be applauded, admired, courted, followed, – compared with this one aim, of “not being disobedient to a heavenly vision”? What can this world offer comparable with that insight into spiritual things, that keen faith,

¹²⁴ *Apo.*, p.213.

¹²⁵ *Apo.*, p.213.

¹²⁶ JHN to Frederic Rogers, in *LD*, vii, pp.154f.; Henry Wilberforce, ‘F.Newman’s Oxford Parochial Sermons’, in *DR(new)*, 12, p.327; and JHN to S.F.Wood, in *LD*, vii, p.156f

¹²⁷ Henry Wilberforce, ‘F.Newman’s Oxford Parochial Sermons’, *DR(new)*, 12, p.327.

that heavenly peace, that high sanctity, that everlasting righteousness, that hope of glory, which they have, who in sincerity love and follow our Lord Jesus Christ? Let us beg and pray Him day by day to reveal Himself to our souls more fully, to quicken our senses, to give us sight and hearing, taste and touch of the world to come; so to work within us, that we may sincerely say, “Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and after that receive me with glory. Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever.”¹²⁸

The ‘old convictions’ to which Newman referred provide a further clue. They were, he recalled in the *Apologia*, ‘the principle of dogma, the sacramental system and anti-Romanism’.¹²⁹ As recently as 1838, Newman had written, in *Tract 83*, of Rome as the Anti-Christ¹³⁰ and it is far from clear that the distinction between the city of Rome and the Church of Rome that he made in the *Apologia* is as clear in either that tract or, as he claimed, in *Home Thoughts from Abroad*.¹³¹ The language of the comment to Wilberforce and the correspondence with Rogers and Wood is clear enough and Newman’s residual anti-Romanism is corroborated in these two near contemporaneous works. The fact that he was able to return to the field of controversy so quickly, with his attempted refutation of Wiseman’s article in his own ‘Catholicity of the English Church’ in the January 1840 number of *British Critic*,¹³² should not be taken as evidence of the unreliability or mendacity of the account in the *Apologia*, as Newman’s critics, Thomas and Turner amongst them, have suggested. It is more likely to have been the reaction of one for whom what he claimed to have seen simply did not accord with what he thought possible. It may also be further evidence of the Tractarian habit of continually practising the principle of reserve. If Rome was Anti-Christ, then the

¹²⁸ Sermon 542 ‘Divine Calls’, preached Sunday 27 October 1839 in St Mary the Virgin, Oxford. Published in JHN, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. VIII, p.2 and quoted in *Apo.*, pp.213f.

¹²⁹ *Apo.*, p.216.

¹³⁰ ‘Advent Sermons on Anti-Christ’ in *Tract 83*, in *Tracts*, vol.V, p.71.

¹³¹ *Apo.*, p.217.

¹³² JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, in *British Critic*, 27 (1840), (‘Catholicity of the English Church’), pp.40-88.

momentary thought that ‘The Church of Rome will be found right after all’¹³³ was a notion of antecedent improbability, deeply uncongenial and any intellectual attraction that the notion held for Newman needed to be kept reserved. Moreover, if Newman’s fear that ‘nothing but a quasi miracle’ could prevent the Tractarians from surviving ‘the trial with no proselytes whatever to Rome’,¹³⁴ then a convincing answer to Wiseman needed to be provided. This Newman attempted to do in his *British Critic* article the following January but the argument there advanced was not the same as that which had characterised his Catholicism of the Word in the *Via Media*, nor was it carried forward with anything approaching the rhetorical bravura that had marked his controversial writings until only a few months earlier. It was a more measured, even tentative piece than he had been accustomed to publishing and one which implicitly revealed Newman’s growing understanding of the need for a Catholicism of the Church.

III. The Theory of Possession

Having secured control of the *British Critic* in 1838, Newman had a ready forum for his controversial writing: it was to this forum he turned when his excitement had calmed and he was ready to answer Wiseman. Published in January 1840 under the title ‘Catholicity of the English Church’¹³⁵ it was, as he wrote to Bowden, an attempt ‘to stop up the leak in our boat which [Wiseman] has made’.¹³⁶ When talking to Henry Wilberforce the previous October Newman had said that, despite the force of Wiseman’s article, he ‘felt confident that when he returned to his rooms and was able

¹³³ *Apo.*, p.213.

¹³⁴ JHN to W Dodsworth, 19 November 1839, in *LD*, vii, pp.185f, here p.186.

¹³⁵ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, pp.40-88.

¹³⁶ JHN to J.W.Bowden, 5 January 1840, in *LD*, vii, pp.201-4, here p.202.

fully and calmly to consider the matter, he should see his way completely out of the difficulty'.¹³⁷ He had now had the opportunity for that full and calm consideration, and 'Catholicity of the English Church' was his response, but it was a response, which, he recognised from the first, lacked his customary rhetorical swagger. As has been noted previously, Newman recalled himself as having begun the Long Vacation of 1839 secure in the 'supreme confidence' of his own 'controversial status'¹³⁸ but here, less than six months later, he was decidedly less self-assured. He wrote to his sister that he had:

... written an article for the B.C. in reply to one of Dr Wiseman's in the Dublin, which had fidgeted me a good deal. It is the only formidable thing I have seen on the Roman side – but cannot deny it is good and strong, and calculated to do harm, considerable harm. I have done what I can by way of an answer. But it is a large subject.¹³⁹

In the guise of an approving review of a work on apostolic succession by his fellow Tractarian Arthur Perceval,¹⁴⁰ Newman began the article by contending that Perceval had made his case: 'We do trust and believe that the question of English Orders is now settled once for all ... at all events the controversy is at an end for the present.'¹⁴¹ Approving Perceval's work was not, however, Newman's purpose: the opportunity of the review was, in reality, simply a device to allow him to make an attempt at stopping up the leak. He proceeded to frame the issue between Rome and the English Church as being, he claimed, not about the validity of Anglican Orders – which 'for argument's sake', along with the charge of heresy, Wiseman had not disputed in the Donatist article¹⁴² – but about schism:

¹³⁷ Henry Wilberforce, 'F.Newman's Oxford Parochial Sermons', *DR(new)*, 12, p.327.

¹³⁸ *Apo.*, p.180.

¹³⁹ JHN to Mrs John Mozley, 29 November 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.187f.

¹⁴⁰ Arthur Perceval, *An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession: with an Appendix on the English Orders*, (London: J.G.F. and J. Rivington, 1839).

¹⁴¹ Perceval, *An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession*, p.2.

¹⁴² *DR*, VII, p.139.

The objection which we have in mind, concisely stated, is this: on the one hand, that unity is the tenure of divine favour; that communion with our brethren is the means of communion with our Lord and Saviour; that the Church is not only Apostolic, but Catholic; that schism cuts off the fountains of grace; and that estrangement from the Christian world is schism; and, on the other, that in matter of fact our Church is emphatically in a state of estrangement, having intercourse with no other Christian body in any part of the world, excepting her own dependencies and offshoots.¹⁴³

The importance of the question for Newman can be in no doubt and his selection of military metaphors served to heighten the sense of both the importance and the urgency of the task:

But though we have gained this point, it does not follow that we have driven the enemy from the field and put an end to the war. There is another important and difficult post which the Roman party have not yet surrendered, and from which we must dislodge them.¹⁴⁴

It was not, he well understood, an easy task and one about which he had ‘no pretences and ... no hopes of doing justice to it’.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless it was work he could not avoid if he was to save the ‘boat’ of both the Tractarian cause and his own stronghold of antiquity within it – his Catholicism of the Word. The way he went about tackling the task reveals that he had moved beyond the conception of the Church as the passive vehicle of tradition that he had derived from Milner, Hawkins, Sumner and Whately, the Church of his dispute with the Abbé Jager, and had now come to understand the centrality of the Church in establishing, protecting and verifying the very stronghold itself.

In the aftermath of Wiseman’s article, Manning had written to Newman suggesting that part of the plausibility of the article was down to Wiseman ‘treating the Roman Jurisdiction in England as anything but an usurpation’.¹⁴⁶ It was this sense of

¹⁴³ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.42.

¹⁴⁴ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, pp.41f.

¹⁴⁵ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.42.

¹⁴⁶ H.E.Manning to JHN, 23 October 1839, in *LD* vii, p173.

being in possession that was to underpin Newman's 'vigorous re-assertion of Tractarian principles'¹⁴⁷ in his *British Critic* response. The Roman Church might well be a part of the true Church but so was the Church of England and it was the latter that was present and in possession of England: it was the Catholic Church in England. In order to make this case, Newman had to be able to argue that it was possible to be not only Apostolic but also to be Catholic and yet not be in communion with the Pope: this he set out to do.

Early in the article Newman, using the Socratic technique he had deployed in a number of the tracts,¹⁴⁸ constructed an imaginary dialogue between an Anglo-Catholic and a Roman Catholic: 'by setting down the arguments on the one side and the other in the form of a dialogue, which shall be conducted favourably to the Church of Rome, so as to bring matters to an issue.'¹⁴⁹ When revising the work for the Uniform Edition, Newman shortened the dialogue and sharpened it somewhat, ending with an exchange that expresses the issue with a clarity that is explicitly absent, although implicitly present, in the original:

Angl. – We go by Antiquity; that is, by the Apostles. Ancient consent is our standard of faith.

Rom. – We go by Catholicity. Universal consent is our standard of faith.

Angl. – You are cut off from the old Fathers.

Rom. – And you are cut off from the present living Church.¹⁵⁰

The dialogue, in a lengthier form in the original than in the revised, lays out the grounds upon which this issue is to be decided. The Roman Catholic begins by asserting that oneness and Catholicity are notes of the Church and the Anglo-Catholic concedes that this is so and that schism is a sin; the Anglo-Catholic claims purity and primitiveness (i.e. Apostolicity) for the Church of England and alleges corruption

¹⁴⁷ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.221.

¹⁴⁸ E.g. that between Clericus and Laicus in *Tracts 38 and 41*.

¹⁴⁹ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', pp.42f.

¹⁵⁰ JHN, 'X. Catholicity of the Anglican Church', in *Ess. ii*, (Longmans: London, 1910), p.6.

against Rome: ‘We are pure because we are primitive. You are corrupt because you are novel.’¹⁵¹ The Roman then asks a question that goes to the heart of Wiseman’s article and Augustine’s ‘palmary words’,¹⁵² a question to which Newman simply had to provide an answer if he was to stop-up the leak in the boat: ‘Who is to judge antiquity?’¹⁵³ Other questions remain in the rest of the longer, original version of the dialogue: if the textual additions to the creed were permissible, why not later expansions? The Roman Catholic, in language close to that which Newman would later deploy in his own arguments, suggests that what the Anglo-Catholic calls corruptions – e.g., prayer to the saints and the doctrine of Purgatory – are no different from the various additions to the creed in that they ‘but interpret and fulfil’ the Apostolic faith: ‘We realize what you only profess.’¹⁵⁴ Finally, Newman put into the mouth of his Roman Catholic the underlying ecclesiological issue which he sought to deal with in the remainder of the article:

This is your theory; we have an opposite theory, which is as good as yours. You say the many went wrong because they were corrupt; we say they could not but go right, because they were promised infallibility. But now observe the contrast between your system and ours, how simple is ours, how perplexed yours. You move on two foundations, we on one; you hold by the primitive Creed *and* the Church; you count it a duty to keep to the Creed and to keep to the Church, making no due provision for the case of a discordance between them, yet maintaining that very case to have happened. We have but one rule, to follow the Church; for in following the body, we are sure to be adhering to the faith. The society which we are to *join* is the teacher of what we are to *believe*. Accordingly in our view heresy and schism are never disjoined. You, on the contrary, almost assert that we are heretics, and almost grant that you are schismatics; yet maintaining withal we are both one Church, and both have one faith.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.43.

¹⁵² *Apo.*, p.211.

¹⁵³ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.44.

¹⁵⁴ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.45.

¹⁵⁵ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.46.

It was as succinct a statement of the issue to be determined as could be made, allowing for the simplification of caricature made necessary by the literary form of the Socratic dialogue.

It was not Newman's primary purpose, in this article, to disprove the Roman case but rather to make the Anglo-Catholic one. Nevertheless, before he did the latter he sought simply and wittily to do the former and in doing so he reveals his explicit awareness of the problems posed by the historical reality of doctrinal development given the fixed nature of the Apostolic faith.

Rehearsing the history of the Deutero-Nicene Council, when 'for the first [time], a general council, or what is called so, made an article of faith, in addition to, not in development of, the Creed',¹⁵⁶ Newman noted the circumstances of that Council which called into question its doctrine: deficiencies which speak to the fundamental grounds of several of the arguments he had previously used to attempt to reconcile change and continuity. These included the fact that this council 'was the first ... which rested the proof of its decree on grounds short of scripture'; that Deutero-Nicaea 'violated the doctrine of adherence to the practice or received opinion of antiquity'; and, a key deficiency in the light of Newman's argument later in the article, the council was 'the first which was held in a divided state of the Church'.¹⁵⁷ These were, in Newman's account, clear deficiencies: Hooker, *sola scriptura* and Article VI were abrogated by the first deficiency, St Vincent of Lérins, antiquity and the Catholicism of the Word contradicted by the second and Newman's theory of the *Via Media* vindicated by the

¹⁵⁶ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.47.

¹⁵⁷ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.47.

third deficiency of the council. Deutero-Nicaea, because of these deficiencies, had resulted in the doctrine that was, Newman argued, simply not reliable:

Now what has it issued in? in[sic] an assemblage of doctrines which, as was observed above, whether right or wrong, have scarcely more connection with the doctrines whether of the primitive Creed or the primitive Church than the doctrines of the Gospel have with those of the law.¹⁵⁸

This, for Newman, was the natural result of the deficiencies, the source of the corruption. It found expression, he argued, in a fundamental rejection of the Christocentric principle in the Christian doctrine of Antiquity in the Roman doctrines of Purgatory and in worship of ‘St Mary and the Saints’, indeed in ‘a radical change of inward temper and principle’,¹⁵⁹ one might even say ethos.

His criticism of the Roman position gave Newman the opportunity to indulge in savagely witty polemic. It is an example of Newman’s capacity for the very effective use of sarcasm: ‘Does the Church, according to the Romanists, know more now than the Apostles knew?’¹⁶⁰ He enquired as to the Marian faith of St Paul, whether he believed ‘that the merits of St. John the Baptist should be imputed to him’ and whether ‘he did or did not hold that St. Peter could give indulgences to shorten the prospective sufferings of the Corinthians in purgatory’.¹⁶¹ He offered an excuse for these imaginings in conceding that even as St Paul ‘certainly does bring out his thoughts only in answer to express questions asked, and according to the occasion’, rather than as a systematic treatise, and St John ‘has written a Gospel as later, so also more dogmatic than his fellow-Evangelists, in consequence of the rise of heresy’, so might they have held doctrines beyond those expressed by them in their extant writings, nonetheless there had to be a limit to what was believable, even by Roman Catholics. He ended

¹⁵⁸ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.48.

¹⁵⁹ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.48.

¹⁶⁰ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.50.

¹⁶¹ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.51

this passage with the most acerbic of his parallels, with a remark that implied precisely the same disingenuousness in the Roman Catholic, as that of which he was himself was later to be accused:

But still there are limits to these concessions; we cannot imagine an Apostle saying and doing what Romanists say and do; can they imagine it themselves? Do they themselves, for instance, think that St. Paul was in the habit of saying what Bellarmine and others say, – “*Laus Deo et Virgine Matri?*” Would they not pronounce a professed epistle of St. Paul’s which contained these words spurious on his [sic] one ground?¹⁶²

Earlier in the article Newman had suggested that the only way the Roman Catholic argument could be at all sustained was ‘to make light of the judgement of antiquity, or to maintain that revelation is progressive’,¹⁶³ now, without any apparent sense of irony, he suggests that ‘this difficulty has led some Roman writers to the theory of a *disciplina arcani*’.¹⁶⁴

However witty Newman’s attack on the Roman Catholic position, the Anglican (or, more properly, the Anglo-Catholic) case still needed to be made. Newman understood that pointing out the weaknesses in the Roman Catholic position was one thing, making the Anglo-Catholic case was quite another and that it was only the latter that would begin to undo the damage Wiseman’s article had done.

When Newman had argued with the Abbé Jager, seeking to construct the hypothesis of the *via media* to provide adequate protection for antiquity and advance his Catholicism of the Word, the difficulty of the English church’s separation had not seemed so great a difficulty. Now, in the aftermath of Wiseman’s article and the light

¹⁶² JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.51.

¹⁶³ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, pp.48f.

¹⁶⁴ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.52.

of Augustine's *securus iudicat orbis terrarum*, Newman acknowledged that it was the central question to be addressed. He recognised that:

... the English difficulty, was that the Church being "one body," how can we, estranged as we are from every part of it except our own dependencies, unrecognized and without intercommunion, maintain our right to be considered part of that body?¹⁶⁵

The remainder of Newman's piece was an attempt to provide a convincing answer to that question. He knew he would have to demonstrate that intercommunion was, even if desirable, unnecessary, that its absence did not necessarily imply schism and that the life of grace within a particular church could be maintained even if schism were conceded. He needed to reassert the claims to Apostolicity for the Church of England that had been part of the narrative and apologetic of the Oxford Movement from its inception, but in a way that met Wiseman's objections. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, he found his ammunition in the works of the Anglican divines and in the Fathers, but before that he had to prepare the ground of battle.

Having stated the standard Tractarian position that Apostolic descent, rather than unity, was what constituted the 'essential completeness'¹⁶⁶ of the Church, Newman provided a justification for the particular claims and nature of the Church of England in terms that are surprisingly Erastian. Allowing for the fact that he was, indeed, an occasional writer, shaping his arguments to the matter in controversy, his assertion that 'each branch [of the Church] is bound to conform to the country', such that '(t)hey are in consequence, as Churches, under the supremacy of the state or monarch whom they obey in temporal',¹⁶⁷ is unexceptional. The immediately following claim that the monarch might, therefore, use the Church 'as one of the functions of his Government,

¹⁶⁵ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.53.

¹⁶⁶ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.54.

¹⁶⁷ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.54.

as his ministers of public instruction', is, however, worthy of note, remarkable even.

The extent of Newman's deployment of an Erastian position is immediately made clear:

Ordination is a bishop's prerogative; but everything else save ordination comes from the king. The whole jurisdiction is his; his are all the spiritual courts; his the right of excommunication; his the control of revenues; his the organization of dioceses; his the appointment of bishops.¹⁶⁸

Whilst seemingly incompatible with his 1833 reaction to the Irish Church (Temporalities) Act, conceding so much to the Erastian position was necessary if Newman was to deploy Cranmer, Stillingfleet, Barrow, Dodwell and Hickes to argue that each communion, indeed each diocese, is essentially a complete Church and 'mutual intercourse ... but an *accident* of the Church, not of its essence'.¹⁶⁹ When he came to the patristic material, he was anxious to claim St Ignatius of Antioch and St Cyprian for this position, citing, for example, the latter's '*Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*'.¹⁷⁰ Newman held that the 'Anglican theory of ecclesiastical unity' was the same as the patristic theory, and, he believed, the testimony of the Fathers supported his contention 'that each Church is naturally independent of every other; each bishop a complete channel of grace, and ultimate centre of unity; and all unions of see with see but matters of ecclesiastical arrangement'.¹⁷¹ He did not go as far as to suggest that this authority extended to allowing the particular church to 'lay down on her own authority Articles of Faith' and the distinction he had so laboriously set out in the correspondence with the Abbé Jager between Articles of Faith and Articles of Religion should not be overlooked here. Nonetheless, Newman came close, at this point in the *British Critic* article, to deploying an argument that gave to the particular church wide doctrinal authority. It was a position that Pusey had explicitly

¹⁶⁸ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.54.

¹⁶⁹ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.55.

¹⁷⁰ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.61.

¹⁷¹ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', pp.62f.

contradicted in correspondence with him only days before Newman had read Wiseman's article.¹⁷² Pusey had written a critical review of Christopher Benson's *Discourses upon Tradition and Episcopacy*¹⁷³ for the *British Critic*, which Newman had published in October 1839.¹⁷⁴ In the review, Pusey had noted that Benson was critical of the Tractarians for seeming to hold that particular churches had the power to determine 'things necessary to salvation'. Pusey argued that this was a 'mistake' on Benson's part, deriving from the latter's lack 'of a notion of the Catholic Church', precisely the place in which that power was located.¹⁷⁵ That the disunity between the churches meant that the Catholic Church could not exercise this power was not to deny to it the faculty itself.

In adopting this conception of the rights and capacities of the particular Church, Newman was prepared to acknowledge that the patristic witness was not univocal. He noted that St Augustine's view was different, one 'more nearly approaching to the Roman'.¹⁷⁶ He could not, however, accept his argument regarding another of St Cyprian's arguments from *De Unitate*:

Tear the ray from the sun's substance, unity will not admit this division of light; break a branch from the tree, it will not bud when broken; cut off the channel from the spring, the channel will dry up¹⁷⁷

Newman would follow Dodwell: these analogies do not apply, as St Augustine claimed, to the whole body of the Church, the *orbis terrarum*, but to each individual diocese, to the 'episcopal and diocesan unit'.¹⁷⁸ What is more, Newman went on to argue, even if

¹⁷² E.B.Pusey to JHN, 12 September 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.146-148, here p.147.

¹⁷³ Benson, C., *Discourses upon Tradition and Episcopacy*, (London,1839).

¹⁷⁴ Pusey, E.B., 'Notice of "Discourses upon Tradition and Episcopacy", by Christopher Benson', in *British Critic*, 26 (1839), pp.508f.

¹⁷⁵ E.B.Pusey to JHN, 12 September 1839, in *LD* vii, p.147.

¹⁷⁶ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.63.

¹⁷⁷ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.64.

¹⁷⁸ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.64.

one were to accept St Augustine's position, even those within the Roman Communion could see and argue that this meant 'that *Catholicity* and not the *Pope*, is the essence of the Church'.¹⁷⁹ If the Gallicans could hold to this view and not be cast off from the Roman Communion, then perhaps the issue in England, Newman suggested, was not a quarrel with '*Catholicity*' but a 'special quarrel which we have with Rome'.¹⁸⁰

The doctrinal consequences of his argument were immediately apparent to Newman and here he claimed St Augustine in support of his position. If the latter's argument that the part must yield to the whole, '*Et concilia posteriora prioribus apud posteros praeponuntur, et universum partibus semper jure optimo praeponitur*',¹⁸¹ then as surely as the Church of England 'yields to a general council', so, surely, must Rome be prepared to submit Trent to 'a Council yet to come'.¹⁸² Quite apart from the logical inconsistency between his claim here for the authority of General Councils over the Church of England with his assertions earlier in the article about state or monarchical prerogatives, not to mention Article XXI of the Thirty Nine Articles, what Newman here, and in the remainder of the article, failed adequately to grasp was the contention underlying Wiseman's – indeed the whole Roman – position, that there was a substantial identity between the Roman Communion and the Catholic Church. Even if St Augustine's argument is understood in the terms of conciliarism, for Wiseman and Rome, Trent *was* a General Council of the Church and there simply was no question of its supersession by 'a council yet to come'.

¹⁷⁹ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.65.

¹⁸⁰ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.65.

¹⁸¹ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.69.

¹⁸² JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.69.

Although he had not fully grasped – or, more likely, felt it unnecessary and inconvenient for his present purposes to engage with it fully – the implications of the underlying claim were not lost on Newman. He well understood that it underpinned the Roman defence against the Anglican charge of novelty. He expressed it in terms that, because it foreshadows the very imagery that he was to use in *Essay*, are worth quoting in full:

When we object to the Romanists that their Church has changed in the course of years, they not unfrequently acknowledge it, and are philosophical on the subject. They say that all systems have their development; that nothing begins as it ends; that nothing can come into the world *totis numeris*, that the seed becomes a tree, and the child a man. And they urge, moreover, that the full grown fulfilment, to superficial observers, necessarily seems different to what it was in its rudiments, just as a friend, not seen for many years, is strange to us at first sight, till, by degrees, we catch the old looks, or the well-remembered tones, or the smile or the remark, which assure us that, with whatever changes of age or circumstance, he is the same.¹⁸³

Newman conceded that this was a powerful argument and one which, he presciently wrote, ‘does seem to reconcile one to much that otherwise it is difficult to comprehend in the history of religion’.¹⁸⁴ Its flaw, however, was that it lacked a mechanism that Newman could accept that would enable one to distinguish when a development ‘departed from antiquity and forfeited its trust’.¹⁸⁵ Absent a living organ to determine between developments and corruption, then, Newman argued, the Roman contention made Dionysius ‘the forerunner of Arius’ and called into question the status of his beloved St Cyprian because of his erroneous baptismal doctrine.¹⁸⁶ In the patristic period, Newman argued, a number of these developments led to the temporary suspension of intercommunion between the Churches. The mechanisms for the resolution of these suspensions were unclear and took differing forms at different times:

¹⁸³ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, pp.69f.

¹⁸⁴ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.70.

¹⁸⁵ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.70.

¹⁸⁶ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.70.

sometimes it was the judgment of the Pope, at others of Councils against the Pope and at others the decision of the Fathers against either or both Pope and Councils. Newman prays in aid of his argument the words of St Augustine: ‘this does nothing to prejudice the Catholic Church diffused over the whole world’.¹⁸⁷ This being so, Newman argued:

Directly it is granted that active intercourse is not *absolutely necessary* as a note of the Church ... then, in spite of our being separated from Greece and Rome, shut up in ourselves and our dependencies, and looked on coldly or forgotten by the rest of Christendom, there is sufficient ground for still believing that the English Church is at this time the Catholic Church in England.¹⁸⁸

The remainder of the article proceeds from the point of this assertion that the Church of England is the Catholic Church in possession of England and its dependencies. Newman had already demonstrated, both in the article and elsewhere, that, to his own satisfaction, both the descent and the doctrine of the Church of England was such as to satisfy the creedal note of apostolicity and, in the foregoing pages, he had seemed to suggest that the note of unity was desirable but not essential. His theory of possession sought to define catholicity in a manner that served his own argument. Wiseman’s parallel of the Church of England with the Donatists failed, Newman claimed because ‘(t)he Donatists had not possession; their only tenure of existence was hatred and opposition to the rest of Christendom’¹⁸⁹ and Roman claims to catholicity were compromised by separation and absence from Greece and Russia.¹⁹⁰ Whatever creedal catholicity meant, then, it was not what Rome claimed.

In support of his theory of possession, in the final pages of the article Newman staked out the Church of England’s claim to the note of sanctity. Newman argued that

¹⁸⁷ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.71,

¹⁸⁸ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.72.

¹⁸⁹ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.73.

¹⁹⁰ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.74.

Rome could not resist the Church of England's claim to be part of the catholic Church – albeit one Rome might assert was in schism – ‘if the Anglican communion had but that one note of the church upon it – sanctity’.¹⁹¹ Newman's examination of the Church of England's claim to sanctity is, however, little more than an assertion and condemnation of Roman devotional corruption. It was an argument that he had deployed against the Abbé Jager three years earlier and he was to return to the same point in the letter to Bloxam in early 1841, noted above:

Rome must first change in her spirit. I must see more sanctity in her than I do at present. Alas! I see no marks of sanctity – or if any, they are chiefly confined to converts from us ... I do verily think that, with all our sins, there is more sanctity in the Church of England and Ireland, than in the Roman Catholic bodies in the same countries.¹⁹²

As a rhetorical device, ending the article in terms that asserted the holiness of Anglicanism and decried the corruption of Roman Catholicism would, undoubtedly, have earned Newman the approbation of the readership of *British Critic*. It is quite another question to answer whether he convinced himself with the jingoism of comments like:

We Englishmen like manliness, openness, consistency, truth. Rome will never gain on us till she learns these virtues, and uses them; then she may gain on us, but it will be by ceasing to be what we now mean by Rome.¹⁹³

Indeed, the passage concerning sanctity makes little effort to demonstrate the presence of the note in the English Church. Newman was clearly satisfied that this was self-evident, as was the corruption and disingenuousness of Rome.

¹⁹¹ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.86.

¹⁹² JHN to J.R.Bloxam, 23 February 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.41-43, here p.42.

¹⁹³ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.88.

In order to stop up the leak, Newman's article had privileged the notes of apostolicity and sanctity, and had played down those of unity and catholicity. Earlier in the article he had claimed that his purpose was to reconcile three points:

... that the Church is one is the point of *doctrine*; that we are estranged from the body of the Church is the point of *fact*; and that we still have the means of grace among us, is our point of *controversy*.¹⁹⁴

In fact Newman had achieved no such reconciliation. He had argued that the first was not essential, that the second was unimportant and had offered little or no evidence for the third. As with much of his ecclesiological polemic since the first days of the Oxford Movement, Newman's entire argument rested on the claim to Apostolical descent and fidelity to the Apostolic faith. Even here, however, Newman was now not so sure of his ground. After dealing with Roman developments in the article, he had considered the problem of those doctrines which were peculiar to the Church of England. Three years earlier, as he thrashed out the theology of the *via media* in both his correspondence with the Abbé Jager and in his *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, Newman had made much of the difference between the Episcopal or Apostolic Tradition and the Prophetic Tradition, between articles of faith and articles of religion. Here he has abandoned these distinctions, although it would clearly have been much simpler for the structure of his argument had he used them: the peculiar doctrines of Rome or England could have been consigned to the latter categories, considering them, as Pusey would have done, to be adiaphora. Newman had considered these doctrines and practices. He argued that whilst estrangement from Rome had led the Lutherans towards rationalism and the Calvinists to Socinianism, the Church of England had 'endured all vicissitudes of fortune'. He acknowledged that the doctrinal climate 'never was in so miserable case as in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth' but that the canons

¹⁹⁴ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.53.

of 1603, the reign of Charles I and the Restoration Convocation of 1661 had restored true doctrine such that even the threat of relapse Newman detected in the events of 1688 could not overthrow this growth. He asserted:

As far as its formularies are concerned, it may be said all along to have grown towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement; every act, every crisis which marks its course, has been upward.¹⁹⁵

But assertion this is: Newman offered no evidence to support it.

Wiseman's article had, however, curtailed the force of such assertions by focussing Newman's attention on the question of just who got to decide what was and what was not part of the *depositum fidei*. Newman may have felt that his response had stopped-up the leak for the present, that the unsettling spectre Wiseman had conjured up had vanished and all seemed almost as it had once been. He recalled as much in the *Apologia*¹⁹⁶ and his remark in his letters to Bowden on 21 February 1840 corroborates his claim.¹⁹⁷ Nonetheless the fragility of the arguments in the article was not lost on Newman, as he confessed to Bowden:

I cannot deny either of [Wiseman's] positions ... My article was to meet this – and I am glad to hear in many quarters that it has done good service. But the great speciousness of his article is one of the things which have made me despond so much.¹⁹⁸

The force and effect of Wiseman's article was such that, Newman here again using language strikingly similar to that which he would use in the *Essay*, it not only 'pulverised the theory of the *via media*' but that it provided an account of why 'St Austin or St Basil coming among us would say at once "*That is the Catholic Church* –

¹⁹⁵ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.77.

¹⁹⁶ JHN, *Apo.*, pp.230f.

¹⁹⁷ JHN to J.W.Bowden, 21 February 1840, *LD* vii, pp.240-242.

¹⁹⁸ JHN to J.W.Bowden, 21 February 1840, *LD* vii, p.241.

and *those* are heretics” – meaning Rome and us respectively’.¹⁹⁹ The weakness of Newman’s response lay precisely in the failure of his theory to give an adequate account of the status of those teachings and practices peculiar to Anglicanism. As he recalled in the *Apologia*:

But ... the great stumbling-block lay in the 39 Articles. It was urged that here was a positive Note *against* Anglicanism:- Anglicanism claimed to hold that the Church of England was nothing else than a continuation in this country ... of that one Church of which in old times Athanasius and Augustine were members. But, if so, the doctrine must be the same; the doctrine of the Old Church must live and speak in Anglican formularies, in the 39 Articles.²⁰⁰

Frank Turner, claiming to follow Stephen Thomas’s line,²⁰¹ has dismissed Newman’s own account. Seemingly ignoring not only the correspondence, the urgent priority Newman accorded to the production of the *British Critic* article and his concessions to Wiseman’s points in the article, particularly those related to want of the note of Catholicity and doctrinal peculiarity, Turner argues that Newman was so distracted by ‘disruptive activities among young Tractarians’ that the force of Wiseman’s ‘polemic’ could not have had the effect on him that Newman claimed.²⁰² He cites, amongst others, as examples of this, Robert Williams’ preoccupation with conversion to Rome,²⁰³ Morris’s preaching on fasting and ‘the Roman doctrine of the Mass’,²⁰⁴ and Bloxam’s imprudent behaviour at Alton Towers. Turner characteristically exaggerates the nature of this last matter, claiming that it had been reported to Newman that Bloxam had prostrated himself at the raising of the host at Mass in Lord Shrewsbury’s chapel, when in fact the complaint was that he had merely

¹⁹⁹ JHN to J.W.Bowden, 21 February 1840, *LD* vii, p.241.

²⁰⁰ *Apo.*, p.231.

²⁰¹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, pp.220-222.

²⁰² Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.337.

²⁰³ To which Newman’s attention had been drawn by Wood, S.F.Wood to JHN, 29 October 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.179f.

²⁰⁴ JHN to S.F.Wood, 10 November 1839, in *LD* vii, p.181.

‘bowed down’.²⁰⁵ The difficulty with Turner’s thesis is that, despite these distractions, and it is certainly true that they made significant claims on Newman’s time and energy, Newman gave priority to the production of the *British Critic* article. Turner’s wider point, that the use of historical parallels, especially with those of the Monophysite Heresy and Donatism, convinced nobody but Newman himself, is reason to doubt Newman’s own account of his reaction to those parallels, is maintained despite the contemporaneous evidence. Such was Turner’s determination to support his *a priori* assumption that, ‘It was [Newman’s] peculiar argument and his alone’, that the accounts of those who were shaken by those parallels are represented as being merely ‘shaken by Newman’s personal doubt ... but none was drawn to the parallel itself’.²⁰⁶

Thomas’s account is more nuanced than Turner gave him credit for, however. Turner claimed that Thomas shared his fundamental scepticism about Newman’s account in the *Apologia* of the events of 1839, citing Thomas’s argument that the 1864 account should be doubted on the grounds of ‘the absence of clear supporting evidence from 1839’.²⁰⁷ However, Thomas recognises that ‘Newman’s correspondence at the time indicates strongly that he felt the pull of Wiseman’s [position], and had begun to doubt his own.’²⁰⁸ Thomas’s argument is not that Newman did not feel the force of the Wiseman article but, rather, as has been shown, that it was Wiseman’s article and the parallel with the Donatists that damaged Newman’s self-confidence, not his own claimed self-realisation of the parallel with the Monophysites.

²⁰⁵ The first report of the event to Newman was from William Dodsworth in his letter of 18 November 1839, in *LD* vii, p.184, where the words ‘bowed down’ are used. Bloxam’s denial and his own account are contained in Newman’s letter in reply on 19 November, see JHN to William Dodsworth, 19 November 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.186f., here p.187. The controversy surrounding Bloxam’s behaviour dragged on until Christmas when the Bishop of Oxford wrote to Newman substantially accepting Bloxam’s account, see Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford to JHN, 26 December 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.189f.

²⁰⁶ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.604.

²⁰⁷ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.335.

²⁰⁸ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.220.

Turner, instead, chose to locate the collapse of Newman's confidence in the Tractarian conception of the Church of England not in Wiseman's article, nor in the Monophysite parallel, nor yet in the rhetorically bold but substantially fragile response of the *British Critic* article, but in the force of the argument in Keble's preface to Froude's *Remains*²⁰⁹ and in the 'polemical onslaught occasioned in 1841 by' Newman's own 'Tract 90'.²¹⁰ He surely overstated the influence of the former, when he claimed that: 'Keble's starkly uncompromising distinction between Catholic antiquity and the Erastian Protestant Reformation, and not Wiseman's article ... baldly, perhaps fatally, posed the dilemma that would fatally disrupt Tractarianism.'²¹¹ Turner's reasons for adopting this position would appear to be derived from his attempt to demonstrate that Newman's own account of these and other events is to be dismissed as a:

. . . personally constructed conversion narrative that imposed a structure of spiritual search on what in actuality had been a series of contingent events infused with enormous personal confusion, anger, despondency, and mixture of other motives.²¹²

The explicit remarks in and clear inferences to be drawn from the contemporaneous correspondence suggest that this cannot be so. Turner is, however, nearer the mark when he highlights the controversy around *Tract 90*. This episode was to play a central role in undermining Newman's own brittle confidence in his latest hypothesis and, as will be demonstrated in the next section, in focussing his mind firmly on the relationship between the authority of the Church and the question of the authentication of apparent doctrinal development.

²⁰⁹ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.339.

²¹⁰ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.334.

²¹¹ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.339.

²¹² Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, pp.336f.

IV. The 1840 Correspondence with Francis Newman

If the position Newman had outlined in ‘Catholicity of the English Church’ was to hold, it would need to provide a satisfactory account of both those teachings, peculiar to Anglicanism, at least in their mode of expression, and be able to demonstrate the fidelity of the Anglican episcopate to Apostolic faith. The question of the Jerusalem Bishopric and the reaction to what turned out to be the last of the *Tracts* would demonstrate to Newman that his latest carefully constructed hypothesis was no more tenable than its predecessors. Yet even before these major events, as early as the summer of 1840 it became clear that Newman was far from comfortable in the position he had outlined in the *British Critic* and that he was considering a more developed hypothesis.

Newman was not alone in being concerned that one of the unintended consequences of the Oxford Movement had been, from the very beginning, the secession of individuals from Anglicanism in the direction of Rome. Writing to Keble in October 1840, with whom, as the correspondence makes clear, he had previously discussed the issue, Newman reflected on these defections and admitted that: ‘I fear I must allow that, whether I will or no, I am disposing them towards Rome’.²¹³ He confessed that this was conceivably his own direction of travel and that it was a matter that had been troubling him for some time. Indeed, he had expressed the contingent nature of his position several months earlier in a letter to W.C.A. Maclaurin in July 1840: ‘A great experiment is going on, whether Anglocatholicism has a root, a foundation, a consistency ... or whether it be a “sham”’.²¹⁴ Rather typically Turner

²¹³ JHN to John Keble, 26 October 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.416-418, here p.417.

²¹⁴ JHN to W.C.A. Maclaurin, 26 July 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.368-370, here p.369.

could not help but suggest that Newman's comment to Maclaurin should be set within the context of what he clearly took to be Newman's singular self-obsession which led to 'ecclesiastical and spiritual ambiguities, which Newman ... could tolerate but which proved an enormous burden to his younger followers'.²¹⁵

In the letter to Keble, Newman commented that he had raised his concerns with Rogers a year before. This is presumably a reference to Newman's letters to Rogers, that of 22 September 1839 where he admitted to having 'had the first real hit from Romanism',²¹⁶ in the form of the Wiseman article; and that of 3 October 1839, where he explicitly confessed that: 'In all this ... I assume, on the one hand, that Rome is right; on the other, that we are not bound by uncatholic subscriptions.'²¹⁷ Now, despite the position that he had set out in the *British Critic* article of the previous January and to which, he maintained, he remained committed, he remarked to Keble:

I have shot my last arrow in the article on English Catholicity; and I am troubled by doubts, whether, as it is, I have not in what I have published spoken too strongly against Rome ... I begin to have suspicions about myself.²¹⁸

What those suspicions were become clearer when his thirteenth University Sermon and the correspondence of October and November 1840 with his brother Francis are considered.

Towards the end of the Trinity Term of 1840, in the place of his friend and Oriel Fellow, R.W.Church, Newman preached his thirteenth University Sermon.²¹⁹ Given on

²¹⁵ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.350.

²¹⁶ JHN to Frederic Rogers, 22 September 1839, in *LD* vii, p.154.

²¹⁷ JHN to Frederic Rogers, 3 October 1839, in *LD* vii, pp.159f., here p.160.

²¹⁸ JHN to John Keble, 26 October 1840, in *LD* vii, p.418.

²¹⁹ JHN, *Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford between AD1826 and 1843*, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909), ('USS.'), pp.251-277. He had preached his first University Sermon in 1826 and was to preach his fifteenth and last at the beginning of 1843. References in this work to the texts of the last three University Sermons are cited from the Uniform Edition of Newman's works. This departure from the practice followed with respect to Newman's other works has been taken because the

the feast of St Peter, 29 June, Newman entitled this sermon ‘Implicit and Explicit Reason’ and in it returned to the themes that he had touched on in two previous University Sermons.²²⁰ The sermon takes the form of an exposition of the implications of the words of 1 Peter 3:15, (in the words of the Authorised Version of the Bible): ‘Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts; and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.’ This verse, Newman argues, gives ‘a clear warrant, or rather an injunction, to cast our religion into the form of Creed and Evidences’.²²¹ He then laid out at some length the relationship of faith and reason as one where the latter, at the service of the former, has its own proper evidence, methods and autonomy. This structure of the relationship – reason being applied to discern the reliability of the evidences of faith – outlined by Newman sketched a notion of change and continuity which grounds the process firmly within the action of the Church and in a manner which left little doubt that, although he did not use the term, his theory of the development of doctrine was, by this time, already remarkably well developed:

And herein consists one great blessing of the Gospel Covenant, that in Christ's death on the Cross, and in other parts of that all-gracious Economy, are concentrated, as it were, and so presented to us those attributes and works which fill eternity. And with a like graciousness we are also told, in human language, things concerning God Himself, concerning His Son and His Spirit, and concerning His Son's incarnation, and the union of two natures in His One Person—truths which even a peasant holds implicitly, but which Almighty God, whether by His Apostles, or by His Church after them, has vouchsafed to bring together and methodize, and to commit to the keeping of science.²²²

original manuscript texts, in the Birmingham Oratory Archives at *BOA A.9.4*. are substantially identical to the published versions but lack any folio numbering, thereby making accurate citation from that source impossible.

²²⁰ Specifically in his tenth, ‘Faith and Reason, contrasted as Habits of Mind’, preached on 6 January 1839, and in *USS.*, pp.176-201 and his eleventh, ‘The Nature of Faith in Relation to Reason’, 13 January 1839, and in *USS.*, pp.202-221.

²²¹ *USS.*, p.253.

²²² *USS.*, p.269.

Newman went on to acknowledge the inadequacy of human language and the incompleteness of the explicit expressions of hitherto implicit faith in the mysteries of the *depositum fidei*. As an explanation of apparent inconsistencies between the various doctrinal expressions over time of the truths of the Christian faith, once more he utilised the analogy of the comparison to be made between the pictures of a little child and that of the same person as an old man, an analogy which he was later to return to in the *Essay*.²²³ Newman was already very much aware of the prophylactic purpose of the process of making explicit that which was hitherto implicit. ‘Doctrinal statements may be introduced, not so much for their own sake, as because many consequences flow from them, and therefore a great variety of errors may, by means of them, be prevented’,²²⁴ he argued and, in an acknowledgement of the apologetic purpose of theology, he explained the incompleteness and occasional particularity of the arguments used and evidence considered in those statements:

Defenders of Christianity naturally select as reasons for belief, not the highest, the truest, the most sacred, the most intimately persuasive, but such as best admit of being exhibited in argument ... how very differently an argument strikes the mind at one time and another, according to its particular state, or the accident of the moment.²²⁵

In bringing the sermon to a conclusion, Newman returned to the mandate that he drew from the scriptural text and set his remarks within the context of the ‘real reasons’ for faith:

I have been engaged in proving the following points: that the reasonings and opinions which are involved in the act of Faith are latent and implicit; that the mind reflecting on itself is able to bring them out into some definite and methodical form; that Faith, however, is complete without this reflective faculty, which, in matter of fact, often does interfere with it, and must be used cautiously.²²⁶

²²³ *USS.*, p.270.

²²⁴ *USS.*, p.270.

²²⁵ *USS.*, p.271.

²²⁶ *USS.*, pp.276f.

Here Newman is explicitly talking about the faith of the individual, rather than that of the whole Church, but implicit within these remarks and, indeed, in the argument of the latter part of the sermon as a whole, bear the inference that he held a more general theology of development. In the autumn of the same year, 1840, Newman was to engage in a correspondence with his brother Francis that was to leave no doubt that Newman had drawn precisely those inferences

Francis Newman, it appeared to his elder brother, had begun to veer from his earlier, largely creedally orthodox Evangelicalism towards Unitarianism, the impetus seemingly coming from his experiences as a missionary in Persia.²²⁷ John Henry had received a letter from Francis on 20 October 1840,²²⁸ which he described to their brother-in-law, Thomas Mozley, as ‘*painful*’ and ‘almost a confession of Unitarianism’.²²⁹ He replied at some length to Francis on 22 October 1840²³⁰ from whom he received a reply two weeks later, on 7 November 1840.²³¹ In his further reply, three days later,²³² the elder Newman set out a comprehensive account of his own position and, in so doing, avowedly sought to make of it a ‘stumbling-block’ in his brother’s path towards the abandonment of orthodox Christology and Trinitarian theology.²³³ His account of his own position reveals just how much he had come to accept the notion of development of doctrine, how central it was to his theological preoccupations and how sophisticated his notion of it had become by this time. It was,

²²⁷ See Newman, F.W., *Phases of Faith; or, Passages from the History of My Creed*, (London: J.Chapman, 1850), pp.16-40.

²²⁸ *LD* vii, p.408.

²²⁹ JHN to Thomas Mozley, in *LD* vii, p.411.

²³⁰ JHN to F.W.Newman, 22 October 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.412-415.

²³¹ *LD* vii, p.434.

²³² JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.436-442.

²³³ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.442.

in fact, as both Peterburs²³⁴ and Pereiro note, a first description of ‘his theory of developments’.²³⁵ The letter set out substantially what was to become the thesis of the *Essay*: that development and identity are a necessary sign of life; that the Church not only grows in its ability to articulate its teachings and practices but also in its understanding of those doctrines not in spite of but because of changing historical and cultural circumstances; and that there appear to be tests by which the authenticity or otherwise of developments can be established.²³⁶

In the letter, Newman first stated that he believed ‘it to be a plain external truth that ... the Church’s religion has been one and the same from first to last’²³⁷ and he then went on to track that religion, in a series of twelve points, in which he demonstrates that the development of the Church’s ‘doctrines and course of conduct’ over time, in response to ‘external and internal causes’,²³⁸ is not only observable but necessary for both the organic unity of the Church itself and to ensure that its faith remains in later centuries ‘the same religion’ as it professed in earlier.²³⁹ In language which prefigures the imagery he would come to rely on in his final University Sermon and the *Essay*, he noted that ‘all systems which have life, have a development, yet do not cease to have an identity though they develop’.²⁴⁰ Furthermore, he argued that, in addition to being an observable and necessary fact, there could be no objection to the development of this same religion insofar as particular ‘Church developments ... harmonize with its temper and principles, are consistent with the ideas from which the[y] profess to spring, and are

²³⁴ Peterburs, M., ‘Newman and the Development of Doctrine’, in V. Allen McClelland, ed., *By Whose Authority: Newman, Manning and the Magisterium*, (Bath: Downside Abbey Press, 1996), pp.49-78, here p.62.

²³⁵ Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.168.

²³⁶ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.441.

²³⁷ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.439.

²³⁸ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.440.

²³⁹ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.441.

²⁴⁰ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.441.

professed unanimously by its members'.²⁴¹ This was no arbitrary change but one ordered towards the unity and integrity of Christianity and one that could be tested to authenticate whether a particular development formed part of the unity and integrity: whether any particular development was 'legitimate' or 'doubtful'.²⁴²

The question of how change and continuity could be reconciled had become *the* theological question for Newman and he had come to understand that the answer would be fundamentally ecclesiological. The Church of England, if it was to sustain its claims to Newman's loyalty, would need to be able to make good its position as the branch of the Church Catholic in possession of England and her dependencies, with an explicit demonstration of its Apostolicity. Newman had not, until the Wiseman article, seriously questioned whether, in its teaching or in its ecclesial life, the English church had remained true to this Apostolical note. In the early tracts, he seemed to have treated Apostolicity as the present, though often hidden, ecclesial reality of the Church of England and its teaching and, indeed, as has been shown in the consideration of the correspondence with Jager, he simply assumed that the fidelity of the Church of England to Apostolical faith and order was a self-evident truth. Newman had admitted to his brother that there was some merit in the criticism 'that I make a Church half visible, half invisible ... like a building seen through a mist'.²⁴³ The extent to which Wiseman's arguments had struck home is supported by the evidence of Newman's concentration on the English church's claim to the note of apostolicity in 'Catholicity of the English Church': what was once self-evident needed now to be demonstrated. The *British Critic* article had not been the place to do that and the correspondence with his brother and with Keble had revealed the precarious nature of Newman's hold on his

²⁴¹ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.441.

²⁴² JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.441.

²⁴³ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.440.

place in the Church of England. It was to be a process fraught with risk, one he recognised:

I do not think that we have yet made a fair trial how much the English Church will bear. I know it is a hazardous experiment, like proving Cannon. Yet we must not take it for granted the metal will burst in the operation. It has borne at various times, not to say at this time, a great infusion of Catholic Truth without damage.²⁴⁴

The events of 1841 and 1842 would provide the proving ground and would make clear to him whether, despite any capacity he might or might not have had for ambiguity, the English Church would bear, in sufficient measure, the ‘Catholic Truth’ of the role of ecclesial authority in the authentication of doctrine that Newman now believed to be a necessary mark of that Apostolical faith for which he had so long sought.

V. Tract 90 and the Jerusalem Bishopric

If the theory of possession was to do duty in reality as a hypothesis to account for the difficulty of change and continuity and not be merely yet another paper theory, the reality of the Church of England would need to match up to the high expectations that Newman had laid upon it in his theory. In terms of its doctrine and its order, there would need to be sufficient correspondence between the English Church and the Church of Newman’s theory. In the light of Newman’s assertions of confidence following the *British Critic* article, it is clear that Newman expected just such a correspondence to be found in the evidence of the Church of England’s life and belief. It has already been suggested that those assertions might equally be read as having something of the brittle,

²⁴⁴ JHN to John Keble, 6 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.433.

self-induced bravado of one who suspects that the position to which one has committed oneself might not, in fact, hold. Whatever the status of Newman's confidence, the reaction of the Bishops of the Church of England to Newman's final tract, *Tract 90*,²⁴⁵ and the moves to establish a Lutheran/Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem were to settle conclusively and unambiguously for Newman the question of the reality and sustainability of his latest hypothesis.

The circumstances of the generation of the Thirty-Nine Articles were such that the matter of their proper interpretation and scope would ever be likely to be a matter of debate. In their first fifty years much of the debate was about the extent to which they bound the Church of England to an exclusively Reformed soteriology or were permissive of a rather less stringent theory which could accommodate the necessity of good works within the theology of justification. The Articles 'had not been intended to be rigid or exclusive upon the point',²⁴⁶ and by the first years of the reign of Charles I they appeared to create room enough for strict Calvinist and Arminian alike to subscribe to them. In 1628, the Articles had been prefaced with a declaration, almost certainly the work of Archbishop Laud, placed there on the instructions of the King with the intention of curtailing further attempts at exclusivity by closing off the mechanism for dispute as to the precise meaning of the articles. It ordered:

... that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.²⁴⁷

That such Articles, sprung from the controversies of the sixteenth century and whose particular doctrinal expression had been drafted to hold a very precarious

²⁴⁵ *Tract 90: Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles*, in *Tracts*, vol.5, ('*Tract 90*')

²⁴⁶ Chadwick, O., *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p.24.

²⁴⁷ 'The King's Declaration, 1628', in Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, pp.481f, here p.482.

balance between competing and apparently incompatible theologies, would be susceptible to be treated in accordance with such an injunction seems wishful thinking. By 1643, John Bramhall, Archdeacon of Meath, a noted clerical supporter of Charles and later, after the Restoration, Archbishop of Armagh,²⁴⁸ pointed out that the very nature of the Articles made taking them on literal terms unrealistic. He noted that the Articles contained such a range of statements, that some kind of interpretation was both essential and inevitable. They were, he wrote, of such diversity of type, that the claims to a literal reading that could be made for them, were entirely dependent upon the type of truth to which each Article, itself, laid claim:

Some of them are the very same that are contained in the Creed; some others of them are practical truths, which come not within the proper list of points or articles to be believed; lastly, some of them are pious opinions or inferior truths, which are proposed by the Church of England to all her sons, as not to be opposed; not as essentials of Faith necessary to be believed by all Christians *necessitate medii*, under pain of damnation.²⁴⁹

The genius of the Articles is to be found, in part because of this diversity of type, in their ability to be held by those of widely divergent opinions. They were carefully crafted to be capable of acceptance by all but those who held to strict Anabaptist beliefs concerning the common tenure of goods or the necessity of believers' baptism, on the one hand, and the specifically Roman Catholic teachings relating to the authority of the Papacy, transubstantiation, indulgences and the invocation of saints, on the other. Henry Chadwick's description of the Articles as 'partly controversial'²⁵⁰ has more than a hint of irony to it, but it does convey something

²⁴⁸ John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh (c.1594-1663), *DNB Online* at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/3237>>, [accessed 16 September 2013]

²⁴⁹ Bramhall, J., 'Schism Guarded', in Haddan, A.W., ed., *The works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall sometime Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of All Ireland: with a life of the author, and a collection of his letters*, 5 vols., (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843), vol.2, p.476

²⁵⁰ Chadwick, H., 'Tradition, Fathers, and Councils', in Sykes *et al.*, eds., *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998), pp.100-115, here p.105.

of their mixed nature: some almost entirely uncontroversial even at the time of their composition,²⁵¹ others speaking directly to the very issues regarding justification, ecclesial authority and ritual practice that had been at the root of the sixteenth century's controversies. Taken as a whole, Chadwick's categorisation, that they lay out a position that 'may be labelled Reformed Catholicism',²⁵² is not without merit, even if it is not immediately obvious to Roman Catholic sensibilities that they contain much that is (or, indeed, was) distinctly Catholic. It is true that the position of the Anabaptists relating to Baptism is rejected, as are opposition to private property and the taking of oaths.²⁵³ Nevertheless the Articles' treatment of papal authority, transubstantiation, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Purgatory, relics and indulgences is accompanied with such condemnatory language²⁵⁴ that it is hard to conclude other than that they aimed to accomplish a wholesale demolition of the apparatus and thinking behind what, then and now, was recognisably and distinctively Catholic belief and practice.

Charles I's prefatory declaration had been aimed at resolving the disputes, then current, between differing schools of Protestant thought, concerning the meaning of the Articles. The increasing latitude in the interpretation of the Articles throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries similarly provided accommodation for positions which were still distinctly Protestant. Notwithstanding Laud's attempts at ritual reform²⁵⁵ and, later, the theology of the Non-Jurors, such room for manoeuvre as there

²⁵¹ e.g. the first five, see Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation*, pp.285-287.

²⁵² Chadwick, H., 'Tradition, Fathers, and Councils', p.106.

²⁵³ Articles 27, 38 and 39, see *Documents of the English Reformation*, pp.301, 308 and 308f.

²⁵⁴ Articles 19, 22, 28, 31 and 37, see *Documents of the English Reformation*, pp.296, 297, 301f., 303 and 307f.

²⁵⁵ For a largely sympathetic account see Carlton, C., *Archbishop William Laud*, (New York: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1987). Less sympathetic is Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), although this does not even attempt to approach the judgement of Patrick Collinson, who describes Laud as '... the greatest calamity ever visited upon the English Church', in Collinson, P., *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in England 1559-1625*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p.90.

was did not extend in a Catholic direction. Insofar as there was a received reading of the Articles by the time Newman came to write *Tract 90*, it was a reading that permitted the Calvinist, the Arminian, the Evangelical, the old High Churchman, the Erastian and the Latitudinarian room. Newman's 'novelty' was 'in his handling the articles in a Catholic direction'.²⁵⁶

The tract was published on 27 February 1841 and immediately caused serious excitement. Some, such as Ward, were thrilled by its contents²⁵⁷ but the chorus of criticism was not long in coming,²⁵⁸ and, when it came, was relentless and, ultimately, devastating for Newman's position within the English church. The cause of excitement for both those who thrilled to it and those who condemned it was the same: the attempt to show how those historic formularies of Anglicanism were capable of an interpretation that was both authentically Anglican and coherently Catholic. In particular, in *Tract 90* Newman sought to counter the objection: 'that there are in the Articles [i.e., the Thirty Nine Articles] propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic faith',²⁵⁹ and he would do this, he claimed, by showing that:

... our Articles also ... are, through GOD's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine.²⁶⁰

Although he had earlier suggested that 'tho' I believe them to be entirely scriptural, ... I think they accidentally countenance a vile Protestantism',²⁶¹ now

²⁵⁶ Chadwick, O., *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*, p.25. Rather more harshly, Pereiro has described this as having '... completed their [i.e. the Articles'] trivialization', in Pereiro, *Ethos*, p.191.

²⁵⁷ See, e.g. Prothero, R.E., *The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley*, 2 vols., (London: John Murray, 1893), vol. I, p.292

²⁵⁸ The first critical response, ostensibly from four tutors in the University of Oxford (Churton, Wilson, Griffiths and Tait), but in fact largely the work of C.P. Golightly, appeared on 8 March 1841. See 'From T.T. Churton and Others to the Editor of the "Tracts for the Times"', 8 March 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.59f.

²⁵⁹ *Tract 90*, p.2.

²⁶⁰ *Tract 90*, p.4.

Newman's conviction, expressed at the very end of *Tract 90*, was that the Articles had been 'drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded'.²⁶² Whether there was much conscious intent to be so inclusive in the middle of the controversies of the sixteenth century is, as has been shown, a matter of some debate but it was clearly of a piece with the position of many within the Oxford Movement and with the argument Newman had put forward in 'Catholicity of the English Church'. *Tract 90* would be an attempt to prove what he had asserted in that article, that the faith of the Church of England, insofar as it was particular to the Church of England, was a move 'towards a more perfect Catholicism'.²⁶³

Newman's stated purpose in writing *Tract 90* was clear. He had felt for some time that it was necessary to offer to the members of the Oxford Movement a truly Catholic synthesis of Anglicanism's distinctive teachings, one that would act as a brake on the headlong slide towards Rome that was becoming apparent in some of the younger Tractarians. In the summer of 1840, for example, he had written to Pusey of his concerns about R.W. Williams, who had arrived at a position of appearing, to Newman, to believe that:

... the Roman is the Catholic Church, that therefore the Tridentine Decrees are eternal truth, that to oppose them is heresy, that all who sign the 39 articles do oppose them, and that it is a sin to be in communion with heretics.²⁶⁴

Although Williams was, Newman perceived, 'stationary at present',²⁶⁵ that is in no immediate danger of secession to Rome, it was clear to him that it was his duty and

²⁶¹ JHN to R.F. Wilson, 13 May 1835, in *LD* v, p.70. He was later to suggest that the Catholic sense of the Articles '... had never been publicly recognized, while the interpretation of the day was Protestant and exclusive', see *Apo.*, p.232.

²⁶² *Tract 90*, p.83.

²⁶³ JHN, 'Catholicity of the English Church', p.77. Cf. JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1837), p.20.

²⁶⁴ JHN to E.B. Pusey, 28 July 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.371f., here p.372.

that of the other leaders of the Movement to do all they could to prevent such defections. That, at least, was the proximate cause for *Tract 90*.²⁶⁶ Newman's need to test the Anglican synthesis against his own conception of the faith of the Old Church must, however, be counted as of more fundamentally causal importance. As Nockles observes: 'Without the doubts of 1839, it probably would never have been written.'²⁶⁷

Whatever his explicit or implicit motives, there are those who have argued that Newman was being deliberately antagonistic. Dean Church's recollection, one that was to become a staple of Tractarian historiography amongst those, Church included, who viewed Newman's eventual defection as an unqualified catastrophe for the Oxford Movement, was that from the beginning there were those, often in positions of ecclesiastical authority, who believed that Newman was being consciously 'absurd, mischievous, and at length traitorous'.²⁶⁸ In more recent times, Paul Avis has called into question Newman's account of his purpose in publishing *Tract 90* and particularly the account offered in the *Apologia*. He argues that Newman must have known that the tract would have been read more widely than its ostensible target audience and that the reaction of the wider readership was entirely predictable.²⁶⁹ Whilst Newman was perfectly capable of calculated antagonism, the tone of concern Newman adopted in his correspondence about the need to provide a bulwark against conversion to Rome for the younger members of the Movement is entirely consistent with the concern he had consistently displayed for those in whose pastoral charge he saw himself. This same

²⁶⁵ JHN to E.B.Pusey, 28 July 1840, in *LD* vii, p.371.

²⁶⁶ See also Newman's 13 August 1841 letter to Edward Pusey in *LD* viii, pp.242-245, and his comments in JHN to R. W. Jelf, 13 March 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.78-88, here p.78.

²⁶⁷ Nockles, 'Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops', p.41.

²⁶⁸ Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*, (London: Macmillan, 1891), p.251.

²⁶⁹ Avis, P., *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1989), p.226. For rival assessments of Newman's purpose in writing *Tract 90*, cf., *Beyond the Reformation?: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition* (London: Continuum, 2006), pp.12-13; and J. R. Connolly, *John Henry Newman: A View of Catholic Faith for the New Millennium* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005), pp.4-5.

sense of moral duty that had lain at the base of his dispute with Hawkins over the Oriel tutorship, and which, despite his admission to Wilson of their countenancing of ‘vile Protestantism’,²⁷⁰ had him in the lists to defend retaining compulsory subscription to the Articles in the University in the mid-1830s,²⁷¹ now impelled him to attempt, if at all possible, a presentation which would ‘keep our young friends etc from stumbling at the Articles and going to Rome’.²⁷² Newman had shown the draft tract to both Pusey and Keble before it was published, the latter commenting that he thought ‘it very likely to answer its purpose’.²⁷³ Neither man appears to have foreseen the storm of reaction.

Had Newman been the first to attempt a Catholic synthesis of the Thirty-Nine Articles, the very novelty of the subject matter of *Tract 90* would have been enough to occasion the reaction it received. It had, however, been attempted at least twice. In the early seventeenth century, the Roman Catholic convert, Franciscan friar and papal diplomat, Christopher Davenport, under his name in religion, Francis of Santa Clara,²⁷⁴ wrote a detailed examination of the Articles from the perspective of Tridentine Catholicism, which aimed at securing doctrinal agreement as a prelude to formal

²⁷⁰ JHN to R.F.Wilson, 13 May 1835, in *LD* v, p.70.

²⁷¹ It was from the time of this controversy that the idea of producing a Catholic interpretation of the Articles may first have come. The suggestion appears in a letter from Froude to Newman ahead of the former’s intended journey to Italy with Isaac Williams: ‘The notion of going to Rome with Isaac is very gratifying ... It occurred to me the other day that one might send a Latin petition to the Pope confessing one’s interpretation of the 39 Articles (Which by the by the Jesuit Francis Santa Clara showed to be “patient if not ambitious of a Catholic meaning” and apparently Laud did not think the interpretation over strained vid Heylin) ... , and praying that one might be allowed to communicate in their Churches.’ (Richard Hurrell Froude to JHN, 4 March 1835, in *LD* v, pp.68f., here p.68). In 1877, Newman quoted Francis Santa Clara’s expression ‘patient if not ambitious of a Catholic meaning’ in the ‘Notice’ appearing in the Uniform Edition of *Tract 90*, p.265. Francis Santa Clara was, in fact, not a Jesuit but, rather, a Franciscan. See n.272 below.

²⁷² JHN to Thomas Mozley, 7 March 1841, in *LD* viii, pp57f., here p.58.

²⁷³ John Keble to JHN, 19 February 1841, in *LD* viii, p.39.

²⁷⁴ For an account of the life of this remarkable man, see Dockery, J.B., *Christopher Davenport: Friar and Diplomat*, (London: Burns and Oates, 1960). See also Christopher Davenport (c.1595-1680), in *DNB Online*, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/7199>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

corporate reunion.²⁷⁵ Again, earlier in the nineteenth century, Samuel Wix produced another, this time from a pre-tractarian High Church perspective.²⁷⁶ What distinguished these attempts from Newman's in *Tract 90* was not the subject matter *per se*, but Newman's controversial status and, as Nockles puts it, 'the execution of the Tract, and its reasoning'.²⁷⁷ Gladstone observed that: 'there never was an uproar, and there never were censures, which were more attributable to the manner and language of a publication as contrasted with its substance'.²⁷⁸ Yet the substance itself was not without responsibility for the uproar. In deciding to tackle fourteen of the thirty-nine, Newman selected those where the popular understanding was most difficult to square with a Catholic reading. His consideration of Articles 6, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31, 32, 35 and 37 covered not only those disciplinary matters where Roman and Anglican practice merely differed (such as the celibacy of the clergy) but also those that touched on the doctrinal issues that had been right at the heart of the Reformation controversies: the place of Scripture, the authority of the Church, the theology of justification and the sacramental and devotional apparatus. In all of this, Newman sought to maintain a distinction between the official Roman doctrine and popular Roman belief and practice, which, he argued, allowed for an accommodation of the most of the former within a reasonable interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Although Newman's insistence on expressing himself in a manner that could easily be taken as an insinuation that he spoke on behalf of the University in some inchoate,

²⁷⁵ Davenport, C., *Deus, natura, gratia, sive tractatus de praedestinatione*, (Lyon: [no publisher given], 1634).

²⁷⁶ Wix, S., *Reflections concerning the expediency of a council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a view to accommodate religious differences [&c.]*, (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1818).

²⁷⁷ Nockles, 'Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops', p.42.

²⁷⁸ Gladstone, W.E., *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, ed. Lathbury, D.C., 2 vols., (London: John Murray, 1910), vol.1, p281.

informal but substantially real way irritated a number of his early critics,²⁷⁹ it was neither this nor the specific treatment of any particular article that gave cause for the reaction. The principal reason that first the four tutors, then the Heads of Houses, then Newman's own Bishop, then wider public opinion and, later yet, almost the whole English episcopal bench came out against *Tract 90* was that, from beginning to end, it read like an attack on the entire edifice of the Thirty-Nine Articles and with it the English Church:

I do not think (to borrow Mr. Newman's illustration), that the Articles are a heap of stones but a building, and he who induces himself by thirty-nine quibbles to assent to them piecemeal, and then denies them as whole, is guilty of the most hateful verbal sophistry and mental reservation.²⁸⁰

Such harsh criticism from those within the University and in the public press engaged Newman's polemical interest but left him fundamentally unmoved in his ecclesial position, even if he was to comment to Maria Giberne that 'a destiny hangs over us, a single step may ruin all'.²⁸¹

Newman's own Bishop, Bagot,²⁸² had expressed his reservations and requested both that there be no further tracts and that *Tract 90* be withdrawn from circulation,²⁸³ but he had not yet condemned it. Newman would still be content to write: 'I consider the Church over which your Lordship presides to be the Catholic Church in this country'.²⁸⁴ Bagot certainly never doubted it, although it is unlikely that that is quite how he would have expressed it, unless pushed. Bagot's treatment of Newman throughout this episode was marked by a certain fatherly indulgence: he was, as

²⁷⁹ See, e.g. Abbott, E.A., *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols., (London: Macmillan, 1892), vol.2, p.95.

²⁸⁰ Lowe, R., *Observations Suggested by 'A few more words in support of no.90'*, (Oxford: Baxter, 1841), p.18.

²⁸¹ JHN to Miss M.R.Giberne, 25 March 1841, in *LD* viii, p.118.

²⁸² Richard Bagot (1782-1854), in *DNB Online*, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/1039?docPos=9>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

²⁸³ Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford to E.B.Pusey, 18 March 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.93-95.

²⁸⁴ JHN to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, 29 March 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.129-144, here p.140.

Nockles says, ‘gentle, considerate’.²⁸⁵ It was a judgment with which, despite his obvious and understandable disappointment at the Bishop’s eventual condemnation of *Tract 90* in his charge of 1842, Newman concurred.²⁸⁶ Newman took comfort that those who, in his view, stood in succession to the apostles had not yet formally rejected his argument. In March he wrote to Wilberforce: ‘The Bishops, I trust, are likely to do nothing’,²⁸⁷ and, a few weeks later to Phillipps:

No doctrine or principle has been conceded by us, or condemned by Authority. The Bishop has but said that a certain Tract is objectionable...I have no intention whatever of yielding any one point which I hold on conviction—And that the authorities of the Church know full well.²⁸⁸

The theory of possession still held, as he reminded Phillipps:

Our Bishop is our Pope. It is our theory that each Diocese is an integral Church, intercommunion being a duty, (and the breach of it a sin) but not essential to Catholicity.²⁸⁹

In a letter to Bagot, Newman could still write of the Church of England as ‘that favoured communion in which God’s good providence has placed us’.²⁹⁰

During the University’s Long Vacation of 1841 Newman, resident at Littlemore, returned to his study of Athanasius, in preparation for the publication of a translation of his works. Rather than a return to the tranquillity of study, he later recalled that it marked a return to the unease of 1839: ‘The ghost had come a second time. In the *Arian*

²⁸⁵ Nockles, ‘Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops’, pp.55-60, here p.60.

²⁸⁶ ‘I will not imply that your Lordship can act otherwise than indulgently to any one, but certainly I did feel at the time, that in the midst of the kindness you shewed to me personally, you were exercising an anxious vigilance over my publication, which reminded me of my responsibility to your Lordship.’ (JHN to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, 29 March 1841, in *LD* viii, pp130f., here p.131. Bagot’s charge on *Tract 90* came out in May 1842 and seemed to Newman ‘... very favourable to us ...’, although the wording of its treatment of the tract was cause for ‘... delicate wording ...’ and anxiety. (JHN to John Keble, 24 May 1842, in *LD* ix, pp.14f., here p.14). The text of the charge is in *LD* ix, pp.605-612. Newman was later to write, in the *Apologia*, of Bagot’s conduct regarding *Tract 90*, ‘I impute nothing whatever to him, he was ever most kind to me.’ (*Apo.*, p.174).

²⁸⁷ JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 22 March 1841, in *LD* viii, p.113.

²⁸⁸ JHN to Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, 8 April 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.165f.

²⁸⁹ JHN to Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, 8 April 1841, in *LD* viii, p.166.

²⁹⁰ JHN to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, 29 March 1841, in *LD* viii, p.131.

History I found the very same phenomenon, in a far bolder shape, which I had found in the Monophysite.²⁹¹ The cause of this spectral return was a historical parallel. Newman saw, once again, the similarity between the relative position of the parties in an ancient doctrinal dispute and the position of the English and Roman Catholic Churches in his own day. He now clearly saw what Wiseman had so momentously and laboriously pointed out in the *Dublin Review* articles: that the antiquity of a doctrine is not in itself a sufficient guarantee of the doctrine's orthodoxy, and that a doctrine need not have been explicitly recognised as revealed by the apostolic Church in order to be considered part of the apostolic faith by the Fathers. Against this, he now had only the bulwark of his theory of possession and the security that the position he had taken in *Tract 90* had, thus far, escaped formal episcopal censure.

Beginning in the summer of 1841 the bishops began to publish visitation charges for the clergy in their dioceses which either strongly cautioned against, or implicitly or explicitly condemned, the *Tracts for the Times*, and *Tract 90* in particular.²⁹² It appeared to Newman that the bishops, in condemning *Tract 90*, were attacking the Catholic Faith itself. One, at least, John Bird Sumner of Chester,²⁹³ Newman insinuated to Keble, was leading his diocese into schism:

Have you seen the Bishop of Chester's charge? He seems to me, as far as in him lies, to have cut off Chester by it from the Catholic Church. In such cases I see only the alternative of obeying or of calling a bishop heretic. St Ignatius's words about trifling with the Bishop invisible are so strong, I really see no alternative between denying he is in possession of his ... functions and obeying him.²⁹⁴

²⁹¹ *Apo.*, p.243.

²⁹² See Appendix 5, *LD* viii, pp.569-592, and Appendix 2, *LD* ix, pp.605-612.

²⁹³ John Bird Sumner, in *DNB Online*, at

<<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/26785?docPos=6>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

²⁹⁴ JHN to John Keble, 24 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.305f.

It seemed that, at least as far as Chester was concerned, the theory of possession had broken.

Newman had, from the first, maintained a narrative in which he suggested that the Bishops had, somehow, broken an implicit understanding: he would not push *Tract 90* and they would not condemn it. He seems to have genuinely convinced himself, and not a few of his followers, that this was the case, although it is difficult to see how such an understanding would have manifested itself. Nonetheless, Newman was determined to fight back:

I suppose it will be necessary in some shape or other to re-assert *Tract 90*; else, it will seem, after these Bishops' Charges, as if it were silenced, which it has not been, nor do I intend it should be. I wish to keep quiet; but if Bishops speak, I will speak too.²⁹⁵

In the event, events were to intervene to make any such attempt otiose.

In 1841, the Prussian diplomat Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen,²⁹⁶ publicised a plan to establish a Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem. Driven by the twin desires of the Emperor Frederick Wilhelm IV to reintroduce an episcopate to the Prussian state church and counter French influence in the Near East, Bunsen's plan received early support in Britain and by the autumn of that year Parliament had enacted legislation that allowed for the establishment of a see, the appointment to which would alternately be made by England and Prussia.²⁹⁷ Newman saw the plan as a purely opportunistic, political act,

²⁹⁵ JHN to Miss M.R.Giberne, 17 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.298f., here p.299. See also JHN to J.R.Hope, 17 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.300f.; JHN to John Keble, 24 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.305f.; JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 24 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.307f.; and JHN to Thomas Mozley, 29 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.311f.

²⁹⁶ Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen (1791-1860), in *DNB Online*, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/53760?docPos=2>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

²⁹⁷ For an outline of the development and implementation of the plan, see Greaves, R.W., 'The Jerusalem Bishopric, 1841, in *The English Historical Review*, 64 (1949), pp.328-352. See also Curran, K., *The Romanesque Revival: Religion, Politics, and Transnational Exchange*, (State College: Penn State University Press, 2003), pp.179-184.

but one with far-reaching consequences for the English Church. He expressed his objections to Wood, describing the proposal as ‘deplorable’,²⁹⁸ and observed to Maria Giberne:

What a miserable concern this Jerusalem Bishoprick [sic] is! We have not a single member of our Church there, except for travellers [sic] and officials. It is a mere political piece of business, to give our government influence in the country’.²⁹⁹

To Keble he wrote that, to achieve a political end by means of ‘a resident religious influence’ in Jerusalem, the British Government was engaging in an act with profound ecclesiological consequences:

So we join with Protestant Prussia to found a sect and put a Bishop over it. Really, if one has any right to utter such a thing, considering Jerusalem is the spot, there is something awful in this.³⁰⁰

What he had half-suspected Sumner of having done, by virtue of his charge to the clergy of the Diocese of Chester, that is leading the English Church into schism, he now believed Parliament, with the full support of the entire English episcopate, had done with the Jerusalem Bishopric:

Alas! I cannot deny that the outward notes of the Church are partly gone from us, and partly going; and a most fearful judgment it is....This in good measure has fallen upon us. The Church of God is under eclipse among us. Where is our unity, for which Christ prayed? where our charity, which He enjoined? where the faith once delivered, when each has his own doctrine.³⁰¹

Lest these words did not make sufficiently explicit Newman’s concerns, when he came to publish the sermon, along with twenty-five others, in *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, in late 1843, he added two notes. For the tone as much as for the content, it is worth quoting them in full:

²⁹⁸ JHN to S.F.Wood, 10 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.293f., here p.293.

²⁹⁹ JHN to Miss M.R.Giberne, 17 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.298f., here p.299.

³⁰⁰ JHN to John Keble, 24 October 1841, in *LD* viii, pp.305f., here p.306.

³⁰¹ Sermon no.584, ‘Outward and Inward Notes of the Church’, in *SD*, pp.324-342, here p.335, ‘... preached Number 584 ...’, (5 December 1841, in *LD* viii, p.363).

1. An allusion was here intended to the then recent appointment (1841) of an Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem, which has had a most grievous effect in weakening the argument for our church's Catholicity, and in shaking the belief in it of individuals. May that measure utterly fail and come to nought, and be as though it had never been!

2. Such conversions to the Church of Rome as have occurred among us, are, for the most part, subsequent to March, 1841; from which date our Church has, in various ways, and through various of her organs, taken a side, and that the Protestant side, in a number of questions of the day. The authorities who were parties to the condemnation of No. 90 of the "Tracts for the Times," by that interposition, released the author, in his own feelings, of the main weight of a great responsibility; the responsibility, which up to that time attached to him, of inculcating religious views which, however primitive, however necessary for our Church, however sanctioned by her writers, tended, without a strong safeguard, towards the theology of Rome. Till then, whatever happened amiss in the spread of Catholic doctrine, might be supposed to flow as a direct result from that one cause which alone seemed in operation, the advocacy of patristical theology; and of its advocates the remedy and correction of all irregularities in the direction of Rome might fairly be demanded. But the state of the case was changed, when persons in station interfered with the work, and took the matter into their own hands. In saying this, the author has no wish at all to rid himself of such responsibility as really belongs to him. That in the course of his exposition of Anglican principles, statements or views were evolved which have become a disposing cause of certain tendencies to Rome, now existing, he does not deny; but theological principles and doctrines have little influence on the mind holding them, without the stimulus of external circumstances. Many a man might have held an abstract theory about the Catholic Church to which it was difficult to adjust our own, might have submitted a suspicion, or even painful doubts about the latter, yet never have been impelled onwards, had our rulers preserved the quiescence of former years; but it is the corroboration of a present, living, and energetic heterodoxy, which realizes and makes them practical; it has been the recent speeches and acts of authorities, who had so long been tolerant of Protestant error, which have given to inquiry and to theory its force and its edge. Such toleration of Catholic doctrine may have been impossible or wrong; that is another question, with which private persons have no right to interfere; still it may be a fact, that the want of it has been the cause of recent secessions.³⁰²

The theory of possession had, for Newman, been broken. If the Catholicism of the Church was to provide the key to the search for continuity in the face of doctrinal change, the episcopal response to *Tract 90* and the lightness with which those same bishops would, as Newman saw it, lay aside their apostolical claims over the

³⁰² SD, p.342.

establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric, meant that it would not be found where he had thus far hoped it to be.

Chapter 4

From a Catholicism of the Church to the Church of Catholicism – 1842 to 1845

Each of the hypotheses which Newman had proposed to account for change in Christian doctrine which might be reconciled with his belief in its essential continuity had failed to stand up to scrutiny. He had been aware, since at least as early as 1826, of the difficulty caused by the historical evidence of doctrinal change, and he had suggested successive theories to account for this: by 1842 none still stood. The objections to each hypothesis had been sufficient to undermine Newman's capacity to reconcile his *a priori* assumption of a fixed deposit of divine revelation with that evidence of doctrinal change. The various hypotheses had been shown either to be insufficient explanation for what had happened or to be paper theories, untried in the real life of a Church of England unwilling to try them, and decisively rejected and undermined by precisely those whose office within that Church it was, Newman believed, to uphold them. This chapter examines Newman's final attempt at arriving at a real and workable hypothesis in his last University Sermon and in the *Essay*. It first considers the background to Newman's fifteenth and final University Sermon before looking closely at the text of the sermon itself, in which the theory of development, the outlines of which were sketched out in the correspondence with his brother Francis, is first laid out in detail. The chapter then considers the full flowering of Newman's work on development in the *Essay*. It looks at the process of its production in 1844 and 1845, its structure and text. Examining the complete synthetic hypothesis, which preserved and incorporated many elements of his prior attempts at accounting for the difficulty of continuity and change, the chapter closes by arguing that Newman's theory of development is, in virtue of its logical structure, a fundamentally ecclesiological

hypothesis to account for developments in doctrine and practice rather than an attempt to set forth a forensic method for the authentication or otherwise of particular developments in Christian doctrine.

I. Background to the Final University Sermon

As has been shown in the previous chapters of this dissertation, Newman had long accepted that there had been a change in expressions of doctrine across time and he had come to see that later expressions contained a complexity and richness of understanding that was not to be found in the earlier. Through his consideration and reconsideration of the Christological and Trinitarian controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, over a decade or more, Newman had come to acknowledge the development of doctrinal ideas as an historical and observable fact. They were not merely changes in the doctrinal vocabulary itself, still less were they to be explained by a growing openness of the Church to speak of them. By 1842 his concern had crystallised around the need to establish a workable theological principle by which it was possible to demonstrate how those changes could be coherent and in accord with the apostolic faith. He had first attempted to do this through considering terminological change and the *disciplina arcani* which led him to various manifestations or iterations of a Catholicism of the Word, all of which ultimately failed to produce the account for which he was looking. This had led him to an attempt to construct a hypothesis which depended on a notion of a Catholicism of the Church, an endeavour which had foundered on the rocks of Anglican *realpolitik*.

In his correspondence with the Abbé Jager, Newman had sought to subject the practical, popular (as opposed to official) doctrines and devotions of Roman Catholicism, especially those related to the veneration of the Virgin Mary, to scrutiny and they had failed the test that he applied to them at that time. He measured them against the Vincentian Canon and found them wanting precisely because he could find no way of connecting their newness, their novelty with the ancient doctrine and practice of the Church. When he had attempted to justify the particular doctrinal formulations of Anglicanism in Tract 90, the reaction of his co-religionists had shown him that the problems of a hypothesis of the Catholicism of the Church were practically insurmountable from within the Anglican Communion: those upon whom the theory depended – the Bishops – were precisely those who refused its strictures and its consequences. The effect of the Monophysite parallel and Wiseman's article on the Donatists had first suggested what the Jerusalem Bishopric and the episcopal reaction to Tract 90 had confirmed: that a Catholicism of the Church could not alone provide a satisfactory account for development, not even in the attenuated form of his theory of possession and the desperate attempt to cling to the note of holiness that had characterised the article in the *British Critic*. In the letters to his brother Francis in the autumn of 1840, Newman had first explicitly, albeit privately, sketched out a synthetic system which, as this chapter will demonstrate, would provide a robust hypothesis of development that accounted for his long-lasting 'difficulty'. This hypothesis would draw on many elements of his earlier theories and bind them together in the ecclesial matrix of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church.

Owen Chadwick observes that Newman:

... had applied the test of antiquity to the teaching and practice of the Church of England, he had pressed her to measure herself against antiquity, and the Church

of England was refusing, and refusing vociferously, to be measured into the bed which he designed.¹

The immediate exterior result of that procrustean struggle had been Newman's withdrawal both from controversy and from Oxford life. Chadwick argues that there was an accompanying internal result: that '[b]etween 1841 and the spring of 1843 Newman's mind ... crossed the Rubicon' with regard to the notion of the development of doctrine.² In support of his contention, Chadwick cites two fixed points which he takes as conclusive evidence of such a momentous change. He first notes that, as late as 1841, Newman was declaring "that novelty in doctrine was heresy"³ and secondly, that Newman's final University Sermon, delivered on 2 February 1843, entitled "The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine", was his "first public utterance upon the question".⁴ Whilst both of those statements are, up to a point, correct, and the withdrawal to Littlemore a matter of record, the inference of the point in time of the internal change in Newman that Chadwick draws from them is not. The idea that Newman, in claiming that novelty in doctrine was the mark of heresy, was condemning any theory of the development of doctrine is to misunderstand both what Newman meant by novelty and what he meant by the development of doctrine.

The lengths to which Newman had gone, both in his correspondence with Jager and in Tract 90, to distinguish between novelty and development were considerable. In the Jager correspondence, it was precisely the novelty of Roman Catholic teaching and practice that Newman criticised but it was novelty understood in the sense of an apparent unconnected newness, incoherence and incompatibility with antecedent, and particularly patristic, expressions of Christian doctrine. Newman had presumed that

¹ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.120.

² Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.120.

³ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.120.

⁴ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.120.

the particular expression of Christian belief and practice to be found in the Church of England was capable of such a connection, although a more forensic interlocutor than the Abbé Jager might have put Newman to proof on this matter, proof that the controversy around Tract 90 had shown was wanting.

In making his assertion that the Rubicon of development was crossed sometime between 1841 and 1843, Chadwick relies particularly on an interpretation of the arguments advanced by Newman in a review of a series of pamphlets on the subject of conversion to Roman Catholicism, which appeared in *British Critic* in July 1841⁵ and which came to be known by its running header, 'Private Judgment'. Here Newman had written that

... considering, in a word, that change is really the characteristic of error, and unalterableness the attribute of truth, of holiness, of Almighty God Himself, we consider that when Private Judgment moves in the direction of innovation, it may well be regarded at first with suspicion and treated with severity. Nay, we confess even a satisfaction, when a penalty is attached to the expression of new doctrines, or to a change of communion. We repeat it, if any men have strong feelings, they should pay for them; if they think it a duty to unsettle things established, they should show their earnestness by being willing to suffer. We shall be the last to complain of this kind of persecution, even though directed against what we consider the cause of truth. Such disadvantages do no harm to that cause in the event, but they bring home to a man's mind his own responsibility; they are a memento to him of a great moral law, and warn him that his private judgment, if not a duty, is a sin.⁶

Chadwick appears to take this as evidence that Newman rejected the notion of development altogether and yet Newman's argument here and elsewhere in the article makes obvious the difference between those changes which were novel, relying on nothing more than private judgment, and those which represented proper developments. This is a further prefiguring of the distinction between authentic developments and corruptions, first drawn in the correspondence with his brother Francis in the November

⁵ JHN, 'Book Review', *British Critic*, 30 (1841), ('Private Judgment'), pp.100-134. The article is reproduced in the Uniform Edition with minor textual amendments in *Ess ii*, pp.336-374.

⁶ JHN, 'Private Judgment', p.105.

of the previous year, and which he was later to repeat throughout the *Essay*. It is, of course, possible that Chadwick was unaware of the correspondence with Francis Newman, for he makes no mention of it. Nevertheless the distinction in ‘Private Judgment’ is clear and yet Chadwick appears not to consider it.

Immediately before the remarks in ‘Private Judgment’ cited above, Newman had already argued that:

... we are far indeed from saying, that it is never to advance in the direction of change or revolution, else the Gospel itself could never have been introduced; but we consider that such material changes have a *prima facie* case against them; they have something to get over, to prove their admissibility, before it can be reasonably granted⁷

Here Newman is considering primarily the use of private judgment in justifying a change of religious confession but later makes clear that the same principle applies to alterations or changes, developments in doctrine. The proper use of private judgment is, Newman maintained, not to justify which doctrines one can or cannot, should or should not assent to, but to identify who the authentic teacher of the faith is:

The great question which it [scripture] puts before private judgement is, who is God’s prophet and where? Who is to be considered the voice of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church?⁸

It is an argument that Newman was to repeat in his 1848 novel *Loss and Gain*, where he employs the metaphor of the use of a lamp to find one’s way into a house to explain the proper use of private judgment in finding the truth:

And here we see what is meant when a person says that the Catholic system comes home to his mind, fulfils his ideas of religion, satisfies his sympathies, and the like; and thereupon becomes a Catholic. Such a person is often said to go by private judgment, to be choosing his religion by his own standard of what a religion ought to be. Now it need not be denied that those who are external to the Church must begin with private judgment; they use it in order ultimately to supersede it; as a man out of doors uses a lamp in a dark night, and puts it out

⁷ JHN, ‘Private Judgment’, pp.104f.

⁸ JHN, ‘Private Judgment’, p.116.

when he gets home. What would be thought of his bringing it into his drawing-room? ... There is no absurdity, then, or inconsistency in a person first using his private judgment and then denouncing its use. Circumstances change duties.⁹

The question for the Anglican Newman in 1841 was precisely the same as it would be for him as a Roman Catholic in 1848. It was not what is the faith of the Church?; but where was the Church of the faith?; not what is the Catholicism of the Church?; but where is the Church of Catholicism?

Development for Newman, from his first, inchoate, embryonic awareness of it as terminological change in the 1820s to the concrete, systematic and fully-worked out version of it as the theory of the development of doctrine in the *Essay*, was not about accepting novelty in doctrine but about verifying, as he put it in the *Essay*, doctrinal change as ‘the development being but the carrying out of an idea into its consequences’.¹⁰ The object of faith, that is the unchanging, unalterable object of faith, remained for Newman, that other ‘luminously self-evident being’ and it was axiomatic that God does not change. Allen’s observation concerning Newman’s position in the Jager correspondence, ‘[t]hat object itself remained identical and invariable’,¹¹ remained his position. The deposit of faith was fixed, the truth about God was immutable. What did change and develop, however, was the Church’s understanding of that immutable truth, as those proper consequences became clear under the action of prayer, reflection and intellectual consideration, and in the face of, amongst other things, heresy. There is no denying that between 1841 and 1843 Newman was able to bring into focus a more complete hypothesis to account for this difficulty. Nevertheless, Newman’s correspondence with his brother Francis in 1840, which was considered in the previous chapter, is persuasive evidence that what he preached in

⁹ JHN, *Loss*, pp.203f.

¹⁰ *Dev.*, p.55.

¹¹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, p.13.

1843 had already been substantially worked out three years earlier and, as Pereiro argues, goes to ‘definitively disprove Chadwick’s suggestion’.¹²

The previous chapters have shown that Pereiro’s own position, reliant, it is on Newman’s criticisms of S.F.Wood’s treatment of the subject, that ‘[t]he evidence against Newman having held a theory of development before 1840 is compelling’,¹³ cannot withstand a scrutiny of the evidence of the link between development and principle of reserve and the unsent letter to Falconer. Furthermore, in his dismissal of Newman’s own recollection of events, to his sister Jemima in 1843, that he had ‘now for 12 years been working out a theory’¹⁴ of development, Pereiro’s approach is similar to that taken by Thomas and also examined in the previous chapter. Thomas called into question Newman’s recollection in the *Apologia* of the effect of the events of 1839, whilst simultaneously offering a plausible explanation of events that accorded with Newman’s account. Similarly, Pereiro decides against Newman’s claim to ‘have kept to the same views and arguments for 12 years’¹⁵, whilst admitting that it is perfectly possible to read those words in the sense of Newman’s notion ‘of interpreting previous steps ... by later ones’.¹⁶ Pereiro takes as decisive what he asserts to be:

The fact that whenever he confronted the question, whether in his 1835 controversy with Jager, in his conversations with Wood, or in the *Prophetical Office*, he resisted the principle of development and fought against it’.¹⁷

As the examination of those episodes in the earlier chapters of this dissertation has shown, ‘the fact’ is nothing of the sort. It is, rather, one reading of Newman’s engagement in each of those controversies and a reading which makes the mistake of

¹² Pereiro, *‘Ethos’ and the Oxford Movement*, p.171.

¹³ Pereiro, *‘Ethos’ and the Oxford Movement*, p.166.

¹⁴ JHN to Mrs J Mozley, 23 January 1843, in *LD* ix, p.214.

¹⁵ JHN to Mrs J Mozley, 23 January 1843, in *LD* ix, p.214.

¹⁶ Pereiro, *‘Ethos’ and the Oxford Movement*, p.165.

¹⁷ Pereiro, *‘Ethos’ and the Oxford Movement*, p.167.

confusing Newman's rejection of what he then took to be the specifically Roman Catholic version of the idea of development with the idea of the development of doctrine *per se*. Newman's attempt to grapple with doctrinal change in each of those and other episodes is entirely consonant with his claims made in letters to his sister Jemima in 1843¹⁸ and to Mrs William Froude in 1844.¹⁹ What had happened, however, was that his earlier hypotheses had each been shown to contain workable and unworkable elements, the former eventually coalescing into the theory of development that Newman had sketched for his brother and which had been shaped by the crises of the intervening years into a coherent, fully-worked out and fundamentally ecclesiological theory of development.

II. 'The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine'

The fourteenth University Sermon, whilst returning to the subject matter of the relationship between faith and reason, under the title 'Wisdom, as Contrasted with Faith and with Bigotry',²⁰ did not take the issue of the development of doctrine significantly further forward. Echoing the impression of discomfort Newman had given when writing *Arians*, that, to use once again Williams' apt phrase, 'the advance of dogma is something almost tragic, a poignant ideological puberty',²¹ he now wrote of wisdom, 'that its perversions are such as love of system, theorizing, fancifulness, dogmatism,

¹⁸ JHN to Mrs J Mozley, 23 January 1843, in *LD* ix, p.214.

¹⁹ JHN to Mrs William Froude, 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, p.297.

²⁰ *USS.*, p.278-311. Original MS in BOA A.9.4. As the fifteenth University Sermon contains, in embryo, the theory that was to be fully expatiated in the *Essay*, the fourteenth contains the germ of *Idea of a University*. See Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, p.264-266.

²¹ Williams, *Newman's Arians*, p.270.

and bigotry'.²² Newman now stated again what had been clear to him in the previous University Sermon and had been brought out in his correspondence with his brother:

Reason is the power of proceeding to new ideas by means of given ones. Where but one main idea is given, it can employ itself in developing this into its consequences. Thus, from scanty data, it often draws out a whole system, each part with its ascertained relations, collateral or lineal, towards the rest, and all consistent together, because all derived from one and the same origin. And should means be found of ascertaining directly some of the facts which it has been deducing by this abstract process, then their coincidence with its à priori judgments will serve to prove the accuracy of its deductions. Where, however, the facts or doctrines in question are all known from the first, there, instead of advancing from idea to idea, Reason does but connect fact with fact; instead of discovering, it does but analyze; and what was, in the former case, the tracing out of inferences, becomes a laying down of relations.²³

It was the manner in which Newman understood that process to work that was to form the subject of his fifteenth and final University Sermon, 'The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine', preached on the Feast of the Purification, 2 February 1843.²⁴

Five days before he preached his last University Sermon, the Oxford Conservative Journal printed the letter Newman had sent to its editor on the preceding 12 December.²⁵ To use Chadwick's imagery, if there was a Rubicon being crossed at this stage, this was it. As late as the *British Critic* article of January 1841, Newman's capacity for stridently critical language to describe the teachings and practices of Roman Catholicism was on display and yet now, less than two years later, he was retracting that same anti-Catholic language. He sought to excuse himself from his

²² USS., p.282.

²³ USS., p.290.

²⁴ USS., pp.312-351. Original MS in BOA, A.9.4.

²⁵ JHN to the Editor of the *Oxford Conservative Journal*, 12 December 1842, in LD ix, pp.167-172. The retraction was later published in the *English Churchman* with a lengthy foreword that aimed at diffusing any intemperate reaction. For a typical reaction to Newman's retraction, see To the Rev. J.H.Newman, a letter published in the *Oxford Herald*, 31 March 1843 from 'A Member of Convocation', in LD ix, pp.296f.

previous anti-Catholic language by suggesting that he was doing no more than following ‘... almost a consensus of the divines’ of the Church of England and seeking to deflect his critics who accused him of ‘Romanism’.²⁶ The more powerful reason he gave, however, was that he had believed that there had been ‘no other way’ than to resort to such polemical language if ‘Rome is to be withstood’ and ‘Anglican doctrine’ affirmed as ‘the only possible antagonist’ of the Roman Catholic system.²⁷ Whilst, for the time being, he maintained his defence of Anglican doctrine, he no longer felt that this required the support of the kind of anti-Catholic statements to which he had previously had recourse. Indeed, as Ker notes, some two years earlier, he had already expressed his ‘misery’ at the lack of a Catholic ethos in the Church of England and had suggested to his sister that he had begun ‘to have serious apprehension lest any religious body is strong enough to withstand the league of evil, but the Roman Church’.²⁸ In the circumstances he could no longer simply dismiss doctrines and practices peculiar to Roman Catholicism, still less do so in pungent language. In the sermon he had prepared for the Feast of the Purification, in 1843, he was to lay out for the first time publicly the theory that he had sketched for his brother in the 1840 correspondence. If he was right and his hypothesis did account for the difficulty of apparent doctrinal change, the need for which hypothesis he had first explicitly identified in 1826, then Rome, particularly as possibly the only strong bulwark against the league of evil of ‘wretched Socialists’, liberal Biblical critics such as Carlisle (whose name Newman misspells as ‘Carlile’), Arnold and Milman, ‘political Economists’ and ‘Geologists’,²⁹ was as entitled to have what she claimed to be her developments tested by reference to that hypothesis, as was the Church of England.

²⁶ JHN to the Editor of the *Oxford Conservative Journal*, 12 December 1842, here *LD* ix, p.171.

²⁷ JHN to the Editor of the *Oxford Conservative Journal*, 12 December 1842, in *LD* ix, p.172.

²⁸ Ker, *Newman: A Biography*, p.193. See JHN to J.W.Bowden, 21 February 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.240-242, here p.240, and JHN to Mrs John Mozley, 25 February 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.244-246, here p.245.

²⁹ JHN to Mrs John Mozley, 25 February 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.244-246, here pp.244-245.

None of Newman's University Sermons is, by modern standards, brief but the fifteenth is of a length that even he thought exceptional. As preached, 'The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine' lasted over ninety minutes.³⁰ Writing to Pusey three days before he preached it, Newman had quipped that:

If any one values his Luncheon on Thursday, he must not go to hear me at St Mary's, for my sermon is of portentous length – and my only satisfaction is that, if any persons go out of curiosity, they will be punished.³¹

For their pains, his hearers heard Newman set his theory of the development of doctrine within the context of the faith of the Blessed Virgin Mary as revealed in the Scriptures.

Newman reminded his congregation that:

Mary's faith did not end in a mere acquiescence in Divine providences and revelations ... she "pondered" them ... both in the reception and in the study of Divine Truth. She does not think it enough to accept, she dwells upon it; not enough to possess, she uses it; not enough to assent, she develops [sic] it; not enough to submit the Reason, she reasons upon it; not indeed reasoning first, and believing afterwards, with Zacharias, yet first believing without reasoning, next from love and reverence, reasoning after believing. And thus she symbolizes to us, not only the faith of the unlearned, but of the doctors of the Church also, who have to investigate, and weigh, and define, as well as to profess the Gospel.³²

The sermon is an extended demonstration, first in general and then with reference to particular doctrines, of what Newman presented as the historical fact of the first of the themes he had identified in his letter to his brother in 1840. The relationship between life and development, and the preservation of identity through that development is the key idea which Newman here used to account for the apparent paradox of change and continuity – his 'difficulty' since 1826. This identification of the link between life, development and identity, both necessary and observable, was

³⁰ 'On the 2nd of February 1843, the Feast of the Purification, all Oxford assembled to hear what Newman had to say...For an hour and a half he drew out the argument...', Shairp, J.C., *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1868), p.249, cited in *LD* ix, p.218, n.1.

³¹ JHN to E.B.Pusey, 30 January 1843, in *LD* ix, pp.216f., here p.217.

³² *USS.*, pp.312f.

neither unique nor original to Newman: Coleridge had written of something very similar in the notes to his 1812/3 lectures on Shakespeare. He argued that:

... the organic form ... shapes as it developes [sic] itself from within, and the fullness of its development is one & the same with the perfection of its outward Form: such is the Life, such is the Form.³³

Newman went beyond theoretical assertion, however, and argued that this relationship is an observable datum of Christian History. Christian doctrine, the ‘large fabric of divinity’ was nothing more and nothing less than ‘the development of an idea, and like itself, and unlike any thing else, its most widely-separated parts having relations with each other, and betokening a common origin.’³⁴ It was, he argued, the natural ‘expansion of a few words, uttered, as if casually, by the fishermen of Galilee’.³⁵ In a passage that he later noted, when preparing the sermon for publication in the Uniform Edition, owed something to his early familiarity with Bull’s *Analogy*, and which certainly foreshadows the ‘tests’ of the *Essay*, Newman wrote of the Gospel:

Its half sentences, its overflowings of language, admit of development; they have a life in them which shows itself in progress; a truth, which has the token of consistency; a reality, which is fruitful in resources; a depth, which extends into mystery: for they are representations of what is actual, and has a definite location and necessary bearings and a meaning in the great system of things, and a harmony in what it is, and a compatibility in what it involves.³⁶

Given Newman’s clear explication of his purpose in preaching the sermon and the manner in which it is organized, Turner’s claim that Newman’s purpose was driven by a desire to defend the ‘Tractarian asceticism’ of the ‘coterie’ at Littlemore, to ‘underscore his longstanding call to a religion of obedience and ... [sustain] ... his

³³ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Lectures 1808-1819 on Literature*, ed. R.A.Foakes, 2 vols., (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), vol. i, p.494. Whilst there are similarities in their thought, Newman and Coleridge differed markedly on the nature of ideas: see Coulson, *Common Tradition*, pp.58-63.

³⁴ *USS.*, p.316.

³⁵ *USS.*, p.317.

³⁶ *USS.*, p.319.

monastic experiment',³⁷ can be discounted. In fact the hypothesis of development is set out in a highly structured manner about halfway through the sermon. Newman laid before the congregation the elements of his theory of the relationship between the idea and its doctrinal expressions in a series of points worth quoting here *in extenso*:

Now of such sacred ideas and their attendant expressions, I observe:—

(1.) First, that an impression of this intimate kind seems to be what Scripture means by "knowledge."

...

(2.) This leads me next, however, to observe, that these religious impressions differ from those of material objects, in the mode in which they are made. The senses are direct, immediate, and ordinary informants, and act spontaneously without any will or effort on our part; but no such faculties have been given us, as far as we know, for realizing the Objects of Faith.

...

(3.) Further, I observe, that though the Christian mind reasons out a series of dogmatic statements, one from another, this it has ever done, and always must do, not from those statements taken in themselves, as logical propositions, but as being itself enlightened and (as if) inhabited by that sacred impression which is prior to them, which acts as a regulating principle,

...

(4.) Again ... that Revelation itself has provided in Scripture the main outlines and also large details of the dogmatic system. Inspiration has superseded the exercise of human Reason in great measure, and left it but the comparatively easy task of finishing the sacred work.

...

(5.) Scripture, I say, begins a series of developments which it does not finish; that is to say, in other words, it is a mistake to look for every separate proposition of the Catholic doctrine in Scripture.

...

(6.) And here we see the ordinary mistake of doctrinal innovators, viz. to go away with this or that proposition of the Creed, instead of embracing that one idea which all of them together are meant to convey; it being almost a definition of heresy, that it fastens on some one statement as if the whole truth, to the denial of all others, and as the basis of a new faith;³⁸

Here, in the sermon, Newman would develop the theory to encompass the three elements of his case to his brother in the 1840 correspondence: the necessary connection between life, development and identity with respect to ideas and their expression in doctrine; growth in understanding within the Church; and the existence of

³⁷ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.501.

³⁸ USS., pp.332-337.

‘tests’ by which developments could be evaluated. What he would not yet attempt was to situate his theory within a definite ecclesial setting, whilst explicitly acknowledging the need for such. This was either because he was unclear of the answer or, as seems more likely in the light of previous admissions in correspondence, because of a prudential exercise of the principle of reserve, Newman excused himself from the task of identifying the ecclesial locus within which his theory of development was to operate. He commented:

Nor am I here in any way concerned with the question, who is the legitimate framer and judge of these dogmatic inferences under the Gospel, or if there be any. Whether the Church is infallible, or the individual, or the first ages, or none of these, is not the point here, but the theory of developments itself.³⁹

A striking characteristic of the sermon is how, as it progressed, Newman sought to deal with the objections to and weaknesses of the various hypotheses that he had previously proposed to account for what had appeared to him to be doctrinal change. The problem with these hypotheses was that no one of them could offer a sufficient account but, as the sermon makes clear, each held an element of truth, which, when taken together, when combined into a composite and multifaceted theory, would do duty. Here, the linguistic development which Newman had thought, some twenty years earlier, could explain how the Church’s doctrine developed whilst the object of faith remained consistent, is offered not as an explanation or a rule but as an observable fact deriving from the very nature of language. As ‘representations of what is actual’ rather than the actual thing itself, there is a natural incompleteness to them: they do not and, indeed, cannot be a complete account. So, as the Church, like her pattern the Virgin Mary, ponders upon the object of faith and the terms used to represent it, in their incompleteness and contingency, those ‘half-sentences’ and ‘overflowings’ give way to

³⁹ *USS.*, pp.319f.

further expressions. The objection to this facet of a theory of development of doctrine was that whilst it might be true that orthodox doctrine develops from this incompleteness, it was less clear from the historical record that it had been so, whereas it was clear that heresy grew in precisely this way. In the face of this obvious shortcoming, rather than take refuge in the *disciplina arcani*, as Newman had done in the early 1830s, he now proposed a series of distinguishing marks, which foreshadow the ‘tests’ of the *Essay*. Authentic development, Newman wrote, has about these changes of linguistic expression and vocabulary the characteristics of life manifesting itself in progress, truth showing itself in consistency, reality demonstrated by its fruitfulness, depth which leads to mystery and fits into a coherent system which has both harmony and compatibility. However, Newman argued, although having about it the tendency to change and develop, heresy did so without these marks, substituting its own:

... its dogmas are unfruitful; it has no theology; so far forth as it is heresy, it has none. Deduct its remnant of Catholic theology, and what remains? Polemics, explanations, protests ... Its *formulae* end in themselves, without development ... It developes [sic] into dissolution⁴⁰

The relationship between the object of faith and the Church’s attempts to express it was central to Newman’s argument as he sets out a systematic theology of development. It is primarily a relationship that belongs to the sphere of philosophy rather than theology. Newman explained to his listeners that it was a matter of exploring the ‘connexion [sic] between Faith and Dogmatic confession’:⁴¹ the former being as distinct from the latter, as the idea is from its expression:

Theological dogmas are propositions expressive of the judgments which the mind forms, or the impressions which it receives, of Revealed Truth. Revelation sets before it certain supernatural facts and actions, beings and principles; these

⁴⁰ USS., p.318.

⁴¹ USS., p.319.

make a certain impression or image upon it; and this impression spontaneously, or even necessarily, becomes the subject of reflection on the part of the mind itself, which proceeds to investigate it, and to draw it forth in successive and distinct sentences.⁴²

The proper distinctions between the object itself, the idea of the object and the doctrinal expression of the idea were central to the synthesis Newman was proposing in the sermon and would remain so in the *Essay*. As Merrigan notes, for Newman, ‘the Christian idea is Christ Himself’,⁴³ the divine truth, a fixed, unchanging whole; the idea, being at all times a partial and incomplete impression of that divine truth, was bound to change as the doctrinal expression of it developed through the natural – and, Newman would come to argue in the *Essay*, divinely intended – reflection upon it by the minds of those who were animated by the Holy Spirit within the communion of the Church. The natural concomitant of this is that dogmatic expression might be at once both a distinct sentence, that is a definitive expression of an idea, and yet contingent. Lash expresses this idea, in his consideration not of the sermon but of the *Essay*, by observing that identity and distinctiveness are not necessarily contradictory:

Christianity is an ‘idea’ inasmuch as it is the human apprehension of that ‘fact’ which is christianity [sic] considered as God’s word, or self-disclosure of his will and purposes for man. The ‘idea’ is one because the ‘fact’ is one. The ‘idea’ is ‘real’ because God’s revelation is an ‘objective fact’, and not an illusion of man. The ‘idea’ is ‘living’ because it is God’s living word.⁴⁴

In the same way as the expression itself is distinct from the idea, understood as the judgments and impressions formed in the mind, so too is the object of faith distinct from the idea. In expressing the idea in ‘successive and distinct sentences’, those expressions successively more nearly and completely approximate to the idea and yet, the idea itself is but the judgment and impression of the reality and so, under the action

⁴² USS., p.320.

⁴³ Merrigan, *Clear Heads and Holy Hearts*, p.98.

⁴⁴ Lash, *Newman on Development*, p.52. Cf. USS., p.328.

of ecclesial reflection, the idea itself develops. Nonetheless, because the dogmatic expression manifested itself in continuity with the underlying idea, its various expressions were themselves closely connected. To illustrate this point, Newman utilised an analogy from St Mark's Gospel: they were like the corn 'first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear' [Mk.4:28], each distinct, accurate, definitive and yet to be superseded not by 'abrupt revolution, or reaction, or fickleness of mind' but rather as 'the development, in explicit form, of what was already latent within it ... possessed, ruled, guided by an unconscious idea'.⁴⁵ Neither is the lack of a public expression of a particular truth to be taken as evidence of its novelty nor yet of its suppression as part of a systematic *disciplina arcani*. Instead, Newman argued for a notion that he had most recently explored in the thirteenth University Sermon, that of a dynamic by which what was implicit became explicit:

The absence, or partial absence, or incompleteness of dogmatic statements is no proof of the absence of impressions or implicit judgments, in the mind of the Church. Even centuries might pass without the formal expression of a truth, which had been all along the secret life of millions of faithful souls.⁴⁶

The impetus for this dynamic would be explored in much greater detail in the *Essay* but the part that the study of heresy had played in clarifying Newman's own understanding of both the content and the proper locus of Christian doctrine provided him with at least one reason for this movement, for 'when details must be drawn out, and misapprehensions anticipated', as is the case when responding to error, 'we seem never to be rid of the responsibility of our task'.⁴⁷ Commenting on this, Walgrave suggested that this sermon 'underestimates the part played by implicit reasoning' when compared with the *Essay*. However, this might be slightly to overstate the difference

⁴⁵ USS., pp.321f.

⁴⁶ USS., p.323.

⁴⁷ USS., p.327.

between the two works and, furthermore, he offers an explanation by suggesting that this is because the sermon only:

deals with the same limited question as the *Arians*, namely, the genesis of explicit dogmatic formulas, especially the Trinitarian and Christological ones, and from a definite psychological standpoint (the relations between faith and reason).⁴⁸

Whilst, for Newman, the richness and fruitfulness were amongst the marks of authentic development, he was aware that he had critics who saw matters very differently. Hampden, for example, was of the view that the progressive clarification of doctrinal positions tended to diminish the underlying reality: seeking to identify as one and the same the reality with the doctrinal expression. It was in answer to this position that Newman contended that, far from being an abuse of reason, the process he was outlining gave ever more fresh perspectives on that reality, or at least on the impressions of it made upon the intellect. Accordingly, the field of divinity, the apprehension of the divine reality widened under the aspect of development rather than narrowed. If anything, the process tended to broaden the understanding of the mystery of God. A natural result of this was the wide variety of the results of the process: ‘the great remoteness of the separate results of a common idea, or rather at first sight the absence of any connexion [sic]’.⁴⁹ In fact, Newman, suggested, ‘we fancied our idea could be expressed in one or two sentences. Explanations grow under our hands, in spite of our effort at compression’.⁵⁰

To those others, Evangelicals and even those associated with the Oxford Movement, such as Palmer of Worcester, who sensed that development was a ‘Romanizing’ tendency that sought to go beyond, for the Evangelicals, the Scriptural

⁴⁸ Walgrave, *Newman the Theologian*, pp.96f.

⁴⁹ USS., p.326.

⁵⁰ USS., p.326.

deposit and, for Palmer, ‘the Catholic verities [the Church] received from the Apostles’,⁵¹ Newman’s reply was that the scriptural warrant offered by the Virgin Mary’s pondering and the evidence that even those ‘Catholic verities’ had been established by precisely the process of development he was describing was answer enough. He admitted that there is a danger with this process. If one moved beyond the textual fundamentalism of a Catholicism of the Word, Newman understood that this could lead to a situation where the Church’s doctrine could appear unconnected with the idea it was seeking to convey. This would be the case whether that Catholicism of the Word was one based on *sola scriptura* or on some univocal consent of Antiquity. As has been shown in the second and third chapters of this work, Newman had found that neither solution was capable of providing the workable hypothesis he sought. –

The difficulty, then, and hazard of developing doctrines implicitly received, must be fully allowed; and this is often made a ground for inferring that they have no proper developments at all; that there is no natural connexion [sic] between certain dogmas and certain impressions.⁵²

To deal with this objection to his theory, as it lay at the time of the sermon, Newman took his listeners to the history of the changes to the Church’s articulation of her understanding of the Trinity and the Incarnation, but, before he did so, he needed to make clearer a couple of philosophical principles that could be properly inferred from his general theory.

First, he argued:

One proposition necessarily leads to another, and a second to a third; then some limitation is required; and the combination of these opposites occasions some fresh evolutions from the original idea, which indeed can never be said to be entirely exhausted. This process is its development, and results in a series, or

⁵¹ Palmer, W., *Narrative of Events Connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, with Reflections on Existing Tendencies to Romanism, and on the Present Duties and Prospects of members of the Church*, (London: John Henry Parker, 1843), (‘A Narrative of Events’), p.58.

⁵² USS., p.328.

rather body of dogmatic statements, till what was at first an impression on the Imagination has become a system or creed in the Reason.⁵³

His listeners should not expect the natural action of the human mind upon the idea, that is the impressions it has received of a reality, particularly a Divine, and thus mysterious, reality, to result in anything other than a system of doctrine for the very reason that the reality, the idea and its expression are distinct:

Ideas and their developments are commonly not identical, the development being but the carrying out of the idea into its consequences. Thus the doctrine of Penance may be called a development of the doctrine of Baptism, yet still is a distinct doctrine; whereas the developments in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation are mere portions of the original impression, and modes of representing it ... This may be fitly compared to the impressions made on us through the senses. Material objects are whole, and individual; and the impressions which they make on the mind, by means of the senses, are of a corresponding nature, complex and manifold in their relations and bearings, but considered in themselves integral and one.⁵⁴

Not only are the reality, the idea and the dogma distinct, Newman reminded his listeners, the limitations of language mean that:

Particular propositions, then, which are used to express portions of the great idea vouchsafed to us, can never really be confused with the idea itself which all such propositions taken together can but reach, and cannot exceed.⁵⁵

It is the very structure of the human mind that necessitates the development of doctrine:

Creeds and dogmas live in the one idea which they are designed to express, and which alone is substantive; and are necessary only because the human mind cannot reflect upon that idea, except piecemeal, cannot use it in its oneness and entirety, nor without resolving it into a series of aspects and relations.⁵⁶

The remainder of the sermon makes it clear that Newman was aware of many of the objections to the theory he had laid out. The limitations of human reasoning and language, ‘immature faculties and their scanty vocabulary’,⁵⁷ mean that dogmas are

⁵³ *USS.*, p.329.

⁵⁴ *USS.*, pp.329f.

⁵⁵ *USS.*, p.331.

⁵⁶ *USS.*, pp.331f.

⁵⁷ *USS.*, p.340.

expressed in words which themselves have ‘a very abject and human meaning’.⁵⁸

Nevertheless, those limitations are transcended by the relationship between the words and the idea. Newman suggested that, rather than the meaning of the technical vocabulary being primarily derived from some kind of linguistic positivism, so far as the expression of Christian doctrine was concerned the vocabulary was defined by reference to the underlying truth of revelation that it was an attempt at expressing. Taking as his reference point some of the technical vocabulary related to the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, he asserted:

... there is no such inward view of these doctrines, distinct from the dogmatic language used to express them, as was just now supposed. The metaphors by which they are signified are not mere symbols of ideas which exist independently of them, but their meaning is coincident and identical with the ideas.⁵⁹

The limitations of human (Newman uses the word ‘earthly’) reasoning and language is to be expected as the contingent apprehends the necessary: the finite, the infinite. It is this, Newman reminded the congregation, of which St Paul wrote when he compared ‘now “seeing in a glass darkly, (*en ainygmati*), but then face to face”: then the completeness of the ‘Beatific Vision, or true sight of Almighty God’, now ‘such an approximation to the truth as earthly images and figures may supply to us’.⁶⁰ In a final warning at the end of the sermon, perhaps against the Noetic attachment to intellectual brilliance ahead of faithfulness that he had experienced in the Oriel Common Room and to which he had once admitted to have been attracted, Newman cautioned his listeners:

The fault, then, which we must guard against in receiving such Divine intimations, is the ambition of being wiser than what is written; of employing the Reason, not in carrying out what is told us, but in impugning it; not in support, but in prejudice of Faith.⁶¹

⁵⁸ USS., p.338.

⁵⁹ USS., p.338

⁶⁰ USS., p.340. See 1 Cor.13:12.

⁶¹ USS., p.351.

It is a sentence that sits uncomfortably with the rest of the sermon but hints at a deficiency that Newman saw as inherent in his theory of development as it stood. Without an authoritative voice to counter the temptations to private judgment, a reductionist rationalism and the anti-dogmatic spirit, then his theory could as easily be used in the cause of infidelity – the portmanteau term Newman had used since the beginning of the Oxford Movement for the natural, logical and, perhaps, unavoidable outcome of these temptations – as it could to explain the apparent paradox of change and continuity in Christian doctrine. That authoritative voice, Newman already knew, was not to be found within the univocal testimony of the Fathers nor yet in the voice of the Bishops of the Church of England. From the pulpit of St Mary's, he could not go further. He could not preach what he had first suspected in the autumn of 1839 and of which the first explicit written confessions are to be found a year later in correspondence with his sister, his brother and Keble in the autumn of 1840:⁶² that the supply to the need of a living authoritative voice to authenticate true developments of doctrine and condemn corruptions was to be found in Rome. Whilst he held the position of Vicar of the University Church, a position he had considered giving up since at least the autumn of 1840 because of the constraints it placed upon his freedom of expression,⁶³ he could hardly voice the answer in his writings for publication, still less preach it from the University pulpit.

⁶² See JHN to Mrs John Mozley, 25 February 1840, in *LD* vii, p.245; JHN to F.W.Newman, 22 October 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.412-415, here p.414; and JHN to John Keble, 26 October 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.416-418, here p.417.

⁶³ See JHN to John Keble, 6 November 1840, in *LD* vii, pp.433f.

III. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*

In early January 1844 Newman replied to an anonymous correspondent in terms which reveal that he was acutely aware of the atmosphere within which everything he now wrote or preached was being judged. The letter to which he was replying does not survive but his answer does. In it he defended himself from the accusation of having gone ‘*beyond the teaching*’ of the Church of England in writing of the intercession of the saints by observing that ‘such is our melancholy state at present that no light can be introduced without causing shadows – not a word of dogmatic truth can be uttered without giving birth to controversy’.⁶⁴ Later in the same month, Keble wrote to Newman concerning Oakley’s plan to publish a translation of the works of the twelfth century Cistercian founder, Bernard of Clairvaux.⁶⁵ Keble was clearly concerned that the increasing preoccupation with the medieval amongst some members of the Oxford Movement was disposing them favourably to Rome as the present expression of ‘Primitive Catholicity’, and suggested that ‘*If the Medieval system is really the intended development of Primitive Catholicity, is it not the most natural way for the English Church to recover it through Primitive Catholicity*’.⁶⁶ Whilst for Keble the Tractarian project of recovering the Catholic for the English Church was still a possibility, for Newman it seemed not to be. In December 1843 he had arrived at a series of resolutions⁶⁷ which revealed that, in the light of the episcopal reaction to Tract 90, he no longer felt that even the imaginative conversion for which he had hoped – that which would ‘bring out certain truths and facts, moral, ecclesiastical, and religious, simply and

⁶⁴ JHN to an Unknown Correspondent, 12 January 1844, in *LD* x, pp.86f., here p.87.

⁶⁵ Oakley had outlined the prospectus to Newman in a letter on 11 January 1844, in *LD* x, pp.87f.

⁶⁶ John Keble to JHN, 22 January 1844, in *LD* x, pp.100f., here p.101.

⁶⁷ MEMORANDUM, 11 December 1843, in *LD* x, pp.55f.

forcibly'⁶⁸ and to which his contributions to the *Lyra Apostolica* and *The Church of the Fathers* had been ordered⁶⁹ – was even possible, let alone the theological and ecclesial change he believed necessary. Replying to Keble, Newman hinted at ‘a steadily growing conviction about the English Church’, the character of which he assumed Keble did not need to have made explicit. Newman was once again engaged in working on a new edition of the *Arians*, an edition which he did not complete, and was translating further works of St Athanasius,⁷⁰ and it was work of this nature, which had ‘all along been my line of study ... this line of reading, and no other, which has lead [sic] me Romeward’.⁷¹ He still hoped that he was wrong, that by Pusey and Manning (and presumably Keble) he might ‘be brought back’ and might ‘die in the English Church’.⁷² Nevertheless the direction of travel was clear and was confirmed in letters to Pusey and Bowden in the next few weeks.⁷³

Newman was conscious of the relationship between the ‘growing conviction’ of which he had written to Keble and the need for a thorough hypothesis relating to the development of doctrine, as his correspondence with Mrs Froude, in the Spring and Summer 1844, bears witness.⁷⁴ These letters to Mrs Froude provide a detailed summary of how Newman’s religious opinions had developed over the previous eleven years and are a remarkable insight into his views. The outline they provide is largely consistent with the account that he was to give twenty years later in the *Apologia*. Where they differ is that the letters are an attempt to give a dispassionate account of the

⁶⁸ JHN to Hugh James Rose, 26 November 1832, in *LD* iii, pp.119f., and here p.120.

⁶⁹ As in, e.g. JHN to John William Bowden, 17 November 1833, in *LD* iv, p.109.

⁷⁰ *LD* x, p.102, n.1.

⁷¹ JHN to John Keble, 23 January 1844, in *LD* x, pp.101ff.

⁷² JHN to John Keble, 23 January 1844, in *LD* x, pp.101ff., here p.103.

⁷³ JHN to Edward Bouverie Pusey, 19 February 1844, in *LD* x, p.126; and JHN to J W Bowden, 21 February 1844, in *LD* x, pp.129f.

⁷⁴ JHN to Mrs W Froude, 3, 5, 6, 9 April, 19, 28 May, 9 June and 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, pp.185-188, 189-192, 195-198, 200-204, 237-244, 251, 264-266 and 297f.

intellectual positions that Newman had, successively, adopted in the face of his growing awareness of the historical record of doctrinal change. Harper's contention that they 'give a point of view somewhat different from that of the *Apologia*'⁷⁵ is not sustainable. It must be admitted that the letters lack the *post hoc* justification that, in 1864, Newman felt was needed to acquit him of Kingsley's charge of dishonesty but it is only the attempt to furnish the history with an apologetic narrative of consistency that differentiates the later account from this correspondence.

It was precisely within the safety of private correspondence that Newman now felt able to say what he was not yet quite ready to confess in public: that he had come to believe that, as he put it in a letter to Keble that same June, 'the Roman Communion is the only true Church'.⁷⁶ To Keble, he claimed that it was his reading of the Fathers that had brought him to this point. It was, in fact, rather more complicated than that. Newman's reading of the Fathers amounted to a twenty year search for the voice of Antiquity, in an attempt to provide an account for the continuity of doctrine, in the face of the evidence of change. This search had convinced him that that voice was to be found, not, as he had first thought, in terminological change, nor in the *disciplina arcani*, nor yet in the Vincentian canon, but in the living authority of the Church, and that Church to be found in the Roman Communion. The evidence was to be found in the historical record of the development of doctrine authenticated by the Church in communion with Rome. It was this ecclesial authority which he now believed to be necessary if the truth of any doctrine was to be demonstrated and for corruptions to be refuted. Development of doctrine as *the* hypothesis to account for the 'difficulty' of doctrinal change was observable in the history of the great Trinitarian and

⁷⁵ Harper, G.H., *Cardinal Newman and William Froude FRS: A Correspondence*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), p.30.

⁷⁶ JHN to John Keble, 8 June 1844, in *LD* x, pp259-263, here 261.

Christological controversies that he had studied so closely and, in those controversies, was intimately tied up with the claims Rome made for herself:

Moreover in every case the view whether of doctrine or discipline taken by the see of Rome, ultimately prevailed, and, if success is the token of truth, is the true one. It is the Pope who has determined the rule for observing Easter, and for treating the baptism of heretics, who has confirmed or pronounced the condemnation of Arianism, Apollinarianism, Pelagianism, and the other numerous heresies which distracted the early Church. He appears to exercise an infallibility which in after ages he has more distinctly claimed.

All these things being considered, I was forced to admit that the doctrine of the papacy was a primitive one – for ... [i]f we do not allow of developments, especially in a matter which from the nature of the case *requires* time for its due exhibition, hardly any doctrine can be proved by antiquity.⁷⁷

Thomas suggests that the correspondence with Mrs Froude is further evidence that the idea of development had become, by this stage, an '*idée fixe*' for Newman. He argues that the notion of development of doctrine was being used by Newman not merely to resolve the 'problem of the relation of change and continuity' but to resolve the 'acute difficulties' he had in 'understanding his own identity which his obsessive concern to demonstrate consistency discloses'.⁷⁸ This is, of course, at the heart of Thomas's thesis. He refers to Newman's 'preoccupation' with heresy which 'bordered on the obsessive' in the abstract at the very beginning of his book⁷⁹ and maintains the argument throughout it with remarkable tenacity. However, as was seen in his consideration of the Monophysite parallel and the Wiseman article, in the previous chapter, although Thomas lays out the contrary evidence, he does not appear seriously to consider the alternative constructions that such evidence might support, particularly any construction put upon it that lends credence to the account given in the *Apologia*. Here, for example, he admits that 'Newman's Anglican rhetoric was always fighting off something very like the doctrine of development of the *Essay*', at least since the period

⁷⁷ JHN to Mrs W Froude, 19 May 1844, p.243.

⁷⁸ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.231.

⁷⁹ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, frontispiece.

during which he had developed the *via media*.⁸⁰ However, he does not take that battle and the necessarily attendant concern with heresy to be a natural corollary of Newman's concern with doctrine, that is with those impressions upon his mind that had been so much a part of his conversion at fifteen and remained with him throughout his life. Neither does Thomas appear to give due weight to the relationship between act and belief that is at least as consistent and significant a feature of Newman's life and thought as is doctrine. Taken on the historical record, it is unarguable that Newman was preoccupied with the question of change and continuity in doctrine: he had been wrestling with precisely this difficulty for nearly twenty years. It is also clear that by the time of the correspondence with Mrs Froude, in 1844, he was acutely seized of the personal consequences that any likely solution to the problem would have for him. In the midst of the correspondence, he notes in his diary both his intellectual convictions and their attendant consequences.⁸¹ Furthermore, it has been shown that Newman had attempted to posit a number of solutions to the question since first he had become aware of its existence. Therefore, to characterise as 'obsessive' the care for consistency and attention to detail which marks Newman's consideration of the subject throughout the period since 1839 and particularly in the period from the final University Sermon to the publication of the *Essay* might be seen as a rather forced attempt to make the evidence fit the theory rather than the reverse.

Newman acknowledged that the attempt to outline his theory without adverting to its necessary ecclesiological underpinning in his final University Sermon had meant that work was unsatisfactory and, in many ways, deserving of the criticism it had

⁸⁰ Thomas, *Newman and Heresy*, p.231.

⁸¹ 4 May 1844, in *LD* x, p.225.

received from, amongst others, Palmer.⁸² There had been good reasons for Newman's previous reticence – fear of censure, a desire not to be seen to be leading others to Rome, even, perhaps, the principle of reserve – but these now seemed to be less important than the theory itself and the moral imperative that flowed from it. He would now need to 'go the whole length of the theory'⁸³ and deal not only with the criticisms of Palmer, that Newman's theory appeared to suggest that '*inferences made by human reason*, are ... to be considered as articles of the Catholic Faith' such that '[t]he doctrine of Purgatory, as a *development*, must be as binding as that of the Trinity',⁸⁴ but also with those particular considerations which weighed upon him. Those considerations certainly show Newman's awareness of the personal consequences for himself that the answer to the difficulty contained. Nonetheless, they are fundamentally theological concerns rather than existential, still less are they evidence of a psychopathology. The structure of his answer to these concerns that he provided in the *Essay* was to be determined by his need to satisfy himself with regard to those 'particular considerations' and they were to prove of such governing significance in the *Essay* that they justify being quoted in full:

1. I am far more certain (according to the Fathers) that we *are* in a state of culpable separation *than* that developments do *not* exist under the gospel, and that the Roman developments are *not* true ones.
2. I am far more certain that *our* (modern) doctrines are wrong, *than* that the *Roman* (modern) doctrines are wrong.
3. Granting that the Roman (special) doctrines are not found drawn out in the early Church, yet I think there is sufficient trace of them in it, to recommend and prove them, *on the hypothesis*, of the Church having a divine guidance, though not sufficient to prove them by itself. So that the question simply turns on the nature of the promise of the Spirit made to the Church.
- 4 The proof of the *Roman* (modern) <special> doctrines is as strong <(or stronger)> in Antiquity, as that of certain doctrines which *both we and the Roman hold* ...

⁸² JHN to Mrs W Froude, 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, p.297.

⁸³ JHN to Mrs W Froude, 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, p.297.

⁸⁴ Palmer, *A Narrative of Events*, p.170.

5. The Analogy of the Old Testament and the New leads to acknowledgement of doctrinal developments.⁸⁵

The structure of the *Essay* would be determined by the need to fully explore the three underlying principles which, as has been shown in the previous chapter, Newman had first sketched out in the 1840 correspondence with his brother, as necessary components of a theory of the development of doctrine. Those principles being that: (i) ‘all systems which have life, have a development, yet do not cease to have an identity though they develop’;⁸⁶ (ii) development includes growth in the Church’s ability to express its doctrines more accurately through time by the action of its interaction with historical and cultural phenomena; and (iii) that there are tests by which developments can be tested. It was the ‘particular considerations’ however, that would determine the manner in which that structure would be filled, the examples from history chosen and the apologetic flavour of the *Essay* determined.

It has already been noted that Newman had started to keep a notebook of his thinking related to the theory of development in March 1844. Throughout the rest of that year, his correspondence and journals indicate that he was much taken up with both his own weakening hold on his position within the Church of England⁸⁷ and that of others,⁸⁸ his involvement in the ongoing fall-out from both Tract 90 and other controversies, most notably that which related to Ward. It is clear from the notebook and the other papers related to the development of doctrine that have survived,

⁸⁵ JHN to Mrs William Froude, 14 July 1844, in *LD* x, pp.297f. It is not clear when Newman’s later interpolations, which are shown in the published edition and cited here within angular brackets, thus: <....>, were added to the manuscript.

⁸⁶ JHN to F.W.Newman, 10 November 1840, in *LD* vii, p.441.

⁸⁷ See e.g. JHN to Henry Wilberforce, 17 July 1844, in *LD* x, pp.298f., here p.299, where he doubts even ‘... the lawfulness ...’ of his remaining within the Church of England.

⁸⁸ E.g. JHN to Robert Francis Wilson, 11 April 1845, in *LD* x, p.623, where Newman admits to having, for six years, ‘had the gravest suspicions that the English Church is in schism’.

however, that he was becoming ever more conscious of the urgent need to set down a complete account of his theory of development of doctrine.⁸⁹

Newman had finished his translation of Athanasius in January 1845⁹⁰ and the *dénouement* of the controversies concerning Tract 90 and Ward occurred in Oxford University's convocation on 13 February 1845, with Ward's book condemned, his being deprived of his degrees and, accordingly, his Balliol Fellowship, and Newman's Tract only saved from formal censure by the action of the Proctors, one of whom, the Junior Proctor, was his friend R.W. Church, whose '*non placet*' vetoed the motion.⁹¹ It seems likely that Newman settled to work on the *Essay* almost immediately after this hiatus and he was certainly 'immersed' in it by the beginning of April.⁹² On 6 October 1845 he laid down the manuscript,⁹³ not finished but sufficiently complete to have both settled the question of his own position and to have set out his theory of development in Christian doctrine.

Coming from a man so grounded in apologetic aimed at justifying his own religious opinions, the closing words of the advertisement at the front of the 1845 edition of Newman's *Essay* come as something of a shock. He prefaces his four hundred and fifty three page argument relating to the theory of development in doctrine with the following words:

⁸⁹ JHN, *Copybook on Development*, and *1844-5 Papers and Fragments on Development*, both in BOA B.2.8.

⁹⁰ JHN to Maria Giberne, 8 January 1845, in *LD* x, pp.484f, here p.484.

⁹¹ See *LD* x, pp.550ff. Cf. Church, M., and F. Paget, eds., *Life and Letters of Dean Church*, (London: Macmillan, 1894), pp.54ff., and Prothero, R., and George Granville Bradley, G.C., *The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley DD, late Dean of Westminster*, 2 vols., (London: J.Murray, 1893), here vol. I, pp.339ff.

⁹² *LD* x, p.614, n.2.

⁹³ *LD* x, p.780, n.8.

It is scarcely necessary to add that he now submits every part of the book to the judgement of the Church, with whose doctrine, on the subjects of which it treats, he wishes all his thoughts to be coincident.⁹⁴

It was a statement that he was only able to make because the argument of the essay itself had proved to Newman's own personal satisfaction that the 'Church' of which he spoke, that is the Roman Catholic Church, was one and the same as the Church of antiquity whose voice he had sought for nearly thirty years, throughout his studies of the early Christian doctrine. Not only was the Roman Communion that selfsame Church, Newman now believed, but he had argued himself into a position where, as the *Essay* demonstrates, he now believed it to be the authentic teacher of the faith, the living organ which was the only guarantee of Catholic and Apostolic truth. As Newman had come to see the need for a Catholicism of the Church, he had arrived at the belief that, as Nicholls and Kerr observe:

... the Catholic position is distinguished from the Protestant in being concerned not with a judgment about the content of Revelation, but about who is the accredited teacher: whose voice is to be followed.⁹⁵

Lash puts it somewhat differently:

... it seemed obvious to [Newman], not so much that Roman catholic [sic] doctrine corresponded most closely to the teaching of the apostolic church, but rather that the complex concrete reality of the Roman catholic [sic] church as he envisaged it ... corresponded more closely than any other claimant to the concrete reality of the church of the fathers.⁹⁶

In October 1845, Newman had come to the firm conviction that the Roman Church, against whom he had once fulminated in language he had only lately abjured, was the voice to be followed.

⁹⁴ *Dev.*, advertisement.

⁹⁵ Nicholls, D., and F. Kerr, *John Henry Newman: Reason Rhetoric and Romanticism*, p.202.

⁹⁶ Lash, *Newman on Development*, p.9.

The *Essay* begins with an introduction which runs to twenty-nine pages⁹⁷ and is then followed by the first chapter entitled ‘On the Development of Ideas’ which outlines, over the following sixty-four pages, the essential elements of the theory in its entirety in such a way as to set out explicitly the three elements that were found in the correspondence with Francis and in the final University Sermon. This chapter starts with a section called ‘On the Process of Development of Ideas’,⁹⁸ before moving on to a consideration of the kinds of development in ideas⁹⁹ and then to a section ‘On the Corruption of an Idea’, where Newman explicitly defines, for the first time, what he means by the developments of an idea: ‘nothing else than its adequate representation and its fulfilment, in its various aspects, relations, and consequences’.¹⁰⁰ This final section of the first chapter laid out Newman's views on what he referred to as the ‘Distinctive Test between Development and Corruption’¹⁰¹ and proposed seven ‘tests of a true development’ by which any change could be accepted as an authentic development or rejected as a corruption of the previous doctrine: ‘Preservation of Type or Idea’, ‘Continuity of Principles’, ‘Power of Assimilation’, ‘Early Anticipation’, ‘Logical Sequence’, ‘Preservative Additions’, and ‘Chronic Continuance’.¹⁰² The second chapter of the *Essay* concerns the development of Christian ideas, as Newman put it, ‘antecedently considered’,¹⁰³ divided into sections ‘On the Probability of Developments in Christianity’¹⁰⁴ and ‘On the Probability of a Developing Authority in Christianity’.¹⁰⁵ The third chapter ‘On the Nature of the Argument in Behalf of the

⁹⁷ *Dev.*, pp.1-29.

⁹⁸ *Dev.*, pp.30-43.

⁹⁹ *Dev.*, pp.43-57.

¹⁰⁰ *Dev.*, pp.57-93, here p.57.

¹⁰¹ *Dev.*, p.57.

¹⁰² *Dev.*, pp.64-93.

¹⁰³ *Dev.*, pp.94-130.

¹⁰⁴ *Dev.*, pp.94-114.

¹⁰⁵ *Dev.*, pp.114-130.

Existing Developments of Christianity'¹⁰⁶ provides an historiographic rationale for development before Newman devoted the remaining five chapters of the essay to illustrations of his rationale by reference to specific doctrinal developments considered under the aspect of each of his seven tests.

The fourth chapter¹⁰⁷ considered the application of the first test to the developments of Christianity by reference to the church of the first century and fourth centuries and the fifth chapter to the church of the fifth and sixth centuries.¹⁰⁸ The sixth chapter contained illustrations of the application of the second and third tests¹⁰⁹ and in chapter seven those that Newman suggested illustrated the fourth.¹¹⁰ The final chapter, the eighth concluded Newman's illustrations by considering examples of the remaining three tests.¹¹¹

A striking feature of this structure is the balance between the various chapters and sections and between the length of the consideration given to each of the tests. The chapters dealing with the theory in principle accounted for over two hundred pages of the four hundred and fifty three of the first edition, those concerning illustrations related to the first test of fidelity covered one hundred and thirteen and the second and third only fifty pages. The exposition of the fourth test took twenty-seven pages and thirty-one pages were needed to illustrate the fifth, with the sixth and seventh test being given seventeen and seven pages respectively. There is an unavoidable sense of acceleration, if not quite impatience. When Newman outlined the tests in principle, the care taken to

¹⁰⁶ *Dev.*, pp.131-202.

¹⁰⁷ *Dev.*, pp.203-269.

¹⁰⁸ *Dev.*, pp.270-317.

¹⁰⁹ *Dev.*, pp.318-368.

¹¹⁰ *Dev.*, pp.369-396.

¹¹¹ *Dev.*, pp.397-453.

spell them out does not vary nearly so much: the first test taking no longer to describe than the eighth; yet when he came to illustrate them, it becomes obvious that he was progressively less and less concerned with demonstrating them in practice, since he had, he seems to have felt, proved his case.

Chadwick observes that the ‘tests which convinced no one and which he himself once admitted to be incapable of performing their ostensible purpose’, were not at the heart of the purpose of the essay. He claims that this was the ‘momentous’ feature that it was concerned less with the development of particular doctrines than with determining the identity of the present Church ‘upon a historical inquiry into the ancient Church’.¹¹² Whilst the ecclesiological point is well made, Chadwick offers no evidence to support his contention that Newman was unconvinced by the utility of the tests themselves. It is possible that Chadwick is relying on Newman’s remark, that the tests ‘are insufficient for the guidance of individuals in the case of so large and complicated a problem as Christianity’, and that they are ‘of a scientific and controversial, not of a practical character’.¹¹³ Nevertheless, Newman immediately asserted their utility as ‘instruments rather than warrants of right decisions’.¹¹⁴ Indeed, that they were intended by Newman, precisely to have a practical character, is clear from his remarks that the tests were ‘required to distinguish legitimate developments from those which are not such’,¹¹⁵ a point he stated yet more clearly in the third edition of the *Essay*:

This is what may be said, and I acknowledge its force: it becomes necessary in consequence to assign certain characteristics of faithful developments, which none but faithful developments have, and the presence of which serves as a test to discriminate between them and corruptions. This I at once proceed to do, and

¹¹² Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, pp.143f.

¹¹³ *Dev.*, p.117.

¹¹⁴ *Dev.*, p.117.

¹¹⁵ *Dev.*, p.58.

I shall begin by determining what a corruption is, and why it cannot rightly be called, and how it differs from, a development.¹¹⁶

Newman repeated the same point, in striking language, in a letter of 1861, which makes clear not only the practical nature of the tests but that he believed that they did, indeed, provide the continuity he sought, in the face of the evidence of change:

I lay down, that no one can religiously speak of development, without giving the *rules* which keep it from extravagating endlessly. And I give seven tests of a true development, founded on the nature of the case. These tests secure the substantial immutability of Christian doctrine.¹¹⁷

The introduction to the *Essay* begins with the assertion that, because Christianity is an historical fact, and its, then, eighteen-hundred year history of doctrine a matter of record, the very fact of that history requires a theory to account for the continuity of Christianity given the claim that Christianity is not, in Newman's day, a different religion from that of the Apostles.¹¹⁸ What Newman had set out to prove was that, in any century, what was believed by the Catholic Church can be seen to be the logical and necessary outgrowth and deeper understanding of what was believed in the century before: that there was both change and continuity and that these were not merely accidental but both to be expected and intimately connected. If examined in sequence, Newman would claim, it was possible to see a natural progression, a true growth in doctrine. There was no observable change of course, but rather a continuation along a single track. An aspect of doctrine is clarified in one century and in the next that clarification is investigated and built on so that further clarification is produced. That which had been determined with finality in the past by the voice of the Church was kept in later centuries. Old doctrines were not overthrown to make way for new ones, instead the Church's understanding of those older doctrines was made more explicit,

¹¹⁶ *Dev.* (1878), p.170.

¹¹⁷ JHN to John Cowley Fisher, 14 October 1861, in *LD* xx, p.54.

¹¹⁸ *Dev.*, p.2.

new aspects of the same truth were added and so, by stages, a fuller expression of the truth was possible. In tracing this, he believed, the question of the identity of the Church would become apparent, indeed was obvious.

In the introduction to the *Essay*, Newman outlined not only that this does happen but why it is important to understand the reason for and process by which it happens. The ‘difficulty’ is that Christianity has changed so much over the centuries that it is not obvious that there is ‘real continuity of doctrine’ since the apostolic era, he noted, and so the theory he was to enunciate would have to demonstrate that there was such continuity in the face of the observable change. One thing was obvious to Newman at this stage: that, in what Chadwick rather superciliously calls ‘typically loose use of words’,¹¹⁹ ‘whatever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this’.¹²⁰

The introduction begins with an assertion of the objective, factual nature of the Christian religion. This is not to assert, for Newman, that matters relating to faith are not matters of opinion but that what he understood to be the liberal contention about Christianity, that it ‘is to each man what each man thinks it to be, and nothing else’,¹²¹ is simply not true. Newman was aware that the wide range of views and practices claiming to be Christian could easily give the appearance that Christianity was ‘a mere name for a number of different religions altogether, and, at variance with one another, and claiming the same appellation’¹²² simply as a result of there being some points of common agreement. He also wished to discount the view that none of the present

¹¹⁹ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.140.

¹²⁰ *Dev.*, p.5.

¹²¹ *Dev.*, p.2.

¹²² *Dev.*, p.2.

manifestations of Christianity ‘represent it as taught by Christ and his apostles’. As he was later to observe, the *Essay* ‘starts with assuming the historical identity of the present and the past Church’ and ‘with the infallibility of the former’.¹²³ Newman, instead, proposed to consider Christianity as ‘the society of Christians which the apostles left on earth ... the internal continuity of name, profession, and communion’.¹²⁴ That was, in his view, both an observable datum of the historical record and ‘a *prima facie* argument for a real continuity of doctrine’.¹²⁵ As he put it quite straightforwardly, ‘the Christianity of the second, fourth, seventh, twelfth, and sixteenth, and intermediate centuries is in its substance the very religion which Christ and his apostles taught in the first’.¹²⁶

Newman understood that whatever theory, mechanism or hypothesis he was to propose would have to offer an account of those changes, observable clearly from the record or otherwise, in Christianity which ‘for good or evil ... lapse of years, or the vicissitudes of human affairs have impressed upon it’.¹²⁷ Newman admitted that there were those who took this as evidence that ‘it is useless, in fact, to seek in history the matter of that Revelation which has been vouchsafed to mankind’.¹²⁸ Christianity, it would appear, is anything but consistent and continuous. Quoting the Caroline divine, William Chillingworth, whose history of conversion to Roman Catholicism and later reversion to the Established Church makes him an interesting character for Newman to

¹²³ JHN to Catherine Ward, 18 November 1848, in *LD* xii, pp.332-337, here p.333.

¹²⁴ *Dev.*, p.2.

¹²⁵ *Dev.*, pp.2f.

¹²⁶ *Dev.*, p.3.

¹²⁷ *Dev.*, p.4.

¹²⁸ *Dev.*, p.3.

have quoted at this point in his own religious journey,¹²⁹ Newman reminded his readers that the history of Christianity gives witness to:

... popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age.¹³⁰

This had been precisely Newman's own observation when he had written *The Arians*. It was the witness of history that his correspondence with the Abbé Jager had put so clearly before him and in answer to which he had developed the notion of prophetic tradition. It was this that had appeared so powerfully to him in his researches into Apollinarianism and the Monophysite crisis and, most forcefully of all, which Wiseman's article had driven home so insistently. If Newman was not to abandon the conviction that Christianity was one and the same religion then as it had been at first, he would have to describe a theological principle which could hold together the change and the continuity. Newman argued that it is not to history *per se* or to any historiographical principles that the enquirer should look to solve this inconsistency. Rather, he contended that, whilst taking seriously the historical record and so writing historically, it was possible to observe, and not merely to propose, a theological principle at work which would allow the Christianity of history to be identified. Whilst asserting 'that Protestantism, then, is not the Christianity of history',¹³¹ for Newman the task of finding, let alone proving the identity of that Christianity of history was now of urgent, critical importance.

The first hypothesis he analysed in the introduction brought him onto the grounds of the controversies of the first years of the Oxford Movement. He admitted

¹²⁹ William Chillingworth (1602-1644) in *DNB Online* at <http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/5308?docPos=1>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

¹³⁰ *Dev.*, p.4.

¹³¹ *Dev.*, p.7.

that seeking for a workable theory, as he had sought to do in the 1830s, in what he now referred to as 'the celebrated dictum of Vincentius', was no longer satisfactory.¹³²

Whilst, Newman admitted, Vincent of Lerins' Canon might well provide 'a short and easy method for reconciling the various informations of ecclesiastical history' and allowing that it contains 'a majestic truth ... offers an intelligible principle, and wears a reasonable care', he observed that it works better at 'determining what is not, than what is Christianity'.¹³³ His own experience of attempting to work with the Vincentian canon as he had attempted to construct his Catholicism of the Word several years earlier had revealed to Newman that if used:

... for the purpose of disproving the catholicity of the Creed of Pope Pius, it becomes also an objection to the Athanasian; and if it be relaxed to admit the doctrines retained by the English church, it no longer excludes certain doctrines of Rome which that Church denies. It cannot at once condemn St. Thomas and St. Bernard, and defend St. Athanasius and St. Gregory Nazianzen.¹³⁴

What he had sought to do with the rule in first attacking what he supposed were Roman Catholic doctrines and practices in the Jager correspondence and then in giving an account of Anglican formularies as being conformable with the Tridentine decrees in Tract 90 is now admitted as impossible. To illustrate this further, Newman then spent several pages examining the development of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, ground with which he was very familiar as a result of his systematic reading of the Fathers and his familiarity with Christian antiquity. The survey further demonstrated what those earlier controversies had shown: that the Vincentian rule could not provide an adequate hypothesis to account for the development of the Church's doctrine, from what was known of the ante-Nicene faith through to the confirmed Nicene faith and the post-Nicene developments. The same is apparent in his presentation of the doctrines of

¹³² *Dev.*, p.7.

¹³³ *Dev.*, p.8.

¹³⁴ *Dev.*, p.9.

purgatory and original sin, the latter, as he noted, appearing ‘neither in the apostles nor the Nicene creed’.¹³⁵ Such is the character of the Vincentian Canon that, Newman observed in a pun, conscious or otherwise, if it were to work at all, it would only do so as a ‘Lesbian Rule’.¹³⁶ The same point is made with regards to the doctrine of the real presence of the Eucharist or the doctrine of papal supremacy. Newman argued that, if the Vincentian Canon were to be the rule, the Church’s belief in the real presence rested on far more slender historical evidence than it did for the doctrine of papal supremacy. Having sought for so long and in the face of such controversy to maintain that ‘Christianity is what has been held always, everywhere and by all’,¹³⁷ Newman abandons it as a tool of practical use:

It does not seem possible, then, to avoid the conclusion that, whatever the proper key for harmonizing the records and documents of the early and later Church, and true as the dictum of Vincentius must be considered in the abstract, and possible as its application might be in his own age, when he might almost ask the primitive centuries for their testimony, it is hardly available now or effective of any satisfactory result. The solution it offers is as difficult as the original problem.¹³⁸

Having laid aside the claims of the Vincentian Canon, Newman next considered what he referred to as a ‘far more widely adopted, not less plausible, and in a certain measure irreconcilable with the former’ hypothesis, namely that early Christianity was corrupted by external influences such that whatever we today call Christianity is simply irreconcilable with the original form of the religion.¹³⁹ Whilst, he acknowledged, this hypothesis perfectly well accounts for variations ‘in doctrine and practice, and for the

¹³⁵ *Dev.*, p.19.

¹³⁶ *Dev.*, p.17. This was the name given historically to the flexible mason’s rule, usually made of lead, that could be bent to the curves of a molding, and used to measure or reproduce irregular curves. Its name derives from Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, where it is used to describe the flexibility required of systems of justice if they are to operate equitably. See *OED Online* at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2277/view/Entry/107453?redirectedFrom=lesbian+rule#eid39331688>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

¹³⁷ *Dev.*, p.8.

¹³⁸ *Dev.*, p.24.

¹³⁹ *Dev.*, p.24.

growth of opinion on particular points',¹⁴⁰ Newman was simply not convinced of it. In fact, his first test of 'fidelity in development' is designed, as will be shown, to disprove even the possibility of any such suggestion.

Newman then considered a third hypothesis. Here he was back on the territory of *Arians* and Bishop Kaye's criticism of it: the *disciplina arcani*. Ascribing the theory here, perhaps slightly disingenuously given the reliance he had himself placed upon it a dozen years previously, to 'divines of the Church of Rome',¹⁴¹ he argued that it was the case that 'it is certain that portions of the church system were held back in primitive times'.¹⁴² Nonetheless, he now argued, as an hypothesis to account for doctrinal change and continuity, it will not serve because it is an hypothesis which, whilst providing a reasonable explanation for the principle of reserve during periods of persecution, once toleration is granted, its *raison d'être* disappears and, after a short time, even the habit of the *disciplina arcani* would fall into desuetude, its utility gone once the faith could be openly practised and taught. Since the development of doctrine appeared to have extended beyond the period of persecution, to a time when it could be demonstrated from the written record that there was no continuing progressive revealing of previously hidden teaching, this was conclusive evidence that the hypothesis of the *disciplina arcani* did not adequately account for the difficulty.

Having dismissed these three possible hypotheses to account for the development of doctrine, Newman reasserted that the essay 'is directed towards a solution of the difficulty' which accords with 'the testimony of ... the history of 1800

¹⁴⁰ *Dev.*, pp.24f.

¹⁴¹ *Dev.*, p.25.

¹⁴² *Dev.*, p.26.

years'.¹⁴³ He claimed that what he proposed to describe, was 'theory of development' that 'has at all times, perhaps, been implicitly adopted by theologians'.¹⁴⁴ The theory, put simply by Newman, was that:

The increase and expansion of the Christian creed and ritual, and the variations which have attended the process in the case of individual writers and Churches, are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart and has had any wide or extended dominion; that from the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas; and that the highest and most wonderful truth, though communicated to the world once for all by inspired teachers, could not be comprehended all at once by the recipient, but was received and transmitted by minds not inspired and through the media which were human, have required only the longer time and deeper thought for their full elucidation.¹⁴⁵

Newman concluded the introduction with two significant observations which hinted at the tentative nature of what otherwise might have looked like a characteristically robust piece of controversial writing. First Newman made clear that the theory of development that he was proposing was, in language he had been using for nearly twenty years, 'an hypothesis to account for a difficulty'.¹⁴⁶ In the same way as the theories of Ptolemy and Newton seem to account for 'the apparent motions of heavenly bodies', he believed the hypothesis to be an explanation which fitted the observable data insofar as it 'rests upon facts as well as accounts for them'.¹⁴⁷ It was not a universal scientific law but a hypothesis that would have to be tested. Secondly, he argued, the theory itself could provide no 'direct justification' for the adoption of 'Roman Catholic doctrine', even if it does, in fact, indirectly 'vindicate the reasonableness of' that doctrine.¹⁴⁸ These observations are important, self-imposed limitations that should be borne in mind when analysing Newman's use of the

¹⁴³ *Dev.*, p.27.

¹⁴⁴ *Dev.*, p.27.

¹⁴⁵ *Dev.*, p.27.

¹⁴⁶ *Dev.*, p.27.

¹⁴⁷ *Dev.*, pp.27f.

¹⁴⁸ *Dev.*, p.29.

hypothesis in the *Essay* in its first edition, the amendments he made to the *Essay* for the Uniform edition, and subsequent attempts by theologians, Roman Catholic and others, to put Newman's theory of development to forensic use.

If Newman was to describe the process of development of ideas, it was important that he first set out what he meant by the term idea. The first section of the first chapter of the *Essay* was devoted to this task. Ideas were, Newman wrote, 'habitual judgments' made by the human mind 'on the things which come before them'.¹⁴⁹ Such ideas may be more than mere subjective opinions, indeed they may approximate to the status of being objective truths when:

... held by persons who are independent of each other, and are variously circumstanced, and have possessed themselves of it by different ways, and when it presents to them under very different aspects, without losing its substantial unity and its identity, and when it is thus variously presented, yet recommended to persons similarly circumstanced; and when it is presented to persons variously circumstanced, under aspects, discordant indeed at first sight, but reconcilable after such explanations as their respective states of mind require.¹⁵⁰

Newman was keen to remind his readers that 'ideas are not ordinarily brought home to the mind, except through the medium of a variety of aspects'. For Newman the ideas that constituted the 'objects of faith' are themselves aspects of the divine.

Norris observes that: 'The abiding core of Christianity for Newman is Christ, or rather the "idea" or image of Christ impressed upon the collective mind of believers.'¹⁵¹

Newman used the analogy of material objects viewed from different points to illustrate what he meant by this. The connection between the idea and the object which it represents or seeks to convey, is, Newman wrote, that the idea is 'practically identical'

¹⁴⁹ *Dev.*, p.30.

¹⁵⁰ *Dev.*, pp.31f.

¹⁵¹ Norris, T., 'The Development of Doctrine: A Remarkable Philosophical Phenomenon', in *Communio*, 22 (1995), pp.470-487, here p.483.

with the particular aspects of the object of which it speaks. Accordingly, it becomes more complete as different aspects are expressed:

They introduce us to that idea from which they are derived, and, so far as they seem to oppose, they correct each other and serve to impress a fuller and more exact representation of their original upon the mind.¹⁵²

Newman then claimed that ideas have a life ‘in the mind which is the recipient’ if the idea ‘is of a nature to interest and possess the mind’. He drew a distinction between, on the one hand, the ideas of Mathematics, which, he observed, ‘real as they are, cannot be called living, for they have no influence and lead to nothing’, and, on the other, to those which amount to ‘some great enunciation, whether true or false, about human nature, or present good, or government, or duty, or religion’. This second class of idea, he argued, is capable of being,

not only passively admitted in this or that form into the minds of men, but it becomes a living principle within them, leading them to an ever-new contemplation of itself, an acting upon it and a propagation of it.¹⁵³

So, he contended, ideas develop as ‘new lights [are] brought to bear upon the original idea’ and ‘aspects ... multiply, and judgements ... accumulate’.¹⁵⁴ It is this process that Newman sought to describe and to name as the theory of development: the ‘germination, growth, and perfection of some living, that is, influential truth, or apparent truth, in the minds of men during a sufficient period’.¹⁵⁵

Newman admitted that this process of development is inherently risky but that the ‘risk of corruption from intercourse with the world around it’,¹⁵⁶ is necessary if the

¹⁵² *Dev.*, p.34.

¹⁵³ *Dev.*, p.35.

¹⁵⁴ *Dev.*, p.36.

¹⁵⁵ *Dev.*, p.37.

¹⁵⁶ *Dev.*, p.38.

idea is to struggle to perfection, and such a struggle to perfection is precisely what the process of development tends towards. Here Newman introduced one of the most powerful analogies from nature in the entire essay: that of the image of the stream, which, he observed, is not ‘clearest near the spring ...’ but ‘... on the contrary, is more equable, and purer, and stronger, when its bed has become deep, and broad, and full’.¹⁵⁷ It is in its lower reaches, far from the source, that the stream reveals its ‘capabilities’ and ‘scope’: so too with ideas, as they develop they too reveal their fullness. Under the action of external factors and causes, the stream changes and adapts in order to retain its identity, in order that it remains the same stream. The analogy ends with perhaps Newman’s most frequently quoted expression. Used by Newman to convey the need of change in order to maintain identity, to manifest continuity, and not as a justification of any change for its own sake, he wrote: ‘it changes with them’ – that is those external stimuli – ‘in order to remain the same. In a higher world it is otherwise; but here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often’.¹⁵⁸ It is clear, from the preceding sentence that Newman’s purpose here is to set change at the service of continuity. Unfortunately, so quotable is the expression that, shorn of its preceding sentence and quoted entirely out of context, it is most often used to justify change almost for its own sake or in the service of some other progressivist conception, inverting almost completely Newman’s intended sense.¹⁵⁹

Having established what he meant by ‘idea’ and demonstrated that ideas are subject to development without losing their practical identity with the object which they

¹⁵⁷ *Dev.*, p.38.

¹⁵⁸ *Dev.*, p.39.

¹⁵⁹ See, for example, Ormerod, N.J., “‘The Times They Are A ‘Changin’’: A Response to O’Malley and Schoessler’, in *Theological Studies*, 67 (2006), pp.834-855, here p.834, where the author misquotes this line as ‘and to be perfect is to change often’, using it as the motif at the head of an article in which he argues ‘for the need to develop a historical ecclesiology grounded in the systematic of history’, here p.835.

express, in the second section of the first chapter, Newman gave consideration to the fact that ideas might well develop but that such developments could be of a number of different kinds. He considered at length a wide range of developments from the mathematical to the metaphysical, each differing from the other by virtue of the nature of the field: mathematical and logical developments proceeding by strict demonstration but political and metaphysical by contemplation and argument. The specific characters of these classes and the description of them that Newman gave are not germane to the current work but Newman's consideration that developments might be 'true or not true, (that is faithful or unfaithful to the ideas from which it started)' ¹⁶⁰ certainly is.

Newman was concerned to show how those developments which were 'false or unfaithful developments' and, thereby 'called a corruption', ¹⁶¹ were to be distinguished from those true, faithful and properly so called developments. It is to the outline of how this task might be accomplished that the final section of the first chapter of the *Essay* was devoted. As Newman put it:

Since the developments of an idea are nothing else than its adequate representation and fulfilment, in its various aspects, relations, and consequences, and since the causes which stimulate may also distort its growth, as is seen in the corruptions of truth with which the world abounds, rules are required to distinguish legitimate developments from those which are not. ¹⁶²

Taking as his analogy 'physical growth' in the animal world, Newman suggested that the 'most obvious characteristic of a faithful development' was '[u]nity in type', whilst not excluding 'all variation, nay, considerable alteration of proportion and relation, in the development of the parts or aspects of an idea'. ¹⁶³ He illustrated what he meant by this with reference first to developments in the natural world, using as an analogy of the bodily resurrection these images: 'the fully fledged bird differs from

¹⁶⁰ *Dev.*, p.44.

¹⁶¹ *Dev.*, p.44.

¹⁶² *Dev.*, pp.57f.

¹⁶³ *Dev.*, p.58.

the egg. The butterfly is the development, but not in any sense the image of the grub'.¹⁶⁴ Similarly, in the case of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, he argued, appealing to the authority of Petavius, that the doctrine of the three persons more readily witnesses to the truth 'that God is One and most Simple'.¹⁶⁵ British political economy provided Newman with a further example of this unity in type in spite of variation. He observed that individuals, political movements, or indeed national character, might change in ways which might appear to 'be in themselves irreconcilable' and yet 'be acquitted of inconsistency' since they 'may be nothing more than accidental instruments or expressions of what [they are] inwardly from first to last'.¹⁶⁶ These, and a further illustration from the history of the Jewish people, led him to observe that the problem with unity in type is that 'it may happen that a representation which varies from its original may be felt as more true and faithful than one which has more pretensions to be exact'.¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, this was, Newman noted, also true not only of authentic developments but 'real diversions and corruptions', in that they 'are often not so unlike externally to the doctrine to which they belong, as are changes which are consistent with it and true developments'.¹⁶⁸

If Newman were to be able to make a proper distinction, using his theory, between authentic developments and corruptions, then the cause of 'corruption in religion' would need to be identified. The first cause he identified, one which underlay several of his seven tests, which he had encountered throughout his reading of antiquity, and now saw exhibited in the search for primitive Christianity amongst Protestants, was 'the refusal to follow the course of doctrine as it moves on, and an obstinacy in the

¹⁶⁴ *Dev.*, p.58.

¹⁶⁵ *Dev.*, p.58f. The quote from Petavius is cited in the *Essay* as from his *De Deo*, ii, 4, § 8.

¹⁶⁶ *Dev.*, p.59.

¹⁶⁷ *Dev.*, p.60.

¹⁶⁸ *Dev.*, p.61.

notions of the past'.¹⁶⁹ In illustration of this, having considered the evidence of Scripture and in particular the case of the Sadducees, and after a short discussion regarding the 'literal meaning of the word corruption, as used by material substances',¹⁷⁰ Newman argued that unity in type can be used in 'drawing the line between a development and a corruption'.¹⁷¹ Any development, he argued:

... is to be considered a corruption which *obscures or prejudices its essential idea*, or which *disturbs the laws of development* which constitute its organisation, or which *reverses its course of development*'.

Whereas, he continued, 'that is *not* a corruption which is *both a chronic and an active state* or which is *capable of holding together* the component parts of the system'.¹⁷²

The result of this twofold test of unity in type allowed Newman to set forth the seven tests of a development which, he admitted from the first, are of 'varying cogency and independence'.¹⁷³ As has already been observed, much of the *Essay* is given over to a discussion of the application of these seven tests to developments of doctrine. Allowing for this acknowledged varying cogency and independence might well be an adequate explanation for the fact that they are given explanations and historical illustrations in the *Essay* similarly of varying cogency and independence, not to mention length. Newman admitted, at the end of the first chapter, that these 'criteriae ... are only of a practical character, and not determined on any logical principle of division'.¹⁷⁴ He appeared, implicitly, to recognise that the tests themselves point to or beg two important questions: whether it is probable that there would be a development of ideas in Christianity; and, arising from the nature of the criteria, whether they would

¹⁶⁹ *Dev.*, p.61

¹⁷⁰ *Dev.*, p.62.

¹⁷¹ *Dev.*, p.63.

¹⁷² *Dev.*, pp.63f.

¹⁷³ *Dev.*, p.64.

¹⁷⁴ *Dev.*, p.93.

be an authority within Christianity to which the believer could turn in order to find an authoritative determination as to whether in a particular instance a change was an authentic development or a corruption? That there should be tests, and what they might be, had been a consistent feature of Newman's development of this hypothesis, as has been related, since he first began to outline it to his brother Francis in November 1840. These tests are not unimportant but they are not, in themselves, constitutive of the theory of development in the *Essay*. Nevertheless they provide 'interpretative assistance' to Newman's primary task.¹⁷⁵ They are illustrations of change in continuity considered under different aspects and subject to the judgment of the Church. They were, as Ford claims, expected by Newman to serve to confirm that the hypothesis of development he had proposed would demonstrate that the Church was what he had hitherto called the Roman Communion.¹⁷⁶

The seven tests are, therefore, of secondary significance when compared with the answers to these two questions which would point Newman conclusively in the direction of an enduring and fundamentally ecclesial hypothesis that, he now believed, could provide the practical solution to his long lasting difficulty. Nevertheless, before considering the answers Newman provided to those two first-order questions, it is necessary to examine briefly the nature and character of each of the tests, since they play such an important part in illustrating how the answers to those two questions have, in fact, operated in the history of Christianity and illuminate how the theory proper was seen by Newman to have worked in practice.

¹⁷⁵ Nichols, A., *From Newman to Congar*, p.51.

¹⁷⁶ Ford, J.T., 'Faithfulness to Type in Newman's "*Essay on Development*"', in Jaki, S., ed., *Newman Today*, (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989, pp.17-48, here p.19.

The first ‘Test of a True Development’ that Newman described was the test of the preservation of type, or idea.¹⁷⁷ It was the test that he gave more space to in the *Essay* than to any other. Over one third of the pages considering the tests were given over to illustrations of the application of the tests to particular historical examples of the development of doctrine which concern preservation of type. Notwithstanding the point about the acceleration of the argument of the *Essay* made earlier, it is reasonable to assume that Newman considered it to be the most significant of the tests. Newman’s definition of this note savours of a particularly platonic note. He wrote:

That the essential idea or type which a philosophical or political system represents must continue under all its developments, and that its loss is tantamount to the corruption of the system, will scarcely be denied.¹⁷⁸

What such an ‘essential idea or type’ might be, however, escaped such straightforward definition and Newman recognised that this made it not ‘easy of application in particular cases’.¹⁷⁹ He offered the analogy from nature of the growth of a plant, changing as it grows, yet remaining the same plant. Rather than offer a concise definition, however, the idea being, in Newman’s view, ‘too obvious and too close upon demonstration’,¹⁸⁰ Newman chose, instead, to give examples later in the essay of where this test could be shown to be at work. Two of those examples will serve to demonstrate what Newman meant.

Newman’s familiarity with the controversies and characters of the Fourth Century meant that he felt that he was on particularly sound territory when he considered the events of the period immediately after the first Nicene Council: ‘How’, in such turbulent times, ‘was the man to guide his course who wished to join himself to

¹⁷⁷ *Dev.*, pp.64-66.

¹⁷⁸ *Dev.*, p.64.

¹⁷⁹ *Dev.*, pp.65f.

¹⁸⁰ *Dev.*, p.65.

the doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles?’¹⁸¹ The answer that he came to, after surveying the Christian *orbis terrarum* was to cite the unity of the title ‘Catholic’ which, in opposition to the various heresies, was everywhere applied to those Churches which were united one with another, exclusive of those ideas and sects which have come to be called heretical, but, crucially, as he now recognised ‘denoted by the additional title of “Romans”’.¹⁸² The ecclesiological idea or type to be preserved, then, was of a Church identified by its Catholic unity in communion with the Bishop of Rome, as distinguished from those known for their disunity as polities the one with another and their lack of shared faith and communion.

In the field of doctrine, Newman chose as one example, among others: ‘the definition passed at Chalcedon’. Again on territory that he might reasonably have claimed to have made his own, the history of the Monophysite crisis, this time Newman tackled the apparent discontinuity of the Christological definition of this Council with the Niceno-Constantineopolitan Symbol. The Chalcedonian definition, Newman claimed was ‘the Apostolic Truth once delivered to the Saints ... in simple accordance with the faith of St. Athanasius, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and all the other Fathers.’¹⁸³ Newman baldly claimed that his account ‘will be evident to the theological student’.¹⁸⁴ Despite this assertion, it is far from clear that it was so obvious. Newman admitted that the Chalcedonian definition was ‘a doctrine which the Creed did not declare, which the Fathers did not unanimously witness’ but was a doctrine necessarily imposed upon all ‘under sanction of anathema’, and, let it not be forgotten, he wrote, made obligatory because of the ‘resolution of the Pope of the day’ This was, Newman believed,

¹⁸¹ *Dev.*, pp.242f.

¹⁸² *Dev.*, p.276.

¹⁸³ *Dev.*, p.307.

¹⁸⁴ *Dev.*, p.307.

because the definition was necessary to preserve the idea of the Incarnation in its entirety as the Church had conceived it, against those who would corrupt it into something that it had not been.¹⁸⁵

The second test, given the name ‘continuity of principles’¹⁸⁶ by Newman, was more readily defined. ‘Doctrines are developed by the operation of principles, and develop differently according to those principles.’¹⁸⁷ If those principles alter, then the doctrine itself will alter, Newman argued, and those developments ‘if they really deserve the name’, rather than being called corruptions, ‘they must be conducted all along on definite and continuous principles, which determine their course’.¹⁸⁸ By way of illustrating how this had operated in the history of the Christian idea, Newman looked at the consistent use by the Church throughout history of the mystical sense in the understanding of the meaning of Sacred Scripture. He argued that, whilst ‘the Jews clung to the literal sense of the Old Testament and rejected the Gospel; the Christian Apologists proved its divinity by means of the allegorical.’¹⁸⁹ In the same way, St Methodius had sought to ‘enforce vows of celibacy’, by appeal to the mystical sense of the Book of Numbers, St Irenaeus had proclaimed ‘the dignity of St. Mary’ by seeing in an allegorical reading of Genesis the words of St Luke’s Gospel, and so on, up and until the present, with those particular Roman doctrines, such as that of purgatory resting on precisely the same principle for the interpretation of Sacred Scripture.¹⁹⁰ He further illuminated his meaning with the illustrations he gave to show the continuity of the principle of the supremacy of faith, particularly with regard to reason. He was,

¹⁸⁵ *Dev.*, p.307.

¹⁸⁶ *Dev.*, p.71.

¹⁸⁷ *Dev.*, p.71.

¹⁸⁸ *Dev.*, p.319.

¹⁸⁹ *Dev.*, p.324.

¹⁹⁰ *Dev.*, pp.320f.

here, rehearsing the arguments of his later University Sermons, particularly the tenth and eleventh, that it is ‘the teaching of the Ancient Church’ as much of the ‘modern schools’ that the continuous principle which acts on doctrines to their development is that faith ‘corrects that perplexity of doubts’ that arises from the exercise of reason alone.¹⁹¹

The power of assimilation is, Newman claimed, a further test: ‘The idea never was that throve and lasted, yet ... incorporated nothing from external sources’.¹⁹² Once again Newman used an analogy from natural science, observing that ‘whatever has life ... grows by taking into its own substance external materials’ by way of nourishment.¹⁹³ The adoption of ideas from pagan philosophy, as for example those from Greek philosophy which made possible the development of the ‘Dogmatic and Sacramental’ principles are illustrations offered by Newman as examples of this test.¹⁹⁴

The fourth test is that of the early anticipation of a later development in the history of an idea. Newman wrote that:

Since developments are in great measure only aspects of the idea from which they come ... it is no wise strange that here and there definite specimens should very early occur, which, in the historical course are not found till a late day.¹⁹⁵

He gave several, almost trivial, examples of this from Christian and ‘profane’ history, such as the election of St Athanasius as a bishop by his childhood ‘playfellows’, or the early intimations of eighteenth-century cabinet government in King James VI and I’s attempts at managing the business of the House of Commons.¹⁹⁶ He was to give more

¹⁹¹ *Dev.*, pp.332f.

¹⁹² *Dev.*, p.75.

¹⁹³ *Dev.*, p.73.

¹⁹⁴ *Dev.*, pp.339ff.

¹⁹⁵ *Dev.*, p.77.

¹⁹⁶ *Dev.*, p.78.

extensive examples of the application of this test, however, to a number of particular aspects of later Roman Catholicism in the seventh chapter of the *Essay*. The doctrines and practices – those ‘Specimens of Theological Science’¹⁹⁷ relating to relics, the cult of the saints, celibacy, the Blessed Virgin Mary and the dogmatic system – were ones which came in for particular criticism from Protestants and with which Newman and the other Tractarians had been compelled by their various interlocutors to deal. In the *Essay* Newman examined the history of each of these doctrines or practices in turn and, instead of attempting lengthy apologetic or even correction of misapprehension, concluded that the historical record provided ‘proof of the existence from the first ... of those doctrinal developments which afterwards became recognised portions of the Church’s Creed’.¹⁹⁸

For all his desire to maintain the superiority of faith over reason, as was observed when his thirteenth University Sermon was considered in the previous chapter, Newman had very high regard for reason. His fifth note, logical sequence, gave voice to this regard: ‘An idea grows in the mind by remaining there; it becomes familiar and distinct, and is viewed in its relations; it suggests other ideas, and these again others, subtle, recondite, original’.¹⁹⁹ Newman’s definition of logic, at least for the purposes of the *Essay*, is wider than might normally be applied, as Chadwick notes.²⁰⁰ It is, nevertheless, recognisably coherent with the sense of sequential and reconcilable reasoning from one truth to another. Both the cult of the saints and of the Blessed Virgin Mary as logical developments from the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus and the Sacrament of Penance, the doctrine of Purgatory and the practice of

¹⁹⁷ *Dev.*, p.388.

¹⁹⁸ *Dev.*, p.396

¹⁹⁹ *Dev.*, p.81.

²⁰⁰ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, p.157.

Monasticism as logical developments from the doctrine of Baptism (and their corruptions as illogical), are cited as examples of the illustration of this test at work in the history of the Church.²⁰¹

Newman called his sixth test one of ‘preservative additions’: the notion that developments which preserve or strengthen the earlier enjoy ‘a fair presumption in their favour, so those which do not ... are certainly corrupt’.²⁰² He was later to describe this test as being that of ‘conservative action upon its past’.²⁰³ The most significant of the illustrations of the sixth test that he offered was that of ‘whether the honours paid to St. Mary, which have grown out of devotion to her Almighty Lord and Son, do not in fact, tend to weaken that devotion’?²⁰⁴ On more than one occasion, in writings critical of Catholic devotion, Newman had contended that they did precisely this, most recently in the *British Critic* article of 1840:²⁰⁵ he was now to argue that it was not the case. He asserted that the title given the Blessed Virgin at the Council of Ephesus, ‘θεοτοκος [sic], or “Mother of God”’ is itself ‘sanction’ for devotion to Mary as preservative of the doctrine of her son’s divinity:²⁰⁶ so too is the tone of that devotion, distinct, as it is, from that paid to the Trinity.²⁰⁷

The seventh, the final test Newman proposed, was that of ‘chronic continuance’. ‘Corruption cannot’, he asserted, ‘be of long standing’ because it leads briefly and rapidly to dissolution.²⁰⁸ Authentic development, however, is characterised by

²⁰¹ *Dev.*, pp.397-429

²⁰² *Dev.*, p.86.

²⁰³ The name he was to give this test as his sixth ‘note’ in the Uniform Edition. See *Dev.*(1878), p.199.

²⁰⁴ *Dev.*, p.435.

²⁰⁵ JHN, ‘Catholicity of the English Church’, p.8.

²⁰⁶ *Dev.*, p.436.

²⁰⁷ *Dev.*, pp.436ff.

²⁰⁸ *Dev.*, p.90.

‘duration’,²⁰⁹ because the ideas it relates to live ‘in men’s minds’ and hence are ‘ever enlarging into fuller development’.²¹⁰ Newman’s illustration of this is to contrast the long duration of the ‘Catholic system’ in the face of ‘the severity of the trials it has undergone’,²¹¹ with the fate of the various heresies with which it has had to contend. Although the briefest of his descriptions and illustrations of the tests, this seventh, the detailed examination of which concludes the *Essay*, brought Newman to the notion of what might be described as the ‘meta-test’: the Catholic Church.

Newman began the second chapter of the *Essay*, ‘On the Development of Christian Ideas Antecedently Considered’, by once again asserting the factual character of Christianity, and that the facts about its doctrines and practices could be made the ‘subject matter of exercises of the reason, and impressed an idea on our minds’.²¹² He also repeated his assertion that ‘it is the peculiarity of the human mind, that it cannot take an object in, which is submitted to it, simply and integrally’ but requires ‘a number of statements, strengthening, interpreting, correcting each other, and with more or less exactness approximating, as they accumulate, to a perfect image’ of the object’.²¹³ Given these two considerations, Newman argued that it was, indeed, probable that ‘Christianity, as a doctrine and worship, will develop in the minds of recipients’.²¹⁴

The fact that Christianity is not confined to specific times or localities, Newman suggested, was further evidence of the probability of its development. Here Newman came to a consideration of the place of heresy in the development of doctrine. Given

²⁰⁹ *Dev.* p.91.

²¹⁰ *Dev.*, p.90.

²¹¹ *Dev.*, p.446.

²¹² *Dev.*, p.94.

²¹³ *Dev.*, p.94.

²¹⁴ *Dev.*, p.96.

the importance the study of heresy had been in Newman's intellectual history, his remarks are both to be expected and also of some significance. Rather than choosing to locate his comments in a consideration of the Trinitarian and Christological controversies of Christian late antiquity, he chose instead to examine the Council of Trent's treatment of Luther's view of the doctrine of justification, which provided at least as good an example of what he wanted to show. Newman's words could, however, have been equally applied to any of the disputes of the early centuries that he had earlier considered in such detail: 'The refutation and remedy of errors cannot precede their rise; and thus the fact of false developments or corruptions involves the correspondent manifestation of true ones.'²¹⁵ Here, in the definitive formulation of his theory of the development of doctrine, was the proper explanation for Newman's concern with heresy. Notwithstanding Thomas's thesis, it was not an obsession with heresy, either for its own sake or for some darkly hinted at but never made explicit psychological deficiency, but a proper concern to establish an hypothesis to account for the difficulty of change of doctrine in continuity with antecedent teaching that explains why Newman had spent so much time considering the history of Christian heresy. It was clear to him that the only conceivable explanation for many Christian doctrines which had appeared throughout the eighteen-hundred year history of the religion was that untruths had developed from truths against which further explicit developments of the truth were necessary in order to guard and guarantee the continuity of the later doctrine with the earlier and overcome or refute the intervening heresy.

Even the structure of Sacred Scripture suggested to Newman an antecedent probability of development. He had previously argued that the fulfilment of earlier

²¹⁵ *Dev.*, pp.96f.

prophecies in later teachings or events in Sacred Scripture, particularly those of the Old Testament in the New, demonstrated that Scripture itself presumes development. Now he argued that even the concept of an argument in favour of a doctrine or practice from Scripture itself is an example of development, since it ‘implies deduction, that is, development’.²¹⁶ Far from diminishing the role of Scripture, as Turner, following George Stanley Faber, argued,²¹⁷ this accords it a role that is not easily diluted by the findings or, more properly, the claims of liberal-Protestant Biblical criticism.

Furthermore Newman argued that, in making such deductions, the Catholic relying upon an ‘*ex cathedrâ*’ judgement of the Pope, and the Protestant, relying on his or her private judgement, were relying on the same ‘claim of authority’ to determine the veracity of a particular development.²¹⁸ Whether considered as the action of the mind of the whole church or the action of individual minds, the conscious or ‘unconscious growth of ideas habitual to the mind’²¹⁹ or the ‘slow process of thought, the influence of mind upon mind, the issues of controversy, and the growth of opinion are ... an observable and natural part of Christianity’, Newman argued.²²⁰ On the one hand, doctrines such as the baptism of children were, he maintained, evidence of this historically observable truth and evidence of the fulfilment of Sacred Scripture. On the other hand, however, the development of the idea of Christianity was intended by God himself:

Thus vast developments of Christianity are proved to have been in the contemplation of its Divine Author, by an argument parallel to that by which we infer intelligence in the system of the physical world. In whatever sense the need and its supply are proof of design in the visible creation, in the same do the gaps, if the word may be used, which occur in the structure of the original creed

²¹⁶ *Dev.*, p.97.

²¹⁷ Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, p.569

²¹⁸ *Dev.*, p.97.

²¹⁹ *Dev.*, p.97.

²²⁰ *Dev.*, p.99.

of the Church, make it probable that those developments, which grow out of the truths which lie around them, were intended to complete it.²²¹

It was Newman's case that even the method of revelation underlying the scriptural texts is proof of the probability of developments in Christianity. Prophecy, for example, is predicated on the notion of a developing revelation, since individual prophecies 'are pregnant texts out of which the succeeding announcements grow'²²² and, Newman maintained, what is true of prophecy is true also of the 'injunctions of doctrine'. These are expressions the meaning of which is not immediately apparent but 'have the same structure' as prophecies and, therefore, 'should admit the same expansion'.²²³ In support of his argument, Newman quoted at some length from his *Lectures on the Prophetic Office*, where he had examined several of Jesus's teachings in passages in the New Testament and found them to be what he now called 'pregnant texts'.²²⁴ The parables and often the actions of Jesus, such as washing his disciples feet and paying tribute, are, Newman wrote, 'instances of a similar peculiarity', that peculiarity being 'developments of revelation' which had 'preceded all through the old dispensation down to the very end of our Lord's ministry'.²²⁵ What is more, in the period immediately after that recorded in the New Testament, that is, in 'the beginnings of apostolic teaching',²²⁶ this continued. No matter how hard we try, Newman observed, 'we shall find ourselves unable to fix an historical point at which the growth of doctrines ceased, and the rule of faith was once for all settled'.²²⁷

²²¹ *Dev.*, pp.101f.

²²² *Dev.*, pp.102f.

²²³ *Dev.*, p.104,

²²⁴ See JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church*, pp.356-361.

²²⁵ *Dev.*, p.107.

²²⁶ *Dev.*, p.107.

²²⁷ *Dev.*, p.107.

What Newman claimed to have observed in the development of the Church's teaching, he also claimed to be able to observe in the development of ecclesial structures, or the 'political development' of Christianity. This was a crucial point if he was to find justification for the development of the authority structure, and particularly the office of the Papacy, to the point it stood as he wrote. He felt able to conclude that:

From the necessity, then, of the case, from the history of all sects and parties in religion, and from the analogy and example of Scripture, we may fairly conclude that Christian doctrine admit [sic] of formal, legitimate, and true developments, or of developments contemplated by its divine author.²²⁸

Having made the case that it was probable that there would be developments in the Christian faith, Newman had then to consider the question of what:

... rule is necessary for arranging and authenticating these various expressions and results of Christian doctrine ... how are we to discriminate the greater from the less, the true from the false.²²⁹

At this point in the *Essay*, Newman admitted that the seven tests that he had set out were 'insufficient', since they were 'of a scientific and controversial, not a practical character, and are instruments rather than warrants of right decisions'.²³⁰ The want of such a mechanism, the need for which had been obvious to Newman since first he had read St Augustine's 'palmary words', meant that his tests of true development were not of the desired practical character. Newman held that it was antecedently probable, that it is likely from the character of the Christian idea and its propensity to develop, that an authority to provide the warrant, the practical mechanism would itself develop. Of course, such a warrant 'must of necessity be external to the developments themselves',²³¹ in order that it might be the judge of them and it was his case that, insofar as it is probable that Christian doctrine would develop, 'and in proportion' to

²²⁸ *Dev.*, p.113.

²²⁹ *Dev.*, p.116.

²³⁰ *Dev.*, p.117.

²³¹ *Dev.*, p.117.

that probability, it was similarly probable that there should be a 'scheme of an external authority to decide upon [those developments] ... This is the doctrine of the infallibility of the church'.²³²

Newman appreciated that this claim to an infallible teaching authority was not uncontroversial. He argued that the fact that Christian doctrine, as first imparted by Christ and the Apostles, 'admits of true and important developments' was 'a strong antecedent argument in favour of a provision in the Dispensation for putting a seal of authority upon those developments'.²³³ He took as a matter of fact that Christ and the Apostles were infallible teachers of that doctrine. Newman maintained these positions whilst acknowledging that there were a number of objections to them, such as the common Protestant criticism of 'Romanists' that the church's claim to infallibility is in fact circular and, as his own argument was constructed, at best, only probable. It was circular because it rested on the claim to be able infallibly to decide the meaning of both scriptural texts and the development of that notion of infallibility and it was only probable since, as Newman had demonstrated, the only grounds other than the scriptural that could justify the development of an infallible authority was from the antecedent probability that the structure of Christian doctrine as given to development required such an authority.²³⁴ Yet, Newman argued that probability, rather than demonstrable certainty, is in the very nature of faith and that any exercise of faith involves the acceptance on trust of claims about which it is possible to claim nothing more than probability. Neither does the existence of such an authority remove free will, as was commonly claimed in objection to the idea of infallibility, either of the Pope or the Church as a whole: it merely narrowed the subject matter to which the free exercise of

²³² *Dev.*, p.117.

²³³ *Dev.*, p.118.

²³⁴ *Dev.*, p.120.

private judgment was to be applied, and this too was to be expected on grounds of antecedent probability:

A Church, or a Council, or a Pope, or a Consent of doctors, or a Consent of Christendom, limits the enquiries of the individual in no other way than Scripture limits them: it does limit them; but while it limits their range, it preserves intact their probationary character; we are tried as really, though not on so large a field. To suppose that the doctrine of a permanent authority in matters of faith interferes with our freewill and responsibility is, as before, to forget that there were infallible teachers in the first age, and heretics and schismatics in the ages subsequent.²³⁵

In the end, for Newman, the argument came down to this issue, or, as he put it:

The case then stands thus: ... as the essence of all religion is authority and obedience, so the distinction between natural religion and revealed lives in this, that one has a subjective authority, and the other an objective. Revelation consists in the manifestation of the invisible divine power, or in the substitution of the voice of a lawgiver for the voice of conscience. The supremacy of conscience is the essence of natural religion; the supremacy of apostle, or Pope, or church, or Bishop, is the essence of the revealed; and when such external authority is taken away, the mind falls back again upon that inward guide which it possessed even before revelation was vouchsafed. Thus what conscience is in the system of nature, such is the voice of Scripture, or of the church, or of the Holy See, as we may determine it, in the system of Revelation.²³⁶

The mention of conscience appears to have encouraged Newman to engage in a short excursus. He admitted that conscience is not infallible and yet notes the universal consensus in favour of obeying it. He pointed out that, as Robert Bellarmine had observed, Popes too can err ‘in particular controversies of fact, which chiefly depend on human information and testimony’.²³⁷ Nevertheless, he maintained, the analogy with conscience supports obedience to even erroneous papal judgments on moral grounds. He quoted and developed Bellarmine:

... “all Catholics agree in two other points ... : first, that the Pope with general counsel cannot err, either in framing decrees of faith or general precepts of morality; secondly, that the Pope, when determining anything in their doubtful matter, whether by himself or with his own particular Council, *whether it is*

²³⁵ *Dev.*, p.121.

²³⁶ *Dev.*, p.124.

²³⁷ *Dev.*, p.125.

possible to him to or not, is to obeyed by all the faithful.” And as obedience to conscience, even supposing conscience ill-formed, tends to the improvement of our moral nature, and ultimately of our knowledge, so obedience to our ecclesiastical superior may subserve our growth in illumination and sanctity, even though he should command what is extreme or inexpedient, or teach what is external to his legitimate province.²³⁸

It was a position that he was to maintain, even when invited by others to depart from it in the wake of the definition of the dogma of Papal Infallibility at the First Vatican Council a quarter of a century later, when he wrote: ‘Unless a man is able to say to himself, as in the Presence of God, that he must not, and dare not, act upon the Papal injunction, he is bound to obey it.’²³⁹

Newman was now close to what had become the unavoidable question.

Newman believed that it was possible to prove that Christian doctrine did develop and that it was probable that this was a constituent element of it. He believed, too, that there was an external authority capable of providing a warrant, authenticating such developments. He now needed to identify what that authority was and where its voice was to be heard. He would do this by following the same principles that he had followed in determining whether or not doctrine would develop or that there would be an authority for authenticating it: by the use of historical analysis to determine what was both antecedently probable and what had developed. Scriptural considerations had pointed Newman in the direction of the Church as the authority but the identity of the Church had, for so long, been an issue to him. Now he was to suggest, in the third chapter of the *Essay*, entitled ‘On the Nature of the Argument in behalf of Existing Development of Christianity’, that only a church which claims to be an infallible judge could, as a matter of logic, be such. Together with a claim ‘of an infallible sanction – a

²³⁸ *Dev.*, p.125

²³⁹ JHN, *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, p.258.

claim, the existence of which, in some quarters or other of the Divine Dispensation, is, as we have already seen, antecedently probable',²⁴⁰ Newman asserted that the Roman Catholic Church's claim to be that infallible guide is supported by 'the argument which arises from the coincidence of their consistency and permanence', that is the consistency and permanence of Catholic doctrines.²⁴¹

Newman then returned to the argument which had dominated the consideration of the rival claims of the English church and the Roman in his *British Critic* article of January 1840, that is the creedal notes of the church: unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity. Departing from the theory of possession and the self-consciously anti-Catholic rhetoric, which he had so lately and publicly abjured, concerning want of holiness in the Roman Communion in the article, Newman now argued that unity, catholicity and apostolicity are intimately related, cannot but exist together, and are to be found within the Roman Catholic communion. He wrote, using an illustration that may have suggested itself to him from one used by Miss Mary Holmes in correspondence with him in November 1844, that:

... did St Athanasius or St Ambrose come suddenly to life, it cannot be doubted what communion they would mistake for their home. All differences of opinion, whatever protests, if we will, would find themselves more at home with such men as St Bernard or St Ignatius Loyola, all with the lonely priest in his lodging, or the holy sisterhood of mercy, or the unlettered crowd before the altar, than with the rulers or members of any other religious community.²⁴²

This was Newman at his controversialist best but the audience here was not those with whom he was or had been engaged in the various ecclesial controversies of

²⁴⁰ *Dev.*, p.136.

²⁴¹ *Dev.*, p.136.

²⁴² *Dev.*, p.138. Cf. Miss Mary Holmes to JHN, 30 November 1844, in *LD* x, pp.441f., where, at p.442, she wrote: 'Could St Thomas of Canterbury, St Anselm and the Venerable Bede rise from their graves, can you doubt an instant which side they would take? Would they submit to Dr Wiseman or to the Bishop (so called) of Oxford? Would St Stephen Harding and St Bernard have any fellowship with a Church founded by Cranmer, and Henry 8th?'

the last decade and more, so much as himself. In a purple passage he drove home the point:

And may we not add, that were the two Saints, who once sojourned in exile or on embassy, at Treves, to come more northward still, and to travel until they reached another fair city, seated among groves, green meadows, and calm streams, the holy brothers would turn from many a high aisle and solemn cloister which they found there, and ask the way to some small chapel where mass [sic] was said in the populous alley or forlorn suburb? And on the other hand, can anyone who has but heard his name, and cursorily read his history, doubt for one instant, how, in turn, the people of England ... would deal with Athanasius, – Athanasius who spent his long years in fighting against Kings for theological term?²⁴³

Newman had discovered his Church of Catholicism; he had found his infallible guide; he had his external authority to decide between authentic developments and corruptions. He would use the rest of the *Essay* to illustrate how this Church of Catholicism, the Roman Catholic Church (although, as he was later to note, he now ‘boldly’ referred to it simply as the Catholic Church)²⁴⁴ was able to determine with authority the development of:

... doctrines [which] come to us, professing to be Apostolic, and possessed of such high antiquity that, though we are only able to assign the date of their formal establishment to the fourth or fifth or eighth or thirteenth century, as it may happen, yet their substance may, for what appears, be coeval with the apostles, and be expressed or implied in texts of Scripture.²⁴⁵

Here then was Newman's theory of development in its three aspects. First, because the idea of Christianity lives in the minds of men and women, it has a development which preserves the identity of the idea. Second, that development involves the progressive and more accurate enunciation of the idea in doctrines and practices through their engagement with historical and cultural frameworks. Finally, that there are tests, perhaps they might better be termed ‘indications’ or even ‘notes’, as

²⁴³ *Dev.*, pp.138f.

²⁴⁴ *Apo.*, p.366.

²⁴⁵ *Dev.*, p.146.

Newman would come to call them in the Uniform Edition, which, subject to the infallible judgment of the Roman Catholic Church, might be used to determine whether a particular change is a development or a corruption. The meta-test, however, was the living authority of the Catholic Church:

It is true, there have been seasons when, from the operation of external or internal causes, the church has been thrown into what was almost a state of *deliquium*; but her wonderful revivals, while the world was triumphing over her, is a further evidence of the absence of corruption, in the system of doctrine and worship into which she has developed. If corruption be an incipient disorganisation, surely an abrupt and absolute recurrence to such a state, after an interval during which it has ceased to be, is even less conceivable than its sustained existence. Now this is the case with the revivals I speak of. After violent exertion men are exhausted and fall asleep; they await the same as before, refreshed by the temporary cessation of their activity; and such has been the slumber and such the restoration of the church. She pauses in her course, and almost suspends her functions; she rises again, and she is herself once more; all things are in their place and ready for action. Doctrine is where it was, and usage, and precedents, and principle, and policy; there may be changes, but they are consolidations or adaptations; all is unequivocal and determinate, with an identity which there is no disputing. Indeed it is one of the most popular charges against the Catholic Church at this very time, that she is “incorrigible;” – change she cannot, if we listen to St Athanasius or St Leo; change she never will, if we believe the controversialist or alarmist of the present day.²⁴⁶

This Catholic Church, changed in appearance, but yet having the same identity as the Church of the Fathers which Newman had sought since the summer of 1816, was the arbiter of change in continuity; it was the living organ necessary to verify development; it was the Church of Catholicism; it was the keystone of the hypothesis to account for the difficulty of which he had been aware for so long; it was, Newman now believed, the Roman Catholic Church.

²⁴⁶ *Dev.*, pp.452f.

Conclusion

When he published his *Essay* John Henry Newman did more than set out an intellectual theory: he addressed a question that had posed for him a serious existential difficulty for a very considerable period of time. The intensity with which he addressed that difficulty had grown to become of such significance that the answer could not but leave him utterly changed. In the theory of the development of doctrine that Newman proposed, he provided himself with a long-sought solution and made arguably his most significant contribution to theology. The remote origins of this solution were in the intense religious experience of the autumn 1816 and in the books which he read in the months before first he went up to Oxford the following year. The need for a theory of the development of Christian doctrine gradually and haltingly emerged, yet it had become explicit enough by the mid-1820s for Newman to begin to frame the question in precisely the language he would use for the next twenty years. In the intervening years, and in response to the specific circumstances of various occasions, Newman proposed a series of theories, more or less complete, depending upon the nature of the occasion, to account for the paradox of a fixed deposit of faith and a changing doctrinal expression. Under test these successive theories failed: revealed as unreal, unworkable or failing to correspond with the historical data.

The first hypothesis, that of the principle of reserve protected by a *disciplina arcani*, proposed that the terminological changes that could be observed in the expressions of the Church's doctrine in the early centuries were, in fact, the gradual lifting of a veil of secrecy that had kept the teaching from public view in times of persecution. The weakness of this theory was two-fold: first, that the historical record

contained no evidence to support the contention that the early Church was conscious of a need to maintain a strict distinction between the exoteric and esoteric expressions of her doctrine and so practice a *disciplina arcani* before the fourth century, yet Newman was faced with evidence of, at least, the language of doctrine changing well before that; and secondly, that this theory provided no tool for distinguishing between changes that had come to be seen as orthodox expressions of faith and those judged to be heresy. By appending the Vincentian Canon to his theory, Newman initially believed he had solved the latter difficulty and, by appealing to an unauthoritative tradition to facilitate the collecting of the sense of scripture in understanding the Church's doctrine, considered that he had side-stepped the inconvenience of the former.

Newman's own research into the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries repeatedly drew his attention to the contradictions between the teachings, not just of those early Christian writers who had come to be called heretics, but also of the orthodox Fathers. In the light of this the need for a hypothesis that would stand up to the evidence in the historical record was increasingly obvious. Although he claimed at the time that its immediate effect was negligible, Newman's correspondence with the Abbé Jager and the *Lectures on the Prophetic Office* which were among its products demonstrated the need for an authoritative rule against which competing claims could be measured. The hoped for stronghold in what has been called a Catholicism of the Word proved to be illusory: the lack of consensus as to if, let alone where, such a univocal patristic voice was to be found, fatally undermined it. For a time, Newman believed that the authoritative note of Apostolical faith could be found in the voice of the Church of England and its adherence to a *via media* between Protestant infidelity and Roman corruption. Even this hypothesis, however, was to crumble in the face of

its own essentially untried and theoretical nature, the refusal of Anglican Bishops to behave as guardians of that Apostolical faith to Newman's satisfaction, and the historical parallels between the position of the Church of England and various heretical sects in the early Church that, Wiseman having made them explicit, forced themselves upon Newman as he continued his study of the Fathers.

In the early 1840s, as Newman's confidence in the position of the Church of England, and his place in it, faltered, he came to the lasting conviction that only a dynamic and organic authority could provide the locus for the resolution of the difficulty. In the *Essay* of 1845, Newman both outlined a theory of the theology of development, the hypothesis which he believed accounted for the difficulty in a manner that did not contain the same flaws of his earlier theories, and provided justification, sufficient for himself, for his conclusion that the necessary dynamic and organic authority was to be found in the Roman Catholic Church. The theory itself and the ecclesial consequences for Newman involved a delicate, even 'precarious balancing act',¹ between those 'impressions of dogma, which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured',² of the summer of 1816, on the one hand, and the story of the intervening twenty-nine years. It was one which, as Merrigan has noted, was:

... inspired not simply by the concern to reconcile a theological datum (the definitiveness of revelation in Christ) with the facts of history, but by the attempts to develop an adequate science (or theology) of the Living Word.³

Newman's polemical Tractarian co-conspirator and almost contemporary fellow-convert to Roman Catholicism, William Ward, anticipated Newman's adoption of a theory of development when, a year before the *Essay*, he boasted:

¹ Merrigan, *Clear Heads and Holy Hearts*, p.97.

² *Apo.*, p.58.

³ Merrigan, *Clear Heads and Holy Hearts*, p.97.

My difficulty in defending this doctrine of development arises from my inability to conceive how anyone can have, for a single day, pursued a course of moral and religious action, and yet deny it.⁴

What Ward claimed to see with such clarity, Newman came to with a characteristic suspicion of his own motives and a desire to ensure that the hypothesis was, indeed, equal to the task. The history of his own engagement with the difficulty of continuity and change meant that the theory of development that he described was both subtle and robust. It had to be subtle enough to address the short-comings of the simpler, more obvious solutions that he had previously adopted, and yet robust enough to stand up to the scrutiny of being not merely a ‘paper theory’ but a reality of ecclesial life. Ward’s bombast was scarcely to outlast his conversion to Roman Catholicism, being replaced with an extreme, almost caricatured, Ultramontanist positivism⁵ not unlike that which Newman had mistakenly believed to be the Roman Catholic doctrine at the time of his correspondence with Jager. Newman’s theory remained largely unaltered, not least because the difficulty to which it was addressed remained the same. That it did remain so in the difficult period around and after the First Vatican Council, when, in the wake of the definition of Papal Infallibility, a Ward-like Ultramontanism seemed triumphant, is testament to its robustness and Newman’s tenacity in holding to it.

⁴ Ward, W.G., *The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with existing practice: containing a defence of certain articles in the British Critic in reply to remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's 'Narrative'*, (London: James Toovey, 1844), pp.547f.

⁵ Ward’s son, Wilfrid, caught his Father’s attitude: ‘W. G. Ward was carrying on in the *Dublin Review* a more carefully reasoned exposition of the new Ultramontanism maintaining the frequency and wide scope of infallible utterances. While theoretically recognising the theological distinctions which Veuillot neglected, his practical conclusion as to the significance of the constant Briefs, Allocutions, and Encyclicals of the existing Pontificate was (to use his own words) that, “in a figurative sense Pius IX. may be said never to have ceased from one continuous *ex Cathedra* pronouncement.” W.G. Ward was, moreover, an active talker: “I should like a new Papal Bull every morning with my *Times* at breakfast,” was one of his sayings which gained currency as literally meant. His articles in the *Dublin* were, as I have already said, republished in a volume in 1866.’ (Ward, W.P., *Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman based on his Private Journals and Correspondence*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1912), here vol.2, pp.212f.)

This dissertation has looked closely at the detailed history of Newman's attempt to account for both continuity and change in Christian doctrine in the period until his seceding from the Church of England and his submission to the authority and communion of the Roman Catholic Church in October 1845. It has provided an analysis of the structure of the theory as it was expressed by Newman in the first edition of his *Essay*, which appeared in November 1845, identifying those elements of the theory that answered the specific problems that had arisen with those earlier, failed hypotheses. It has not attempted a systematic, theological analysis of Newman's theory of development nor attempted to assess the theory's utility as a tool for the forensic assessment of the status – authentic development or corruption – of any particular contemplated change in doctrine. Nevertheless, it is clear that, as the International Theological Commission observed, the tests or notes it proposes constitute 'a criteriology for the development of dogma, which ... can be applied in proper proportions to ... further interpretation of dogmas aimed at giving them contemporary relevance'.⁶ Even if the theory did not take shape in order to undertake such a task, when it has been used in such a way, by, for example, O'Collins in his consideration of the Resurrection⁷ or by Ker in an analysis of the development of the Roman Catholic theology of religious liberty at Vatican II,⁸ its utility is beyond doubt.

The post-publication histories of the *Essay* and Newman's engagement with his own theory of development are also beyond the scope of this present work. His ideas

⁶ International Theological Commission, *On the Interpretation of Dogma*, at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_cti_1989_interpretazione-dogmi_en.html, [accessed 13 December 2013]

⁷ O'Collins, G., 'Newman's Seven Notes: The Case of the Resurrection', in O'Collins, G., and D. Kendall, eds., *Focus on Jesus: Essays in Christology and Soteriology*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996), pp.135-148.

⁸ Ker, I., 'Is *Dignitatis Humanae* a case of Authentic Doctrinal Development?', in *Logos*, 11 (2008), pp.149-157.

did not find immediate acceptance in his new communion, where the criticisms of his critics were often heard more insistently than Newman's own arguments. Newman's eventually creative engagement with the eminent Roman Jesuit, Giovanni Perrone, and the outright attack on his work by the American Orestes Brownson, marked his first years as a Roman Catholic. Nevertheless, both in his 1868 *Unpublished Paper on the Development of Doctrine*⁹ and in the reworked text of the *Essay* for its third edition in 1878, what emerged was, if anything, a stronger attachment to the theory of 1845. In the *long-durée*, Newman's influence has eclipsed his contemporary critics and a thoroughgoing appraisal of his impact on the major theologians of the twentieth century can only be assisted by a detailed explanation of the origins of the *Essay*.

On receiving a copy of the third edition of the *Essay*, Newman's once devout disciple, Mark Pattinson surely did not exaggerate when he wrote to him:

Is it not a remarkable thing that you should have first started the idea – the word – Development, as the key to the history of church doctrine, and since then it has gradually become the dominant idea of all history, biology, physics, and in short has metamorphosed our view of every science, and of all knowledge.¹⁰

Theology, rightly retaining her place within the academy, has been altered utterly by the notion of development. The Roman Catholic Church, during the period since the Second Vatican Council, has seen a curious inversion of the Ultramontanist positivism with which Newman had to contend in his later years. Whilst Newman had to engage with a tendency to invest excessive authority in any and all Papal pronouncements, the post-Vatican II period has seen a manifestation of the same tendency now deployed in support innovations and changes justified simply by an appeal either to what the documents of the Council are thought to say or, more often, to

⁹ JHN, *Unpublished Paper on the Development of Doctrine*, in De Achaval, H., 'An Unpublished Paper by Cardinal Newman on the Development of Doctrine', in *Gregorianum*, Volume 34 (1958), pp585-596.

¹⁰ Mark Pattinson to JHN, 5 April 1878, in *LD* xxviii, p.339, at n.3.

a *soi-disant* “Spirit of Vatican II”. This is done often without any serious consideration of the extent to which such innovations and changes are consistent and cohere with the antecedent teaching or practice. This approach, yoked to a mentality that is inclined to see progress as an unalloyed good in and of itself, appears to contain an ‘almost naïve progressivist optimism which [seems] unaware of the ambivalence of all external progress’.¹¹ Engaging with the question of how Newman searched for continuity in the face of change offers the prospect of an answer to the question of development identified by John Courtney Murray in January 1965 that goes beyond such naivety. The current debate has coalesced around the question of how the teaching of the Second Vatican Council is to be understood, in what does its positive doctrinal and ecclesial content consist, and how it is to be received. For the Roman Catholic Church, where this question of conciliar hermeneutics has become an urgent task for theologians in the service of the Church, Newman’s *Essay* remains the ‘almost inevitable starting point for any investigation of the development of doctrine’.¹² If the *Essay* is to serve as such a point of departure, its genesis, structure and purpose need properly to be understood. This dissertation is a contribution to that task.

¹¹ Ratzinger, J., *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2009), p.227.

¹² Pelikan, J., *Development of Doctrine: Some Historical Prolegomena*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), p.3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

John Henry Newman

Manuscript Sources

Newman, John Henry, *Apollinarianism*, in Birmingham Oratory Archives, B.2.9.a.

--- *Apollinaris' History*, Birmingham Oratory Archives, B.2.5.

--- *Copybook on Development*, Birmingham Oratory Archives, B.2.8

--- *The Monophysite Heresy*, in Birmingham Oratory Archives, B.2.9

--- *Papers and Fragments on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, Birmingham Oratory Archives, B.2.8

--- *Preparatory Notes for the 3rd Edition of Development*, Birmingham Oratory Archives, D.7.6

--- Various Sermons, MS in Birmingham Oratory Archives, B.3.4.

Published Sources

Newman, John Henry, 'Marcus Tullius Cicero', in *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*, (London: Mawman, 1824), pp.279-294.

--- 'Apollonius of Tyanæus', in *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*, (London: Mawman, 1826), pp.619-644.

--- *The Arians of the Fourth Century: Their Doctrine, Temper and Conduct chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church between A.D.325 & A.D.381*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1833).

--- 'The Brothers' Controversy, being a genuine Correspondence between a Clergyman of the Church of England and a Layman of Unitarian Opinions', in *British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, 20 (1836), pp.166-199.

--- 'Letters on the Church Fathers: Letter XVI', in *British Magazine*, 1 July 1836, 10 (1836).

--- 'Wiseman's *Lectures on the Church*', in *British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, 20 (1836), pp.373-403.

--- *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1837).

- *A Letter to the Rev. Godfrey Faussett, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Certain Points of Faith and Practice*, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1838).
- 'Notices of Books' *The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review*, 24 (1838), pp.230-238.
- 'Preface to the Catechetical Lectures of St Cyril of Jerusalem', in R.W.Church, ed., *Library of the Fathers*, no.2., (Oxford: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1839).
- et al., *Extracts from the Tracts for the Times, the Lyra Apostolica, and Other Publications; Showing that to Oppose Ultra-Protestantism Is Not to Favour Popery* (London: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1839).
- 'Catholicity of the English Church', in *The British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, 27 (1840), pp.40-88.
- et al., *Tracts for the Times, by Members of the University of Oxford*, 5 vols. (London and Oxford: J. G. F. and J. Rivington, and J. H. Parker, 1840).
- 'Book Review', *The British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, 30 (1841), pp.100-134.
- *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, (London: J.G., F. and J. Rivington, 1843).
- *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: James Toovey, 1845).
- *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: being a Reply to a Pamphlet entitled "What then does Dr Newman Mean?"*, (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864).
- 'Utrum profecerit Ecclesia Catholica in cognitione sua fidei semel sibi ab Apostolis traditae' [1847] in Thomas Lynch, ed., 'The Newman-Perrone Paper on Development' *Gregorianum*, 16 (1935), pp.402-447.
- 'On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine' *The Rambler*, 3rd Series (July 1859), pp.189-230.
- *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* 2nd edition (London: Basil Pickering, 1873).
- *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius* (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1877).
- 'On the Inspiration of Scripture', in *The Nineteenth Century*, 15 (1884), pp.185-199.
- *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1901).
- *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1901-1909).

- *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1902).
- *Addresses to Cardinal Newman with His Replies, etc., 1879-1881* edited by W. P. Neville (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1905).
- *Historical Sketches*, 3 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1906-1909).
- *Essays Critical and Historical*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907).
- *Two Essays on Biblical and Ecclesiastical Miracles*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907).
- *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 8 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907-1908).
- *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious Opinions*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1908).
- *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1908).
- *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1908).
- *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1908).
- *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1909).
- *Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford between AD1826 and 1843*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1909).
- *Newman's Apologia Pro Vita Sua. The Two Versions of 1864 and 1865, Preceded by Newman's and Kingsley's Pamphlets*, introduced by Ward, Wilfred, [no editor given] (London: Oxford University Press, 1913).
- *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, new edition, ed. Harrold, Charles Frederick, (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1949).
- *John Henry Newman: Autobiographical Writings*, edited by Tristram, Henry, (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956).
- *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, ed. Svaglic, Martin, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).
- *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine: The Edition of 1845*, edited and introduced by Cameron, James M., (London: Penguin, 1974).

--- *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, eds. Dessain, Charles Stephen, and variously, Ian Turnbull Ker, Gerard Tracey, Francis J. McGrath et al., 31 vols., vols. i-vi (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978-1984), vols. vii-x (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995-2006), vols. xi-xxii (London: Thomas Nelson, 1961-1972), vols. xxiii-xxxi (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973-1977).

--- *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, ed. Ker, Ian Turnbull (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989).

--- *The “Via Media” of the Anglican Church*, ed. Weidner, H.D., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

--- *Sermons 1824-1843*, ed. Murray, Placid (vols.I and III), Vincent Blehl (vol.II), Francis McGrath (vols III, IV and V), 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991-2012).

--- *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, ed. Ker, Ian Turnbull, (London: Penguin, 1994).

--- *Apologia Pro Vita Sua and Six Sermons*, ed. Turner, Frank Miller, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

Other Authors

Manuscript Sources

Liddon, Henry, ed., *Correspondence of Dr Pusey*, in *Liddon Bound Volumes*, Dr Pusey’s Library, Pusey House.

Published Sources

[anonymous (“M. A.”)], *Mr. Ward and the New Test, Or, Plain Reasons Why Those Who Censure Mr. Ward Should Not Vote for the New Statute, Which Limits the Thirty Nine Articles: In a Letter to a Friend*, (Oxford: [no publisher given], 1844).

Abbott, Edwin Abbott, *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols., (London: Macmillan, 1892).

Abraham, Charles John, *Mithridates: Or, Mr. Newman’s Essay on Development Its Own Confutation, by a Quondam Disciple*, (London: J. W. Cleaver, 1846).

Alberigo, Giuseppe and Joseph Andrew Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II*, 5 vols., (Leuven: Peeters, 1995-2005).

Allen, Louis, *John Henry Newman and the Abbé Jager: A Controversy on Scripture and Tradition (1834-1836)*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Allen, W., 'Newman's Model of the Church', in Davies, M., ed., *A Thankful Heart and a Discerning Mind: Essays in Honour of John Newton*, (Dursley: Lonely Scribe, 2010).

Allies, Thomas W., *The Church of England Cleared from the Charge of Schism, upon Testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the First Six Centuries*, (London: James Burns, 1846).

Andrewes, Lancelot, *The Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine at Large: Or, A Learned and Pious Exposition of the Ten Commandments*, (London: Roger Norton and George Badger, 1650).

Arnold, Thomas, *Sermons, Preached Mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School, 1835-1840*, New edition 4 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1878).

Artz, Johannes, 'Preface', in Norris, Thomas, *Newman and his Theological Method*, (Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp.xi-xiv.

Aston, Nigel, *Christianity and Revolutionary Europe. c. 1750-1830*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Asveld, Paul, 'Saint Vincent de Lérins dans la discussion entre Newman et l'Abbé Jager' in Lepelley, Claude, and Paul Veyiras, eds., *Newman et l'Histoire: Actes du Colloque 1990 de l'Association Française des Amis de John Henry Newman*, (Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1992), pp.169-188.

Atkinson, Nigel, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, (London: Paternoster Press, 1997).

Avis, Paul D. L., *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1989).

--- *Beyond the Reformation?: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition*, (London: Continuum, 2006).

Baker, William Joseph, *Beyond Port and Prejudice: Charles Lloyd of Oxford 1784-1829*, (Orono: University of Maine at Orono Press, 1981).

Barbeau, Jeffrey W., 'Newman and the Interpretation of Inspired Scripture', in *Theological Studies*, 6 (2002), pp.53-67.

Baring-Gould, Sabine, *The Church Revival: Thoughts thereon and Reminiscences*, (London: Methuen, 1914).

Bebbington, David William, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989).

--- [and Noll, Mark A., and George A. Rawlyk, eds.], *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Bellenger, Dominic Aidan, *The French Exiled Clergy in Great Britain after 1789: A Working List*, (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1986).

Bennett, Gareth Vaughn, *King William III and the Episcopate*, in Bennett, Gareth Vaughn and John D. Walsh, eds., *Essays in Modern Church History in Memory of Norman Sykes*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1966), pp.104-131.

--- 'Patristic Tradition in Anglican Thought 1660-1900', in Gassmann, Günther, and Vilmos Vajta, eds., *Tradition in Luthertum and Anglikanismus: OEcumenica 1971/2*, (Gütersloh, 1972)

Benson, C., *Discourses upon Tradition and Episcopacy*, (London, 1839).

Beveridge, William, *Ecclesia Anglicana Ecclesia Catholica; Or, The Doctrine of the Church of England Consonant to Scripture, Reason and Fathers* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1840).

Biemer, Günter, *Newman on Tradition*, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967).

--- 'Newman's View of Liberalism in Religion: An Historical Introduction to a Relevant Problem' in R. Siebenrock, Roman and Wilhelm Tolksdorf, eds., *Sorgfalt des Denkens: Wege des Glaubens im Spiegel von Bildung und Wissenschaft: Ein Gespräch mit John Henry Newman*, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006), pp.197-213.

Blehl, Vincent Ferrer, *John Henry Newman: A Bibliographical Catalogue of his Writings*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978).

Boekraad, Adrian J., *The Personal Conquest of Truth According to J. H. Newman*, (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1955).

Bokenkotter, Thomas, *Cardinal Newman as an Historian*, (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1959) .

Booty, John, 'Standard Divines', in Sykes, Stephen, John Booty and Jonathan Knight, eds., *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998).

Bossuet, Jacques-Bénigne, *Exposition de la foi catholique*, (Paris: 1671).

--- *Histoire des variations des Églises protestantes*, (Paris: Charpentier, 1844-5).

Bossy, John, *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850*, (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1975).

Bouyer, Louis, *Newman: His Life and Spirituality*, (London: Burns and Oates, 1958).

Bramhall, John, 'Schism Guarded', in Haddan, Arthur West, ed., *The works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall sometime Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of All Ireland: with a life of the author, and a collection of his letters*, 5 vols., (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843).

Bray, Gerald Lewis, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation*, (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 2004).

Breisach, E., *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).

Brose, Olive J., 'The Irish Precedent for English Church Reform: The Church Temporalities Act of 1833', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 7 (1956), pp.204-225.

--- *Church and Parliament: The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828 1860* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959).

Brown, David, ed., *Newman: A Man for Our Time, Centenary Essays*, (London: SPCK, 1990).

Brown, Ralph, 'Victorian Anglican Evangelicalism: The Radical Legacy of Edward Irving' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 75 (2007), pp.675-704.

Brown, Stewart J., *The National Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland 1801 1846*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Brownson, Orestes A., 'Doctrinal Developments', in *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, New Series, 2 (1848), pp.525-539.

--- 'The Mercersburg Hypothesis' in *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, 3rd Series, 2 (1854), pp.253-265.

--- 'Newman's Development of Christian Doctrines' in H. F. Brownson, ed., *The Works of Orestes A. Brownson*, 20 vols., (New York: AMS Press, 1966), vol.xiv, pp.1- 28.

Bull, G., *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae, ex scriptis, quae exstant, Catholicorum Doctorum, qui intra tria prima Ecclesiae Christianae saecula floruerunt. In qua obiter quoque Constantinopolitana Confessio, de Spiritu Sancto, Antiquiorum testimoniis adstritur*, (Oxford: 1685).

Butler, Joseph, *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, 2nd corrected edn., (London: James, John and Paul Knapton, 1736).

Burke, Patrick, *Reinterpreting Rahner: A Critical Study of His Major Themes*, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002).

Butler, J., *The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, (London, 1736).

Butler, Perry, *Gladstone: Church, State and Tractarianism: A Study of his Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809-1859*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Butler, William Archer, *Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine, in Reply to Mr. Newman's Essay*, edited by T. Woodward (Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1850).

Cameron, Euan, *Interpreting Christian History: The Challenge of the Churches' Past*, (Oxford: Blackwells, 2005).

Carlton, Charles, *Archbishop William Laud*, (New York: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1987).

Carpenter, Spencer Cecil, *Church and People, 1789-1889: A History of the Church of England from William Wilberforce to "Lux Mundi"*, (London: SPCK, 1933).

Carr, Thomas K., *Newman and Gadamer: Towards a Hermeneutic of Religious Knowledge*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

Chadwick, Henry, 'Newman's Significance for the Anglican Church', in Brown, David, ed., *Newman: A Man for Our Time, Centenary Essays*, (London: SPCK, 1990), pp.52-74.

--- 'Tradition, Fathers, and Councils', in Sykes *et al.*, eds., *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998), pp.100-115.

Chadwick, Owen, ed., *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957).

--- *From Bossuet to Newman*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957).

--- *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century: The Gifford Lectures in the University of Edinburgh for 1973-4*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

--- *From Bossuet to Newman*, 2nd edn., (London: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

--- 'A Consideration of Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*' in P. Vaiss, ed., *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996).

Chandler, Michael, *An Introduction to the Oxford Movement*, (London: SPCK, 2003).

Chapman, Mark D., 'John Keble, National Apostasy, and the Myths of 14 July', in Blair, K., ed., *John Keble in Context*, (London: Anthem Press, 2004).

--- 'Why Do We Still Recite the Nicene Creed at the Eucharist?', *Anglican Theological Review*, 87 (2005), pp.207-223.

--- *Bishops, Saints and Politics: Anglican Studies*, (London: T. and T. Clark, 2007).

--- 'A Catholicism of the Word and a Catholicism of Devotion: Pusey, Newman and the first *Eirenicon*', *Zeitschrift für neue Theologiegeschichte/Journal for the History of Modern Theology*, 14 (2007), pp.167-190.

--- *Anglican Theology*, (London: Continuum, 2012).

--- 'Temporal and Spatial Catholicism: Tensions in Historicism in the Oxford Movement', in Dickinson, Colby, ed., with the collaboration of Lieven Boeve and Terrence Merrigan, *The Shaping of Tradition: Context and Normativity*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), pp.17-26.

Church, Mary C., and Francis Paget, eds., *Life and Letters of Dean Church*, (London: Macmillan, 1894).

Church, Richard William, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*, (London: Macmillan, 1891).

Churton, Edward, ed., *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, 2 vols., (Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1861)

Clark, Jonathan C. D., *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Coburn, Kathleen, ed., *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, 5 vols., (London: Routledge, 1957-2002).

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *The Friend* edited by Barbara E. Rooke, 2 vols. (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969).

--- *Lay Sermons* edited by R. J. White (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).

--- *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each* edited by John Colmer (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976).

--- *Lectures 1808-1819 on Literature*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2 vols. (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).

--- *Aids to Reflection* edited by John Beer (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1993).

--- *Marginalia* edited by H. J. Jackson and George Whalley, 5 vols. (Princeton: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2000).

Collinson, Patrick, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in England 1559-1625*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Congar, Yves, *A History of Theology*, (New York: Doubleday, 1968).

Conn, Walter E., 'From Oxford to Rome: Newman's Ecclesial Conversion', *Theological Studies*, 68 (2007), pp.595-617.

Connolley, John R., *John Henry Newman: A View of Catholic Faith for the New Millenium*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005).

Cornwell, J., *The Unquiet Grave: the Reluctant Saint*, (London: Continuum, 2012).

Cosin, John, *A Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture*, (London: Roger Norton and Timothy Garthwait, 1658).

Coulson, John, *Newman and the Common Tradition: A Study in the Language of Church and Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

--- *Religion and Imagination: "In Aid of a Grammar of Assent"* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

--- [and Arthur MacDonald (Douglas) Allchin, eds.], *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium*, (London: SPCK, 1967).

Cragg, Gerald Robertson, *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648-1789* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966).

Curran, Kathleen, *The Romanesque Revival: Religion, Politics, and Transnational Exchange*, (State College: Penn State University Press, 2003), pp.179-184.

Daley, Brian, 'Newman and the Alexandrian Tradition', in Merrigan, Terrence, and Ian Turnbull Ker, eds., *Newman and Truth*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2008), pp.147-188.

Daly, Gabriel, in Merrigan, Terrence, and Ian Turnbull Ker, eds., *Newman and the Word*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2000), pp.49-68.

D'Arcy, Eric, 'The New Catechism and Cardinal Newman', in *Communio*, 20 (1993), pp.485-502.

Davenport, Christopher, *Deus, natura, gratia, sive tractatus de praedestinatione*, (Lyon, 1634).

Davies, Julian, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992).

Davis, H. Francis, 'Newman and the Theology of the Living Word', *Newman Studien*, 6 (1964), pp.167-177.

de Achaval, Hugo, 'An Unpublished Paper by Cardinal Newman on the Development of Doctrine', in *Gregorianum*, 34 (1958), pp.585-596.

--- [and J. Derek Holmes], eds., *The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman on Faith and Certainty*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

de Lubac, H., *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, trans. R. Sheed, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1998).

--- *A Brief Catechesis on Nature and Grace*, trans. R. Arnadez, (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1984).

de Maistre, Joseph, *Du Pape*, (Paris: 1819), in *Oeuvres Complètes de J. De Maistre*, (Paris: Vitte, 1928).

De Mattei, Roberto, *Il Concilio Vaticano II. Una storia mai scritta*, (Turin: Lindau, 2010).

Denzinger, Heinrich, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, ed. Hünemann, Peter, Robert Fastiggi and Anne Eglund Nash, 43rd edn., (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2012).

de Sainte-Marthe, D., *Histoire de S. Gregoire le Grand, Pape et Docteur de l'Eglise*, (Rouen, 1697).

Dessain, Charles Stephen, 'An Unpublished Paper by Cardinal Newman on the Development of Doctrine', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 9 (1958), pp.324-335.

--- *John Henry Newman*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

--- [and, variously, Ian Turnbull Ker, Gerard Tracey, Francis J. McGrath et al., eds.], *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, 31 vols., vols. i-vi (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978-1984), vols. vii-x (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995-2006), vols. xi-xxii (London: Thomas Nelson, 1961-1972), vols. xxiii-xxxi (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973-1977).

Dick, Klaus, 'Das Analogieprinzip bei J.H.Newman und seine Quelle in J. Butlers Analogy', in *Newman Studien*, 5 (1962), pp.9-228.

Dockery, John Berchmans, *Christopher Davenport: friar and diplomat*, (London: Burns and Oates, 1960)

Drey, Johann Sebastian von, *Apologetik als wissenschaftliche Nachweisung der Göttlichkeit des Christentums in seiner Erscheinung*, 2nd edn., 3 vols. (Mainz: Florian Kupferberg, 1844).

--- 'Ideen zur Geschichte des katholischen Dogmensystems' in J. R. Geiselman, *Geist des Christentums und des Katholizismus. Ausgewählte Schriften katholischer Theologie im Zeitalter des deutschen Idealismus und der Romantik* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald, 1940), pp.235-331.

--- 'Vom Geist und Wesen Katholizismus' in J. R. Geiselman, *Geist des Christentums und des Katholizismus. Ausgewählte Schriften katholischer Theologie im Zeitalter des deutschen Idealismus und der Romantik* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald, 1940), pp.195-234.

Duffy, Eamon, 'The Reception of Turner's Newman: A Reply to Simon Skinner', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 63 (2012), pp.534-548.

Dulles, Avery, 'The Threefold Office in Newman's Ecclesiology', in Ker, Ian Turnbull and Alan G. Hill, eds., *Newman After a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp.375-399.

--- 'From Images to Truth: Newman on Revelation and Faith', in *Theological Studies*, 51 (1990), pp.262-267.

--- *Newman: The Anatomy of a Conversion*, in Ker, Ian Turnbull, ed., *Newman and Conversion*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1997)

--- *Newman*, (Continuum: London, 2002).

--- 'Vatican II: The Myth and the Reality', *America*, 24 February 2003.

Dupré, Louis K., *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture*, (London: Yale University Press, 2004).

Egan, Philip, 'Lonergan on Newman's Conversion', in *The Heythrop Journal*, 37 (1996), pp.437-455.

Every, George, *The High Church Party 1688-1718*, (London: SPCK., 1956).

Faber, Geoffrey Cust, *Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1933).

Faber, George Stanley, *The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*, 2 vols., (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1832)

Faggioli, Massimo, *Vatican II: the Battle for Meaning*, (Mahwah NJ: Paulist, 2012).

Fergusson, David, ed., *The Blackwell Companion to Nineteenth-Century Theology*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010).

Fergusson, Thomas, 'The Enthralling Power: History and Heresy in John Henry Newman' in *Anglican Theological Review*, 85 (2003), pp.654-659.

Ffoukes, Edward., *A History of the Church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford: the University Church: from Domesday to the Installation of the late Duke of Wellington, Chancellor of the University*, (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1892), pp.381-383.

Foot, Sarah, 'Has Ecclesiastical History Lost the Plot?', in 'I. The Church on Its Past', *Studies in Church History*, 49 (2012) pp.1-25.

Ford, John T., 'Faithfulness to Type in Newman's "Essay on Development"', in Jaki, Stanley L., ed., *Newman Today*, (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989), pp.17-48.

Forster, Charles, ed., *Thirty years correspondence between John Jebb and Alexander Knox*, (London, 1834).

Fothergill, Brian, *Nicholas Wiseman*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1963).

Fuller, Reginald, 'The Classic High Church Reaction to the Tractarians' in Rowell, Geoffrey, ed., *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986), pp.51-63.

Gallagher, Michael Paul, 'Newman: sulla disposizione per la fede', in *Civiltà Cattolica*, 3 March 2001, pp.452-463.

Gherardini, B., *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II: Un discorso da fare*, (Turin: 2009).

--- *Concilio Vaticano II: Il discorso mancato*, (Turin: Lindau, 2011).

Geiselmann, Josef Rupert, *The Meaning of Tradition*, (London: Burns and Oates Ltd., 1966)

Gilley, Sheridan, *Newman and His Age*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990).

Gladstone, William Ewart, *The State in Its Relations with the Church*, (London: John Murray and Hatchard and Son, 1838).

--- *Church Principles Considered in Their Results*, (London: John Murray and Hatchard and Son, 1840).

--- *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, ed. Lathbury, Daniel Connor, 2 vols., (London: John Murray, 1910).

Glover, George, *Remarks on the Bishop of Peterborough's 'Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome'*, (London, 1821).

Greaves, Robert William, 'The Jerusalem Bishopric, 1841, in *The English Historical Review*, 64 (1949), pp.328-352.

Guitton, Jean, *La Philosophie de Newman: Essai sur l'idée de développement*, (Paris: Boivin, 1933).

--- *L'Église et les Laïcs*, (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963).

Gunton, Colin, 'Newman's Dialectic: Dogma, Revelation and Reason in the Seventy-Third Tract for the Times', in Ker, Ian Turnbull and Alan G. Hill, eds., *Newman After a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp.309-322.

Hall, Joseph, 'Bishop Hall's Latin Theology, with Translations', in *The Works of Bishop Hall*, 12 vols., (Oxford: Talboys, 1839).

Hammond, David, 'Imagination and Hermeneutical Theology: Newman's Contribution to Theological Method', in *Downside Review*, 106 (1988), pp.17-34.

Hammond, Jay, 'Interplay of Hermeneutics and Heresy in the Process of Newman's Conversion from 1830-1845', in Parker, Kenneth and Michael J.G.Pahls, eds., *Authority, Dogma, and History: The Role of Oxford Movement Converts on the Papal Infallibility Debates*, (Palo Alto, CA: Academica Press, 2009).

Hanson, Ellis, *Decadence and Catholicism*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).

Hare, Julius Charles, *Charges to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lewes, Delivered at the Ordinary Visitations from the Year 1840 to 1854*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: MacMillan and Company, 1856).

Harper, Gordon Huntingdon, *Cardinal Newman and William Froude FRS: A Correspondence*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933).

Harrison, Benjamin, *Tract 16: Advent; Tract 17: The Ministerial Commission: A Trust from Christ for the Benefit of His People; and Tract 24: The Scripture View of the Apostolical Commission*, all in Newman, John Henry, et al., *Tracts for the Times*, by Members of the University of Oxford, 5 vols. (London and Oxford: J. G., F. and J. Rivington, and J. H. Parker, 1840). vol.1.

Hawkins, Edward, *A Dissertation upon the Use and Importance of Unauthoritative Tradition, as an Introduction to the Christian Doctrines; Including the Substance of a Sermon upon 2 Thess. ii. 15*, (London: J. Parker and F. C. and J. Rivington, 1819).

Hedley, Douglas, 'Participation in the Divine Life: Coleridge, the Vision of God and the Thought of John Henry Newman' in Vaiss, Paul, ed., *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996), pp.238-251.

--- Coleridge, *Philosophy, and Religion: Aids to Reflection and the Mirror of the Spirit*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Herring, George, *What Was the Oxford Movement*, (London: Continuum, 2003).

Hole, Robert, *Pulpits, Politics and Public Order in England, 1760-1832*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Hollingsworth, Arthur George Harpur, *The Folly of Going to Rome for a Religion, in Two Letters to a Friend*, (London: John Hatchard, 1846).

Holmes, J. Derek, ed., *The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman on Faith and Certainty*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

Hooker, Richard, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book 1, chap. xiv, in *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: with an Account of His Life and Death*, arr. Keble, John, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876).

Horne, Brian, 'Church and Nation: Newman and the Tractarians', in *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, 5 (2005), pp.25-40.

Imberg, Rune, *In Quest of Authority: The 'Tracts for the Times' and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-41*, (Lund: Lund University Press, 1987)

Irons, William Josiah, *The Theory of Development Examined: With Reference Specially to Mr. Newman's Essay, and to the Rule of St. Vincent of Lerins*, (London: Francis and John Rivington, 1846).

Israel, Jonathan Irvine, *William III and Toleration*, in O. P. Grell, J. I. Israel, and N. Tyacke, eds., *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp.129-170.

Jager, Jean-Nicholas, *Le Protestantisme aux prises avec la doctrine catholique, ou Controverses avec plusieurs ministres anglicanes, membres de l'Université d'Oxford*, (Paris: Debécourt, 1836)

Jaki, Stanley L., ed., *Newman Today*, (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989), pp.17-48.

--- *Newman's Challenge*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

--- Introduction to *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine [1845]*, (Pickney, MI: Real View Books, 2003).

Jebb, John, *Sermons, on subjects chiefly practical, with illustrative notes and an appendix, relating to the character of the Church of England, as distinguished both from other branches of the Reformation, and from the modern Church of Rome*, 1st edn., (London: Cadell and Davies, 1815), and 3rd edn., (London: Cadell, 1831).

Jelf, Richard William, *Grounds for Laying Before the Council of King's College, London, Certain Statements Contained in a Recent Publication, Entitled, "Theological Essays, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, M. A., Professor of Divinity in King's College"*, 2nd edn., (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1853).

Kater, John L. Jr., "Whose Church Is It Anyway?: Anglican 'Catholicity' Re-Examined", *Anglican Theological Review*, 76 (1994), pp.44-60.

Kaye, John, *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian*, (Cambridge: J. Deighton and Son, 1826).

--- *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1835)

Keaty, Anthony, W., 'Newman's Account of the Real Apprehension of God: The Need for a Subjective Context', *Downside Review*, 114 (1996), pp.1-18.

Keble, John, *The Christian Year*, (London: C. and J. Rivington, 1827)

--- *National Apostasy: Considered in a Sermon Preached in St. Mary's Church, Oxford before His Majesty's Judges of Assize on Sunday July 14th 1833*, intro. Stephenson, Alan, (Abingdon: Rocket Press, 1983).

Ker, Ian Turnbull, 'Newman's Theory: Development or Continuing Revelation', in James D. Bastable, ed., *Newman and Gladstone: Centennial Essays* (Dublin: Veritas, 1978), pp.145-159.

- *John Henry Newman: A Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- *Newman on Being a Christian*, (London: Harper Collins, 1990)
- *Healing the Wound of Humanity*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1993).
- *Newman and the Fullness of Christianity*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1993).
- ed., *Newman and Conversion*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1997).
- *Newman the Theologian: A Reader*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990).
- 'Slow Road to Rome', in *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 December 2002, p32.
- 'Newman, Councils and Vatican II, in Ker, Ian, and Terrence Merrigan ,eds., *Newman and Faith*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2004).
- 'Is *Dignitatis Humanae* a case of Authentic Doctrinal Development?', in *Logos*, 11 (2008), pp.149-157.
- *John Henry Newman: A Biography*, revised edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- [and Alan G. Hill], eds., *Newman After a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- [and Terrence Merrigan ,eds.], *Newman and Faith*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2004).

- King, Benjamin John, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers: Shaping Doctrine in Nineteenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

- Lamb, Matthew and Matthew Levering, eds., *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

- Lash, Nicholas, 'The Notions of 'Implicit' and 'Explicit' Reason in Newman's University Sermons: A Difficulty', in *The Heythrop Journal*, 11 (1970), pp.48-54.
- 'Faith and History: Some Reflections on Newman's "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine"', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 38 (1971), pp.224-241.
- *Change in Focus: A Study in Doctrinal Change and Continuity*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1973).
- *Newman on Development: The Search for an Explanation in History*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1975).
- 'Was Newman a Theologian?', in *The Heythrop Journal*, 17 (1976), pp.322-325

--- 'Tides and Twilight: Newman since Vatican II, in Ker, Ian Turnbull, and Alan G. Hill, eds., *Newman After a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp.447-464.

Lease, Gary, *Witness to the Faith: Cardinal Newman on the Teaching Authority of the Church*, (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971).

Lepappe de Trevern, Jean François Marie, *Discussion amicale sur l'établissement et la doctrine de l'Église anglicane et en général sur la Réformation*, 2 vols., (London: 1817).

Liddon, Henry Parry, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 3 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, 1893-8).

Longley, Charles Thomas, and Richard Davenport, *The brothers' controversy: being a genuine correspondence between a clergyman of the Church of England and a layman of Unitarian opinions: chiefly on the questions how far belief is an act of the will; on the use of reason in the study of the Bible; and how far it is the duty of unlearned Christians to examine or implicitly abide by the religion of their education*, (London: Fellowes, 1836).

Lovegrove, Deryck, *Established Church, Sectarian People: Itinerancy and the Transformation of English Dissent, 1780-1830*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Lowe, Robert, *Observations Suggested by 'A few more words in support of no.90'*, (Oxford: Baxter, 1841).

Lynch, Thomas, ed., 'The Newman-Perrone Paper on Development' *Gregorianum*, 16 (1935), pp.402-447.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, 'Richard Hooker's Reputation', in *The English Historical Review*, 117 (2002), pp.773-812.

--- *Christianity: the First Three Thousand Years*, (London: Penguin, 2009).

Machin, G. Ian T., *The Catholic Question in English Politics 1820 to 1830*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).

Magill, Gerard, ed., *Discourse and Context: An Interdisciplinary Study of John Henry Newman*, (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993).

--- ed., *Personality and Belief: Interdisciplinary Essays on John Henry Newman*, (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995).

Mandle, W. F., 'Newman and His Audiences: 1825-1845', *Journal of Religious History*, 24 (2000), pp.143-158.

Mannion, Gerard, 'History of Vatican II – Edited by Guiseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak', in *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 12 (2010), pp.478-484.

Marchetto, Agostino, *The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: A Counterpoint for the History of the Council*, trans. Kenneth D. Whitehead, (Scranton, PA: University of Scranton Press, 2010).

McCarren, Gerard, *Tests or Notes? A Critical Evaluation of the Criteria for Genuine Doctrinal Development in John Henry Newman's "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine"*, (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1998).

McClelland, V. Alan, ed., *By Whose Authority?: Newman, Manning, and the Magisterium*, (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1996).

McGrath, Francis, *John Henry Newman: Universal Revelation*, (Tunbridge Wells Burns and Oates, 1997).

--- 'John Henry Newman and the Dispensation of Paganism', in *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, 1 (2001), pp.26-42.

Merrigan, Terrence, 'Newman on the Practice of Theology', in *Louvain Studies*, 14 (1989), pp.260-284.

--- *Clear Heads and Holy Hearts: The Religious and Theological Ideal of John Henry Newman*, in *Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs*, 7, (Louvain: Peeters, 1991).

--- 'Newman's Catholic Synthesis', in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 60 (1994), pp.39-48.

--- 'The Anthropology of Conversion: Newman and the Contemporary Theology of Religions', in Ker, Ian Turnbull, ed., *Newman and Conversion* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1997).

--- 'The Image of the Word: Faith and Imagination in John Henry Newman and John Hick' in Merrigan, Terrence and Ian Turnbull Ker, eds., *Newman and the Word*, (Leuven: Peeters Press, 2000).

--- [and Ian Turnbull Ker, eds.], *Newman and the Word*, (Leuven: Peeters Press, 2000).

Middleton, Arthur, *Fathers and Anglicans: The Limits of Orthodoxy*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 2001).

Middleton, Robert Dudley, *Newman at Oxford: His Religious Development*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950).

Milman, Henry Hart, 'Newman on the Development of Christian Doctrine', *The Quarterly Review*, 7 (1846), pp.404-465.

Milner, Joseph *History of the Church of Christ*, 5 vols.(London, 1794).

--- *The end of religious controversy, in a friendly correspondence between a religious society of Protestants and a Roman Catholic divine. Addressed to the bishop of St. David's, in answer to his lordship's Protestant catechism*, (London: Thomas Burgess, 1824).

Misner, Paul, 'Newman's Concept of Revelation and the Development of Doctrine', in *The Heythrop Journal*, 11 (1970), pp32-47.

Moberly, George, *The Proposed Degradation and Declaration, Considered in a Letter Addressed to the Rev. The Master of Balliol College*, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845).

--- *The Sayings of the Great Forty Days, between the Resurrection and Ascension, Regarded as the Outlines of the Kingdom of God: In 5 Sermons. With an Examination of Mr. Newman's Theory of Developments*, (London: Francis and John Rivington, 1846).

Morris, Jeremy, 'Newman and Maurice on the *Via Media* of the Anglican Church: Contrasts and Affinities', in *Anglican Theological Review*, 85 (2003), pp.623-640.

Mozley, Anne, ed., *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church: with a Brief Auto Biography*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1891).

Mozley, James Bowling, *The Theory of Development, a Criticism of Dr. Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, (London: Francis and John Rivington, 1878).

Mozley, Thomas, *Reminiscences Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols., (London: Longman Green and Co, 1882)

Murray, John Courtney, 'The Matter of Religious Freedom', in *America*, 9 January 1965, pp.40-43.

Murray, Placid, Vincent Ferrer Blehl and Francis J. McGrath, eds., *John Henry Newman: Sermons, 1824-1843*, 5.vols., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991-2012), vol.1, ed. Murray; vol.2, ed. Blehl; vol.3, ed. McGrath and Murray; vols.4 and 5, ed. McGrath.

Newman, Francis William, *Phases of Faith; or, Passages from the History of My Creed*, (London: J. Chapman, 1850).

Newsome, David, *The Parting of Friends: A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning*, (London: Murray, 1966).

Nichols, Aidan, *From Newman to Congar: the Idea of Doctrinal Development from the Victorians to the Second Vatican Council*, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1990).

--- 'Littlemore from Lucerne: Newman's Essay on Development in Balthasarian Perspective' in I. Ker, ed., *Newman and Conversion* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1997), pp.100-116.

--- *Catholic Thought Since the Enlightenment: A Survey*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 1998).

Nockles, Peter, 'The Oxford Movement: Historical Background, 1780-1833', in Rowell, Geoffrey, ed., *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), pp.24-50.

--- 'Oxford, Tract 90 and the Bishops', in Nicholls, David, and Fergus Kerr, eds., *John Henry Newman: Reason, Rhetoric and Romanticism*, (Bristol: Bristol Press, 1991), pp.28-87.

--- 'Church Parties in the Pre-Tractarian Church of England 1750-1833: The 'Orthodox'—Some Problems of Definition and Identity', in Haydon, Colin, Stephen Taylor, and John Walsh, eds., *The Church of England, c.1689-c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp.334-359.

--- *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship 1760- 1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

--- 'Church and King: Tractarian Politics Reappraised', in Vaiss, Paul, ed., *Newman: From Oxford to the People. Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996), pp.93-123.

--- 'The Waning of Protestant Unity and Waxing of Anti-Catholicism? - Archdeacon Daubeney and the Reconstruction of "Anglican" Identity in the Late Georgian Church, c.1780-c.1830', in Gibson William and Robert G. Ingram, eds., *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp.179-229.

Norman, Edward R., *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).

Norris, Thomas, *Newman and his Theological Method*, (Leiden: Brill, 1977)

--- 'The Development of Doctrine: A Remarkable Philosophical Phenomenon', in *Communio*, 22 (1995), pp.470-487.

--- *Only Life Gives Life: Revelation Theology and Christian Living according to Cardinal Newman*, (Dublin: Columba Press, 1996).

--- 'Newman's Approach to the Act of Faith in the Light of the Catholic Dogmatic Tradition', in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 69 (2004), pp.239-261.

Oberman, H., *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1992).

O'Collins, Gerald, 'Newman's Seven Notes: The Case of the Resurrection', in O'Collins, Gerald, and Daniel Kendall, eds., *Focus on Jesus: Essays in Christology and Soteriology*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996), pp.135-148.

O'Donovan, Oliver, *On the Thirty Nine Articles: A Conversation with Tudor Christianity*, (London: SCM Press, 2011).

O'Leary, Joseph S., 'Impeded Vision: Newman against Luther on Justification' in Nicholls, David and Fergus Kerr, eds., *John Henry Newman: Reason, Rhetoric and Romanticism*, (Bristol: Bristol, 1991), pp.53- 193.

O'Malley, John, Joseph Andrew Komonchak, Stephen Schloesser, Neil Ormerod and David Schultenover, *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?*, (London: Continuum, 2007).

Ormerod, Neil J., "'The Times They Are A 'Changin'': A Response to O'Malley and Schoessler', in *Theological Studies*, 67 (2006), pp.834-855

Palmer, William Patrick, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ: Designed Chiefly for the Use of Students in Theology*, 2 vols., (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1838)

--- *A Narrative of Events Connected with the Publication of the Tracts*, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843).

Pattison, Mark, 'Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750' in Parker, John William, ed., *Essays and Reviews*, (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860), pp.254-329.

Pattison, Robert, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and Liberal Heresy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Peel, Robert, *Sir Robert Peel's Address on the Establishment of a Reading Room at Tamworth, on the 19th of January, 1841*, (London: Henry Hooper, 1841).

--- *An Inaugural Address Delivered by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., M. P., President of the Tamworth Library and Reading Room, on Tuesday, 19th January, 1841*, 2nd edn., revised and corrected, (London: James Bain, 1841).

Pelikan, Jaroslav, *Development of Doctrine: Some Historical Prolegomena*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).

Perceval, Arthur Philip, *An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession: with an Appendix on the English Orders*, (London: J.G.F. and J. Rivington, 1839).

--- *Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833*, (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1842).

Pereiro, James, 'S. F. Wood and an Early Theory of Development in the Oxford Movement' *Recusant History*, 20 (1991), pp.524-552.

--- *'Ethos' and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Petavius, D, *Opus de Doctrina Temporum: Auctius in Hac Nova Editione Notis & Emendationibus Quamplurimis, Quas Manu Sua Codici Adscripserat Dionysius Petavius*, (Paris: Lutet, 1627).

Peterburs, Michael, 'Newman and the Development of Doctrine', in V. Allen McClelland, ed., *By Whose Authority: Newman, Manning and the Magisterium*, (Bath: Downside Abbey Press, 1996), pp.49-78.

Peterson, Linda H., 'Newman's *Apologia pro vita sua* and the Traditions of the English Spiritual Autobiography', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, 100 (1985), pp.300-314.

Phillips, Peter, 'Newman, Vatican II and the Triple Office', in *New Blackfriars*, 94 (2013), pp.97-112.

Pope Benedict XVI, *Ad Romanam Curia ob omnia natalicia*, 22 December 2005, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 98 (2006), (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 2006), pp.40-53.

Pope Paul VI, 'Declaratio de Libertate Religiosa', in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 58 (1966), (Rome: Typis Vaticanis Polyglotis, 1966), pp.929-941.

Prothero, Rowland Edmund and George Granville Bradley, *The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley DD, late Dean of Westminster*, 2 vols., (London: John Murray, 1893).

Pusey, Edward Bouverie, 'Notice of "Discourses upon Tradition and Episcopacy", by Christopher Benson', in *British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, 26 (1839), pp.508f.

Quantain, Jean-Louis, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Rahner, Karl, 'The Position of Christology in the Church between Exegesis and Dogmatics', in Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 11, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1974), pp.185-214.

--- 'The Historicity of Theology: The Teaching Office of the Church in the Present-Day Crisis of Authority', in Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 12, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1974), pp.3-30.

--- 'Basic Observations on the Subject of Changeable and Unchangeable Factors in the Church', in Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 14, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1976), pp.3-23.

--- ‘Yesterday’s History of Dogma and Theology for Tomorrow’, in Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 18, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1983), pp.3-34.

--- ‘Magisterium and Theology’, in Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 18, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1983), pp.54-73.

--- ‘On the Situation of Faith’, in Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 20, (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1981), pp.13-32.

Ramsey, Michael, *Anglican Spirit*, (New York: Church Publishing, 2004).

Ratzinger, J., *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2009).

Rickaby, Joseph, *An Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914).

Rogers, Frederic, *A Short Appeal to Members of Convocation upon the Proposed Censure of No. 90*, (London: James Burns, 1845).

Ronheimer, M., ‘Benedict XVI’s “Hermeneutic of Reform” and Religious Freedom’, in *Nova et Vetera*, 9 (2011), pp.1029-1054.

Rose, Hugh James, ‘Notices and Reviews: The Arians of the Fourth century, their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct’, in *British Magazine*, 5 (1834), pp.67f.

Rosman, Doreen, *The Evolution of the English Churches, 1500-2000*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Rule, Philip, *Coleridge and Newman: The Centrality of Conscience* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004).

Schiefen, Richard J., *Nicholas Wiseman and the Transformation of English Catholicism*, (Shepherdstown, WV: Patmos Press, 1984).

Schmaus, M., *Dogma 1: God in Revelation*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968).

Selby, Robin, *The Principle of Reserve in the Writings of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Shairp, John Campbell, *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1868).

Shea, C. Michael, ‘Newman, Perrone, and Möhler on Dogma and History: A Reappraisal of the “Newman-Perrone Paper on Development”’, in *Newman Studies Journal*, 7 (2010), pp.45-55.

Sheridan, Thomas, *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography*, (New York: Alba House, 1967).

Sidenvall, Erik, 'Dealing with Development: The Protestant Reviews of John Henry Newman's *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 1845-7', in *Studies in Church History*, 38 (2004), pp. 357-364.

--- *After Anti-Catholicism: John Henry Newman and Protestant Britain, 1845- c.1890* (New York: T. and T. Clark, 2005).

Sillem, Edward, ed., *The Philosophical Notebook of John Henry Newman*, 2 vols., (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1969-1970).

Skinner, Simon, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004).

--- 'History versus Hagiography: The Reception of Turner's *Newman*', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (2010), pp.764-781.

--- 'A Response to Eamon Duffy', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 63 (2012), pp.549-567.

Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn, ed., *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late Head Master of Rugby School and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford*, 2 vols., (London: Fellowes, 1844).

Stern, Jean, *Bible et tradition chez Newman: Aux origines de la théorie du développement*, (Lyons: Éditions Aubier-Montaigne, 1967).

Strachey, L., *Eminent Victorians : Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale, Dr. Arnold, General Gordon*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1918).

Sullivan, Francis, 'Newman on Infallibility' in I. Ker and A. G. Hill, eds., *Newman After a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp.419-446.

Sumner, John Bird, *Apostolical Preaching considered in an Examination of St Paul's Epistles*, (London: John Hatchard, 1815).

--- *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester, at the Triennial Visitation in 1838*, (London: John Hatchard, 1838).

Sweeney, James, 'How Should We Remember Vatican II', *New Blackfriars*, 90 (2009), pp.251-260.

Sykes, Stephen, *The Identity of Christianity*, (London: SPCK 1984).

--- [and John Booty and Jonathan Knight], eds., *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998).

Tagle, Luis, 'The "Black Week" of Vatican II (November 14-21, 1964)', in Alberigo, Giuseppe and Joseph Andrew Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II: Volume IV – Church as Communion, Third Period and Intersession, September 1964 –September 1965*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), pp.387-452.

Tait, Archibald Campbell, *A Letter to the Rev. the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, on the Measures Intended to be Proposed to Convocation on the 13th of February, in Connexion with the Case of the Rev. W. G. Ward*, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1845).

Tanner, Norman, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1990).

Taylor, Jeremy, *Of the Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy*, (Oxford, 1642).

Tennyson, G.B., *Victorian Devotional Poetry: The Tractarian Mode*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981).

Thiel, John E., 'The Analogy of Tradition: Method and Theological Judgment' *Theological Studies*, 66 (2005), pp.358-380.

Thirwall, Connop, *A Charge, Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's*, (London: J. F. and G. Rivington, 1848).

Thiselton, Anthony C., *The Hermeneutics of Doctrine*, (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007).

Thomas, Stephen, *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Trevor, Meriol, *Newman: The Pillar of the Cloud*, (London: Macmillan, 1962).

Tristram, Henry, 'In the lists with the Abbé Jager', in *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays*, (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1945), pp.201-222.

Turner, Frank Miller, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

Vaiss, Paul, *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, (Leominster: Gracewing, 1996).

Vincent of Lerins, 'Commonitorium', 3.4, in *Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953-), vol.64.

Walgrave, Jan-Hendrik, *Newman: Le Développement du dogme*, (Tournai: Casterman, 1957).

--- *Newman the Theologian: The Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works*, trans. Littledale, A.V., (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1960).

--- *Unfolding Revelation: The Nature of Doctrinal Development*, (London: Hutchinson, 1972).

Ward, Maisie, *Young Mr. Newman*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1948).

Ward, Wilfrid Philip, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1897).

--- *Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman based on his Private Journals and Correspondence*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1912).

--- *Last Lectures of Wilfrid Ward being the Lowell Lectures, 1914 and Three Lectures Delivered at the Royal Institution, 1915*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1918).

Ward, William George, *The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with existing practice: containing a defence of certain articles in the British --- Critic in reply to remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's 'Narrative'*, (London: James Toovey, 1844)

--- *An Address to Members of Convocation in Protest Against the Proposed Statute*, (London: James Toovey, 1845).

Watkin, Edward Ingram, *Roman Catholicism in England: From the Reformation to 1950*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1957).

Whately, Richard, *Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian*, (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1826).

Whitaker, William, *Disputatio de sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis papistas, inprimis Robertum Bellarminum Iesuitam ... pontificium in collegio Romano, & Thomam Stapletonum regium in Schola Duacena controversiarum professorem: Sex quæstionibus proposita et tractata*, (Cambridge: Ex officina Thomæ Thomasii, florentissimæ Cantabrigiæ Academiae Typographi, 1588)

Wilberforce, Henry, 'F.Newman's Oxford Parochial Sermons', in *Dublin Review*, n.s., 12 (1869), pp.309-330.

Wilberforce, Samuel, *A Charge, Delivered to the Candidates for Ordination; and a Sermon, Preached at the General Ordination, in the Cathedral Church of Christ, Oxford, December 21, 1845*, (London: Francis and John Rivington, 1846).

Williams, Rowan, 'Newman's Arians and the Question of Method in Doctrinal History' in Ian Ker and Alan G. Hill, eds., *Newman After a Hundred Years*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 263-285.

--- ed., 'Introduction', in John Henry Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century, Their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct, Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church, between A.D. 325 and A.D. 381*, (Millennium Edition, Gracewing: Leominster 2001)

Wilson, James Matthew, 'Doctrinal Development and the Demons of History: The Historiography of John Henry Newman', in *Religion and the Arts*, 10 (2006), pp.497-523.

Winstanley, Denys Arthur, *Unreformed Cambridge*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935).

Wiseman, Nicholas, *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, 2 vols., (London: 1836).

--- 'Tracts for the Times: Anglican Claim of Apostolical Succession', in *Dublin Review*, 4 (1838), pp.307-335.

--- 'Tracts for the Times: Anglican Claim of Apostolical Succession', in *Dublin Review*, 5 (1838), pp.285-309.

--- 'Tracts for the Times: Anglican Claim of Apostolical Succession', in *Dublin Review*, 7 (1839), pp.139-180.

Wix, Samuel, *Reflections concerning the expediency of a council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a view to accommodate religious differences [&c.]*, (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1818).

Woodruff, Douglas, 'Newman and the Modern Age' in *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays*, (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1945), pp.55-67.

Unpublished Dissertations

Christie, Robert, 'The Logic of Conversion: The Harmony of Heart, Will, Mind and Imagination in John Henry Newman', (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1997).

Coulson, John, 'Newman's Idea of the Church and Its Kinship with Similar Ideas in Coleridge and F. D. Maurice', (unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford, 1968).

Dietz, K., 'John Henry Newman and the Fathers of the Church: the Birth of an Ecclesiology', (unpublished S.T.D. dissertation, Pontifical University of St Thomas, Rome, 2007).

Earnest, James David, 'A Study of John Henry Newman's Oxford University Sermons', (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1978).

Egan, Philip Anthony, 'Newman, Lonergan and Doctrinal Development', (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Birmingham University, 2004).

Henry, Lawrence Joseph, 'Newman and Development: The Genesis of John Henry Newman's Theory of Development and the Reception of His Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine', (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1973).

Komonchak, Joseph Andrew, 'John Henry Newman's Discovery of the Visible Church, 1816 to 1828', (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1976).

Linnan, John E., 'The Evangelical Background of John Henry Newman, 1816-1826', 2 vols., (unpublished S.Th.D. dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1965).

McCormack, Edward, 'The Development of John Henry Newman's View of the Christian Life in his Anglican Sources', (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 2001).

Mazich, Edward, 'Ideas and Authority: F.D. Maurice's Critique of John Henry Newman's "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine"', (unpublished D.Phil. Dissertation, Oxford University, 2009).

Miller, Jeremy Edward, 'The Idea of the Church in the Correspondence of John Henry Newman', 2 vols., (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Université Catholique de Louvain, 1975).

Sylva, Jo Anne Cammarata, 'The Italians and the English Cardinal: Italian Exemplars and the Handing Down of Tradition in the Life of John Henry Newman', (unpublished D.Litt. dissertation, Drew University, 2006).

Online Sources

Articles etc.

Foot, Sarah, 'Thinking with Christians: Doing Ecclesiastical History in a Secular Age', <<http://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/thinking-christians-doing-ecclesiastical-history-secular-age-audio>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, 'A Different Cloth – Newman's Unquiet Grave: The Reluctant Saint by John Cornwell', a review for *Literary Review*, (June 2010), at <http://www.literaryreview.co.uk/macculloch_06_10.html>, [accessed 16 September 2013]

Pink. T., 'What is the Catholic Doctrine of Religious Liberty', at <http://www.academia.edu/639061/What_is_the_Catholic_doctrine_of_religious_liberty>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

--- 'The Interpretation of *Dignitatis Humanae*: A Response to Martin Ronheimer', at <http://www.academia.edu/2911284/The_Interpretation_of_Dignitatis_Humanae_A_Response_to_Martin_Rhonheimer>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

Pope John Paul II, 'Letter to Archbishop Vincent Nichols on the occasion of the 2nd Centenary of the Birth of Cardinal John Henry Newman', at <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/letters/2001/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_20010227_john-henry-newman_en.html>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

Online Reference works

Catholic Hierarchy, at <<http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/blpdt.html>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].

Oxford English Dictionary Online, at <<http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2277/>>, [accessed 16 September 2013].