

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

The Trinitarian Theology of John Henry Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*:  
1833-1843

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
School of Theology of Religious Studies  
Of The Catholic University of America  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

©

Copyright

All Rights Reserved

Vinh Bao Luu-Quang

Washington, D.C.

2010

The Trinitarian Theology of John Henry Newman's  
*Parochial and Plain Sermons*: 1833-1843

Vinh Bao Luu-Quang, Ph.D.

Director: John T. Ford, S.T.D.

John Henry Cardinal Newman (1801-1890) is well known for his *Parochial and Plains Sermons*, which were delivered between 1828 and 1843; these sermons have usually been treated as resources for spirituality, while their theological content has rarely been analyzed, even though these sermons have a noteworthy theological basis. In particular, although Newman never wrote a treatise specifically discussing the Trinity, he frequently preached on the Trinity during his Anglican years in a way that was scriptural, theological, and pastoral.

Newman was also one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement, which was launched in order to promote the renewal of the Church of England and so “withstand the Liberalism of the day.” During the decade of Newman’s involvement in the Oxford Movement (1833-43), when Tractarian theology seemed to be gaining widespread acceptance among Anglicans, Newman’s first principle was dogma and the defense of “fundamental doctrines”—particularly the doctrine of the Trinity.

This dissertation examines Newman’s Trinitarian theology in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons* during the first decade of the Oxford Movement (1833 to 1843) in relation to his personal theological development. His Trinitarian sermons are treated in chronological order according to the three periods (1833-34; 1835-38; 1839-43) of his involvement in the Oxford Movement. This dissertation provides a detailed examination of his treatment of both the Trinity as a whole and the divine Persons in particular. In addition, this dissertation shows a

dialectic between Newman's Trinitarian theology and his experience in the Oxford Movement, as evidenced in his *Letters and Diaries* and other published works. Finally, this dissertation shows that Newman's Trinitarian sermons not only extensively employed biblical theology and patristic thought, but also were an integral part of Newman's repudiation of "the Liberalism of the day."

In sum, this dissertation provides a systematic chronological view of Newman's Trinitarian theology during his years as a leader of the Oxford Movement, as well as a better understanding of the importance of Tractarian theology in the Oxford Movement's attempted renewal of the Church of England.

This dissertation by Vinh Bao Luu-Quang fulfills the dissertation requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Theology and is approved by John T. Ford, S.T.D., Director, and Paul McPartlan, D. Phil., and William P. Loewe, Ph.D., readers.

---

John T. Ford, S.T.D., Director

---

Paul McPartlan, D. Phil., Reader

---

William P. Loewe, Ph.D., Reader

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
--------------------	---

### CHAPTER I:

#### NEWMAN: A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF HIS ANGLICAN YEARS (1801-1845)

1. "First Conversion" .....	8
2. Student Years at Oxford .....	11
3. Fellow of Oriel .....	15
4. Preacher at Saint Mary's .....	21
5. The Oxford Movement .....	28
6. Tract Ninety and the Conversion .....	35
Preview .....	44

### CHAPTER II:

#### THE FIRST PERIOD: 1833 – 1834 - THE IMMANENT LIFE OF THE HOLY TRINITY AND AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION

##### I. From 1829 to 1833

1. The Mystery of the Holy Trinity and Knowledge through Grace .....	47
2. The Immanent Life of the Holy Trinity .....	52

##### II. From 1833 to 1834

1. Against Rationalism – Faith in the Holy Trinity .....	65
--	----

2. A Pneumatological Introduction to the Economy of Salvation . . . . .	72
3. A Christological Introduction to the Economy of Salvation . . . . .	83
Conclusion . . . . .	101
CHAPTER III:	
THE SECOND PERIOD: 1835 – 1838	
THE HOLY TRINITY IN THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION	
I. From 1835 to 1836	
1. The Incarnation and the Atonement in the Gracious Economy. . . . .	104
2. The Passion – Theology of Glorification . . . . .	119
3 A Defense of the Humanity and Divinity of Christ . . . . .	132
4. The Economic Trinity <i>is</i> the Immanent Trinity. . . . .	138
5. The Eucharist – The Sacrament of Glory . . . . .	144
II. From 1837 to 1838	
1. “ <i>His Spirit</i> ” in the Church – Communion and Governing Soul . . . . .	151
2. The Visible and Invisible Church and the Salvation of the World . . . . .	156
3. Economic Anthropology – From “State of Nature” to “State of Salvation” . . . . .	165
Conclusion . . . . .	175

CHAPTER IV:  
THE THIRD PERIOD: 1839 – 1843  
A TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY OF “REST AND PEACE”

I. From 1839 to 1840	
1. Incarnation and Sanctification – A Theology of Within-ness . . . . .	180
2. Deification – Partakers of God’s Rest and Peace . . . . .	191
3. God and the Soul . . . . .	195
4. Was Newman a Mystic? . . . . .	200
II. From 1841 to 1843	
The Cross – Peace and Love . . . . .	208
Conclusion . . . . .	215

CHAPTER V:  
THE CONTEXT OF NEWMAN’S TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY  
IN *THE PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS*: 1833 – 1843

I. The First Period: From 1833 to 1834 . . . . .	227
1. The Birth of the Oxford Movement . . . . .	228
2. The Context of Newman’s Trinitarian Theology in the First Period . . . . .	233
II. The Second Period: From 1835 to 1838 . . . . .	256
1. Years 1835 and 1836 . . . . .	256
a. Gilbert Burnet and John Tillotson . . . . .	258
b. Renn Dickson Hampden and Blanco White . . . . .	264

c. Newman's Trinitarian Theology as a Response to Liberalism . . . . .	269
2. Years 1837 and 1838. . . . .	278
a. Rationalism – Anti-Doctrines or Anti-Creeds in the Church of England . . .	278
b. Calvinism and Evangelicalism – Invisible and Visible Church . . . . .	285
III. The Third Period: From 1839 to 1843 . . . . .	299
1. Justification and Sanctification . . . . .	299
2. Journey to the Roman Catholic Church . . . . .	314
Conclusion . . . . .	324

CHAPTER VI:  
CONCLUSION: NEWMAN'S TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY  
IN HIS *PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS*: 1833-1843

1. An Overview of Newman's Trinitarian Theology . . . . .	328
2. Newman's Methodology and Terminology . . . . .	342
3. Newman and Modern Trinitarian Theology . . . . .	353
4. Newman and Ecumenical Dialogue . . . . .	363
5. Contribution of the Study . . . . .	374
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	378



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank many people without whose assistance, support and prayer this dissertation would not have been completed. First of all, I am most indebted to the guidance of Rev. John T. Ford, S.T.D., my director, who has spent considerable time in helping me from the very first stage of this dissertation to its completion. I am deeply grateful for everything he has done for me. I would also like to express my profound gratitude to my two readers, Msgr. Paul McPartlan, D. Phil. and Dr. William P. Loewe, Ph.D., whose wide knowledge of the subject matter and many beneficial suggestions have helped me to produce a more careful study of Newman's Trinitarian theology.

In addition, I am indebted to the National Institute for Newman Studies, particularly Rev. Drew Morgan, the director of the Institute, Mr. Damon G. McGraw, Mr. Monty Crivella and Ms. Jan Grice. Their assistance, support, and generosity, during my fellowship at the Institute in the summer of 2009, have proved a tremendous asset to my research.

I also want to express my sincerest thanks to the Baltimore Province of the Redemptorists, especially Very Rev. Patrick Woods, the Provincial, and the former Provincials Very Rev. George Keaveney and Very Rev. Kevin Moley, and the rectors and confrères with whom I have lived and prayed. Their concern, support and affection have helped me during my years of study in the United States. I am particularly grateful for the scholarship provided by the Baltimore Province, which has afforded me this precious opportunity of study. My special appreciation is also conveyed to my Provincial Very Rev. Vincent Pham Trung Thanh, and the former Provincials Very Rev. Joseph Cao Dinh Tri and

Very Rev. Thomas Pham Huy Lam, and all superiors and confrères in Viet Nam for their encouragement and prayers for me.

Finally, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my mother and father, as well as to my godparents, relatives and friends, whose love and concern are profoundly felt. Without their love and prayers, I could not complete my study. They have been a constant source of support and joy for me. I will always remember them in my heart.

## INTRODUCTION

One hundred and ninety-one of the *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, which were delivered by John Henry Newman between 1828 and 1843, were published in eight volumes.<sup>1</sup> The publishing house of Rivington, in *A Classified Catalogue of Books*, stated that “these sermons are, of course, masterly” and eulogized: “To praise the noble language of Dr. Newman, an acknowledged master of English, would be superfluous; and these sermons, composed in the vigour of his years, are marked with the rarest grandeur and breadth of thought, and can be read with profit and pleasure by all, the religious for their profound piety, and by the students of English for their purity of diction.”<sup>2</sup> From the perspective of a British theologian and biblical scholar, Dr. William Sanday (1843-1920), sometime Dean Ireland’s Professor of Exegesis of Holy Scripture at Oxford (1883-1895), described the *Parochial and Plain Sermons*: “Their influence has sunk deep, and of all the agencies which have gone to make the English Church what it is, I doubt if there is any which has been so powerful.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of Newman’s sermons were originally published in his six volumes of *Parochial Sermons* and in the Tractarian series *Plain Sermons*. Later Newman selected and republished these sermons in the eight-volume series *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. The arrangement of the sermons in these volumes did not follow a chronological order. All eight volumes are available at <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/index.html>; hereafter references to Newman will be abbreviated: JHN. See Gerard Tracy, “Preface,” *John Henry Newman, Sermons 1824-1843*, vol. I. Placid Murray, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), v.

<sup>2</sup> Messrs. Rivington, *A Classified Catalogue of Books* (London: Rivington, April 1880), 53.

<sup>3</sup> Edwin A. Abbot, *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*, vol. II (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892), 480.

Newman's sister Jemima expressed the appreciative reaction typical of many listeners: "It makes deep things so very simple."<sup>4</sup>

Although Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* were widely read—as evidenced by the fact that multiple editions were published during his lifetime—his sermons have usually been treated as resources for spirituality, while their theological content has rarely been analyzed. Yet the topics that Newman discussed in these sermons are central to Christian doctrine: the Trinity; the Incarnation; the sufferings and resurrection of Christ; the indwelling and gifts of the Holy Spirit; the Church; grace; the immortality of the soul; sin and the world; faith, hope and love; revelation; providence; prayer; etc. In effect, Newman's sermons presented the theological basis of the Oxford Movement as grounded in biblical and patristic resources and Anglican theology, as well as his personal insights and pastoral experience.

The decade of Newman's involvement in the Oxford Movement (1833-43) was marked by various phases: an early and almost euphoric phase (1833-34) in which the call for Church reform attracted considerable attention; the "golden years" when Tractarian ideas and ideals seemed to be gaining widespread acceptance (1835-38); and the crisis years (1839-43), which were a prelude to Newman's entrance into the Roman Catholic Church.

Although Newman never wrote a book specifically treating the Trinity, as an Anglican, he frequently preached on the Trinity. This dissertation examines Newman's Trinitarian theology in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, particularly at the time of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Anna Mozley, ed., *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*, vol. II (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1970), 367; hereafter cited Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*. There are two volumes.

Oxford Movement from 1833 to 1843, in order to ascertain: first, the Trinitarian theology of these sermons in relation to his personal theological development; and, second, whether there was a dialectic between Newman's Trinitarian theology and his experience during the Oxford Movement (1833-1843) within the Church of England. Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, as Samuel Hall commented, "are clear and emphatic, but without exaggeration in their recognitions of the actual facts of life, and their stern denunciation of the religion of the day with its laxity and easiness and general concurrence with the tendencies of modern civilisation."<sup>5</sup> This dissertation examines how Newman formed and developed his Trinitarian theology over against the "anti-dogmatic tendency of the time"<sup>6</sup> within the context of "the triumph of Liberalism in England."<sup>7</sup>

Chapter One gives a brief biographical study of Newman's Anglican years (1801-1845) and his role in the Oxford Movement as reflected in his writings. Chapters Two, Three

---

<sup>5</sup> Samuel Hall, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1906), 83.

<sup>6</sup> Kenneth L. Parker and Michael J. G. Pahls, eds., *Authority, Dogma, and History* (Bethesda: Academica Press, 2009), 68.

<sup>7</sup> Verlyn Klinkenborg, Herbert Cahoon, *British Literary Manuscripts: 1880-1914* (London: Courier Dover Publications, 1981), 45. The word "liberalism" came into common use in English in the early part of the nineteenth century and, during the course of the century, acquired a variety of meanings in different areas: economics, philosophy, politics, religion, science, theology, etc. In accord with Newman's practice, as well as to indicate the specific form of liberalism with which Newman took issue, Liberalism will ordinarily be capitalized except in those instances where liberalism in general is meant. See for example, Mark S. Burrows, "A Historical Reconsideration of Newman and Liberalism: Newman and Mivart on Science and the Church," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987): 399-419; J. M. Cameron, "Newman and the Empirist Tradition," in *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium*, John Coulson and A. M. Allchin, eds. (London-Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1967), 76-91; John F. Crosby, "Newman's Witness against the Spirit of Liberalism in Religion" in *John Henry Newman, Theologian and Cardinal*, Studia Urbaniana 10 (Rome/Brescia: Urbaniana University Press/Paideia, 1981), 99-125; T. S. Gregory, "Newman and Liberalism," in *A Tribute to Newman: Essays on Aspects of His Life and Thought*, Michael Tierney, ed. (Dublin-Belfast-Cork: Browne and Nolan, 1945), 84-115.

and Four provide a detailed examination of the contents of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* which treated the Trinity as a whole and the divine persons in particular. His Trinitarian sermons are treated in chronological order in relation to the three periods (1833-34; 1835-38; 1839-43) of Newman's involvement in the Oxford Movement. Chapter Five examines the context of Newman's sermons, by focusing on the events of his life within the context of the Church of England as manifested in his *Letters and Diaries* and other published works. This chapter seeks to answer the question as to what motivated and stimulated Newman, through his sermons, to form and develop his Trinitarian theology.

The concluding chapter summarizes Newman's Trinitarian theology as presented in the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* in the light of his personal experiences and the context of his life during the first decade of the Oxford Movement. In addition, it also provides some suggestions for today's Trinitarian theology and ecumenical dialogue.

The research for this dissertation utilized many nineteenth century materials, that are available in Pittsburgh at the National Institute for Newman Studies [NINS], whose library has copies of many pertinent works, both on the shelves and in digital form; these holdings provide the evidence for this dissertation's conclusion that Newman's Trinitarian sermons were not only doctrinal homiletics, but also controversial pieces directed against his opponents, such as Whately, Blanco White, et alii.<sup>8</sup>

Nonetheless, there are quite a few problems in using such nineteenth century materials: authorship is not always clear, e.g., the author might be self-described as a "Fellow

---

<sup>8</sup> The author of this dissertation wants to take this opportunity to express his appreciation to the National Institute for Newman Studies for providing a fellowship during summer 2009 that enabled him to benefit from the abundant resources available in its library.

of Oriel College” or use a Latin name (“Catholicus”) or a Greek letter—Newman signed his poems in *Lyra Apostolica* as “delta”; e.g., there is still some debate about which of the early unsigned *Tracts for the Times* were written by Newman. In addition, publication was often an author’s personal capitalistic venture, so that not all publication details can be easily retrieved. NINS is in the process of obtaining copies of all the editions of Newman’s writings that were published during his lifetime—not an easy task—since publishers often printed small orders and authors sometimes changed the text between printings; as a result, a text may be labeled the second edition, but there may be variants between different printings of an edition.

In regard to recent literature on Newman, there is an overwhelming amount; however, there are very few studies about Newman’s views on the Trinity. There are a number of reasons for this: first, Newman never wrote a treatise on the Trinity; second, Newman’s sermons only recently have been recognized as theological sources; and, perhaps most puzzling of all, Newman’s sermons have not usually been seen in the overall context of the Oxford Movement, but merely as “pastoral responsibilities” or “spiritual reflections.”

**CHAPTER I:**  
**NEWMAN: A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL STUDY**  
**OF HIS ANGLICAN YEARS (1801-1845)**

Born on February 21, 1801, in London, England, John Henry Newman was the eldest son of a middle-class family with six children – three boys and three girls.<sup>9</sup> His father was a banker and a member of the Church of England. His mother was the descendent of a French Protestant family. Newman was baptized at the Church of St. Benet Fink on April 9, 1801.<sup>10</sup> Educated in a pious family, he was taught his duties toward God and trained to obey God’s Commandments.<sup>11</sup> Perhaps this family education influenced his later sermons, where he often emphasized the significance of obedience and duties toward God. One person who had significant influence on his inner life was his grandmother—whom he later called his “earliest benefactor.”<sup>12</sup> On August 17, 1825, he wrote to his aunt: “That we are living together in peace, harmony and affection, and that we have (as I trust we have) the fear of God before our eyes, is under God owing to my dear grandmother and yourself.”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Charles Frederick Harrold, *John Henry Newman: An Expository and Critical Study of His Mind, Thought and Art* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1966), 2; hereafter cited: Harrold, *Newman*.

<sup>10</sup> Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Newman* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912), 27; hereafter cited: Ward, *Life of JHN*.

<sup>11</sup> Zeno Capuchin, *John Henry Newman: His Inner Life* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987), 10.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>13</sup> JHN to Elizabeth Newman (Oriel College, 17 August 1825), Ian Ker and Thomas Gornal, eds., *The Letters and Dairies of John Henry Newman*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 251-252, at 251; hereafter cited: *LD*.



Newman was also decisively influenced by his mother, a deeply religious woman, who had a genuine trust in God's Providence and a steadfast hope in time of trials. She wrote him on August 30, 1822: "I can only repeat, that, in the midst of so many and great troubles, I have ever had so many blessings to be thankful for, that I have even at the worst been full of hope."<sup>14</sup> Newman seemingly learned this virtue from his mother—a virtue that later became a source of strength during crises, such as the debate that ensued after his publication of *Tract 90*. The need for hope and trust was also emphasized in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*.

Newman went to school at Ealing—at that time a village west of London. At the age of five, Newman was able to read letters from his father. By age eleven, he was considered "a very philosophical young gentleman" and "very observant and considerate."<sup>15</sup> At Ealing School, he started a club and a school magazine based on Addison's *Spectator: The Spy* and a rival paper: *The Anti-Spy*.<sup>16</sup> He founded a secret society with some of his friends.<sup>17</sup> As a youth of fourteen, Newman began to read Thomas Paine's *Tracts against the Old Testament* and enjoyed the author's arguments.<sup>18</sup> He also read Hume's *Essays* and Voltaire's poems that denied the immortality of the soul and said to himself, "How dreadful, but how plausible!"<sup>19</sup> He loved to act Latin plays and practice the violin—which would be an enjoyable pastime for

---

<sup>14</sup> From Mrs. Newman (30 August 1822), *LD* 1: 149.

<sup>15</sup> *Family Adventures*, 1852; quoted in Ward, *Life of JHN*, 27.

<sup>16</sup> Louis Bouyer, *Newman: His Life and Spirituality* (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1958), 6; hereafter cited: Bouyer, *Newman*.

<sup>17</sup> Brian Martin, *John Henry Newman: His Life and His Work* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 12; hereafter cited: Martin, *Newman*.

<sup>18</sup> JHN, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, David J. DeLaura, ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1968), 15-16; hereafter cited: *Apologia*.

<sup>19</sup> *Apologia*, 14; also see Harrold, *Newman*, 3.

the rest of his life.<sup>20</sup> However, on March 8, 1816—due to the economic crisis at the end of the Napoleonic wars—his father’s banking firm closed, leaving his father unemployed. Because of his family crisis, Newman had to remain alone at school through the summer holidays. He fell ill. Newman saw this as one of the three providential illnesses of his life which were accompanied with profound spiritual experiences. He wrote, “The first keen, terrible one, when I was a boy of 15, and it made me a Christian – with experiences before and after, awful and known only to God.”<sup>21</sup> Newman listed the dates of his “first conversion” from the beginning of August to 21 December. That was seen as “the turning point of his life.”<sup>22</sup>

### 1. “First Conversion”

As a boy, Newman loved Arabian tales and wished they were true. He thought life possibly a dream, himself an angel, and this world a deception, and his fellow-angels concealing themselves from him and deceiving him with the semblance of a material world. He was very superstitious and used to cross himself on going into the dark.<sup>23</sup> Although he had long enjoyed reading the Bible, at the age of fifteen, he experienced a conversion that he later described in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*: “I had no formed religious convictions till I was fifteen. Of course I had a perfect knowledge of my Catechism.”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Brian Martin, *Newman*, 13.

<sup>21</sup> JHN, *Autobiographical Writings*, Henry Tristram, ed. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1957), 268; hereafter cited: JHN, *Autobiographical Writings*.

<sup>22</sup> Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 3; hereafter cited: Ker, *Newman*.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> *Apologia*, 14.

Through the influence of his mentor, Walter Mayers, Newman accepted a Calvinistic form of Evangelicalism. Evangelicals in the early nineteenth century were divided into two streams: the extreme Evangelicals (e.g. Robert Haldane, Edward Irving), and the moderate Evangelicals (e.g. Joseph Milner, Henry Martyn, William Wilberforce). This second stream, to which Newman was introduced by Mayers, tended to view the Church as an institution that was not as important as the spiritually minded people within it, emphasizing the Bible rather than dogmas or sacraments.<sup>25</sup> Through Calvinistic works, such as *The Private Thoughts* of Bishop Beveridge, Law's *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, and especially the works of William Romaine, Newman came to the realization that there were "two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator":

When I was fifteen (in the autumn of 1816), I 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. Above and beyond the conversations and sermons of the excellent man, long dead, the Rev. Walter Mayers, of Pembroke College, Oxford, who was the human means of this beginning of divine faith in me, was the effect of the books which he put into my hands, all of the school of Calvin . . . I believed that the inward conversion of which I was conscious (and of which I am still more certain than that I have hands and feet), would last into the next life, and that I was elected to eternal glory.<sup>26</sup>

Under the guidance of Mayers, an ardent disciple of John Calvin, Newman experienced an "inward conversion," which he regarded as "the beginning of a new life;" it

---

<sup>25</sup> In a letter from Ealing with the date, 14 April 1816, but probably written in 1817, Walter Mayers wrote Newman that there were "thousands around us, who though they have been admitted by Baptism into the *visible* church of Xt, are evidently not living as members of the *invisible* church, or as those whom the Scriptures would denominate 'renewed in the spirit of their mind.' Eph 4: 23." *LD* 1: 32-34, at 32; *italics* in the original. Unless otherwise noted, all *italics* in quotations are in the original.

<sup>26</sup> William Samuel Lilly, ed., *Characteristics from the Writings of John Henry Newman* (London: Henry S. King & Co., 1874), 3; hereafter cited Lilly, *Characteristics*.

was “a returning to, a renewing of, principles, under the power of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>27</sup> This conversion drew him to the conviction of the nearness of God, and was not a fear of eternal damnation.<sup>28</sup> Newman spoke of his “conversion with great difference.” Although going through the “Evangelical process of conversion in a series of Scripture texts” such as “stages of conviction of sin, terror, despair, news of the free and full salvation, apprehension of Christ, sense of pardon, assurance of salvation, joy and peace, and so on to final perseverance,” Newman felt that his “own feelings were *not* violent but a returning to, a renewing of, principles, under the power of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>29</sup> Later in his *Grammar of Assent* (1870), Newman spoke of

The reality of conversion as cutting at the root of doubt, providing a chain between God and the soul that is with every link complete. I know I am right. How do you know it? I know that I know.<sup>30</sup>

Conversion, for Newman, is then not simply repentance from sin or despair, but a communion of the soul with God. As he later remarked in his *Apologia* (1845),

If I am asked why I believe in a God, I answer that it is because I believe in myself, for I feel it impossible to believe in my own experience (and of that fact I am quite sure) without believing also in the existence of Him, who lives as a Personal, All-seeing, All-judging Being in my conscience.<sup>31</sup>

His conviction that there were “two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator” was echoed in his sermon, “The Immortality of the Soul”:

---

<sup>27</sup> JHN, “Autobiographical Memoir,” in Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1: 124.

<sup>28</sup> Robert Sencourt, *The Life of Newman* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1948), 8; hereafter cited Sencourt, *Life of Newman*.

<sup>29</sup> Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1: 123-124.

<sup>30</sup> JHN, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, Nicholas Lash, ed. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), 200; hereafter cited, JHN, *Grammar of Assent*.

<sup>31</sup> *Apologia*, 156.

There are but two beings in the whole universe, our own soul, and the God who made it. Sublime, unlooked-for doctrine, yet most true! To every one of us there are but two beings in the whole world, himself and God.<sup>32</sup>

Newman's conversion was also deeply influenced by Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford (1747-1821), "the writer who made a deeper impression on my mind than any other, and to whom (humanly speaking), I almost owe my soul":

He followed truth wherever it led him, beginning with Unitarianism, and ending in a zealous faith in the Holy Trinity. It was he who first planted deep in my mind that fundamental truth of religion.<sup>33</sup>

Scott's profound belief in the Holy Trinity seems to have carried over into Newman's sermons, which often ended with prayers rooted deeply in faith in God the Holy Trinity. It was Thomas Scott, who inspired Newman to a close study of the Athanasian Creed and the early Church Fathers, particularly Augustine and Ambrose.<sup>34</sup> Newman's conversion also resulted in a steadfast faith in, and a profound relationship, with God; as a result, Newman felt called to celibacy and to missionary work. As he later stated in his *Apologia*: "My calling in life would require such a sacrifice as celibacy involved; as, for instance, missionary work among the heathen, to which I had a great drawing for some years."<sup>35</sup>

## 2. Student Years at Oxford

On December 21, 1816, Newman left Ealing and on June 8, 1817, he officially entered Trinity College, Oxford. As an entering student, Newman had to subscribe to the *Thirty-nine*

---

<sup>32</sup> JHN, "The Immortality of the Soul," *The Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. 1: 15-26, at 19; hereafter cited: *PPS*.

<sup>33</sup> *PPS* 1: 4.

<sup>34</sup> John Moody, *John Henry Newman* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945), 11.

<sup>35</sup> *Apologia*, 19; see Bouyer, *Newman*, 28.

*Articles* as a condition of admission to the college. His tutor, Rev. Thomas Short, sent John William Bowden to instruct Newman in the ways of college life.<sup>36</sup> Bowden was three years older than Newman and a year ahead of him. Newman and Bowden became best friends.<sup>37</sup> In 1818, Newman was elected a scholar of Trinity. In February 1819, Newman and Bowden published the first number of a new magazine named *The Undergraduate*. Bowden was in charge of the historical and picturesque parts; Newman was responsible for the theological. This magazine was printed and sold well in Oxford booksellers.<sup>38</sup> In addition, Newman was interested in music and attended the recitals offered at St. John's College and sometimes took part in the performances. He also enjoyed Buckland's lectures on geology, although this was not a subject of his examination.<sup>39</sup>

In preparation for his baccalaureate examinations, Newman worked hard without any break--studying thirteen to fourteen hours a day. As he later recalled in his *Autobiographical Memoir*:

I stayed in Oxford during the vacations [summer 1819], got up in winter and summer at five and six, hardly allowed myself time for my meals, and then ate, indeed, the bread of carefulness. During twenty out of the twenty-four weeks immediately preceding my examination, I fagged at an average of more than twelve hours a day. If one day I read only nine, I read the next fifteen.<sup>40</sup>

Newman, indeed, overworked himself in preparing for his final examination. Yet he put his trust not in himself but in God. As he wrote to his brother, Francis:

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 36.

<sup>37</sup> Martin, *Newman*, 20.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>39</sup> Bouyer, *Newman*, 44.

<sup>40</sup> JHN, "Autobiographical Memoir" in Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1:44.

As to the event of the examination, ‘it is in the Lord’s hands; let Him do as it seemeth to Him good.’ It is my daily, and (I hope) heartfelt prayer, that I may not get any honours here, if they are to be the least cause of sin to me. As the time approaches, and I have laboured more at my books, the trial is greater. May God give me strength still to say, ‘Let me get no honours, if they are to be the slightest cause of sin to me.’ And do you, my dear Francis, pray for me in the same way.<sup>41</sup>

Newman’s examination was a catastrophe. When the results were posted, his name was not on the mathematical side at all, and in Classics it appeared in the lower division: “under-the-line.” What were the reasons for this failure? Most evident is that he had overworked himself into a state of mental exhaustion. In addition, he had been advised wrongly. As he wrote to Walter Mayers about a month before the examination:

And I have not been advised, or have been advised wrongly, what books to read. I have fagged at books which will be of no service to me, and this to such an extent that I think six months of very hard reading has been thrown away.<sup>42</sup>

Newman at this time was only 19. He admitted that he lacked experience and had “as little tutorial assistance or guidance as it is easy to conceive and found myself left almost entirely to my own devices.”<sup>43</sup>

Newman’s failure was not only personally painful, but also disappointing to those whom he loved. As he wrote to his father:

It is all over, and I have *not* succeeded. The pain it gives me to be obliged to inform you and my mother of it, I cannot express. What I feel on my own account is indeed nothing at all, compared with the thought that I have disappointed you. And most willingly would I consent to a hundred times the sadness that now overshadows me, if so doing would save my mother and you from feeling vexation.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> JHN to Francis William Newman (Oxford, 17 August 1820), *LD* 1: 82-83, at 83.

<sup>42</sup> JHN to Walter Mayers (First week in October 1820), *LD* 1: 89.

<sup>43</sup> JHN, *Autobiographical Writings*, 51.

<sup>44</sup> JHN to Mr. Newman (Trinity College, 1 December 1820), *LD* 1: 94.

When Newman heard from his mother that his parents were not disappointed with him, he felt better, even a bit joyful: “I really am not at all sad now, and my only sorrow, I will not say *it* was slight, arose from the pain I expected to give you and my father.”<sup>45</sup>

Newman’s failure did not diminish his faith in God, rather it led him to put his life fully in God’s providence. As he wrote to Walter Mayers:

. . . now I am thankful to say, I am not only enabled to believe failure to be best for me, but God has given me to see and know it. . . . I think I see clearly that honour and fame are not desirable. God is leading me through life in the way best adapted for His glory and my own salvation.<sup>46</sup>

This awareness of being led by divine providence appeared many times in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*; for example, his sermon “Religious Faith Rational” pointed out: “We are from our birth dependent creatures, utterly dependent;—dependent immediately on man; and that visible dependence reminds us forcibly of our truer and fuller dependence upon God.”<sup>47</sup>

Although Newman had received his bachelor’s degree “under-the-line,” fortunately, his Trinity scholarship had not expired; he could remain at Oxford for several more years. He then decided to seek ordination in the Church of England; he also decided to stand for a fellowship at Oriel College, then the most prestigious college at Oxford. On January 11, 1822, he decided to receive Anglican Orders and on April 12, he was elected a Fellow of Oriel College.<sup>48</sup> That evening, Newman took his seat in Oriel Chapel, and then sat next to John Keble in the dining hall.

---

<sup>45</sup> JHN to Mrs. Newman (3 December 1820), *LD* 1: 95-96, at 96.

<sup>46</sup> JHN to Walter Mayers (January 1821), *LD* 1: 99.

<sup>47</sup> JHN, “Religious Faith Rational,” *PPS* 1: 190-202, at 199.

<sup>48</sup> Martin, *Newman*, 25.



### 3. Fellow of Oriel

There is an unforgettable story of Newman receiving the news of his election. The Provost's butler came to Newman's lodgings, found him playing the violin, and announced that Newman was elected Fellow of Oriel: "His immediate presence was required there." Newman just answered, "very well," and went on fiddling. This prompted the butler to ask whether he had not mistaken the rooms or gone to the wrong person.<sup>49</sup> In retrospect, Newman's election as fellow of Oriel was the turning point of his life. The Oriel fellowship not only gave him a prestigious position and a secure income, but more important "it opened upon him a theological career, placing him upon the high and broad platform of University society and intelligence, and bringing him across those various influences personal and intellectual."<sup>50</sup> In a letter to his aunt, Newman wrote:

A month ago, everything was uncertain and dark as to my future prospects. I seemed to have no hopes in the University, . . . I was sensible that everything I eat even, I had no idea how it was to be paid for . . . I had completely failed in the schools, I was looked down upon and nearly despised by those who heard I was a competitor for the Oriel Election. . . . Yet by that Heaven Arm before which the most difficult things are as nothing, I was in an instant secured in comfort and tranquility. He rolled away every barrier; He dispelled every cloud; in the morning everything was uncertain, and by noon everything was sure and settled.<sup>51</sup>

For Newman, his election was providential; as he wrote his aunt Elizabeth: "I glory in confessing it was God and God alone who accomplished it . . . It was the work of Providence."<sup>52</sup> Since he saw everything that happened in his life as stemming from the Will

---

<sup>49</sup> Ker, *Newman*, 17.

<sup>50</sup> Ward, *Life of JHN*, 36.

<sup>51</sup> JHN to Elizabeth Newman (Oriel College, 28 April 1822), *LD* 1:137-139, at 138.

<sup>52</sup> Quoted in Martin, *Newman*, 28.

and Providence of God, Newman envisioned Faith, not as something abstract, but something very real that he was experiencing in his very self. As he later stated in his *Lectures on Justification*:

When I speak of faith, I am not speaking of a definition, or creation of the mind, but of something existing. I wish to deal with things, not with words. I do not look to be put off with a name or a shadow. I would treat faith as it is actually found in the soul; and I say it is as little an isolated grace, as a man is a picture. It has a depth, a breadth, and thickness; it has an inward life which is something over and above itself; it has a heart, and blood, and pulses, and nerves, though not upon the surface.<sup>53</sup>

Through his own experiences of struggling with life, Newman came to understand the dimensions of faith in God. For Newman, faith “is itself an intellectual act,” but still “it takes its character from the moral state of the agent” and “is perfected, not by intellectual cultivation, but by obedience.”<sup>54</sup> In other words, faith is a total surrender of *oneself* to God’s Will and Providence. If his failure in his collegiate examinations led him to a realization of his completely dependent state and so to a surrender to God, the honor of being elected to the Oriel Fellowship was a favor of Divine Providence. Newman came to see failure as a shadow preparing for a “substance” that God would later show; as he stated in his sermon, “The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World”:

It is a shadow, raising hope because the substance is to follow, but not to be rashly taken instead of the substance. And it is God’s usual mode of dealing with us, in mercy to send the shadow before the substance, that we may take comfort in what is to be, before it comes.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> JHN, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* (London: Rivington & Parker, 1838), 303; hereafter cited: JHN, *Lectures on Justification*.

<sup>54</sup> JHN, *Fifteen Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford Between A.D. 1826 and 1843*, with an introduction by Mary Katherine Tillman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 224-228, 230; hereafter cited JHN, *Fifteen Sermons*.

<sup>55</sup> JHN, “The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World,” *PPS* 6: 83-93, at 92.

Newman's years at Oriel fall into three periods. The first was a period of intellectual development (1822-1828) under the influence of liberal thinkers such as Richard Whately.<sup>56</sup> The next was a period of spiritual growth (1828-1832) under the influence of Richard Hurrell Froude;<sup>57</sup> this second period began with his appointment as Vicar of St. Mary's: "It was to me like the feeling of spring weather after winter; and, if I may so speak, I came out of my shell."<sup>58</sup> The third and longest period (1833-1845) was the time of Newman's involvement in the Oxford Movement.<sup>59</sup>

At Oriel, Newman first experienced the influence of the Oriel "Noetics": "They called everything into question; they appealed to reason first, and disallowed authority as a judge in matters intellectual."<sup>60</sup> Prominent among the "Noetics" was Richard Whately, to whom Newman owed "a great deal. He was a man of generous and warm heart." He was the one who "transformed the raw, bashful youth into an independent and brilliant thinker."<sup>61</sup> As Newman later acknowledged in his *Apologia*, Whately "taught me to see with my own eyes and to walk with my own feet"<sup>62</sup>:

What he did for me in point of 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

---

<sup>56</sup> Richard Whately (1787-1863), a fellow of Oriel and Principal of St. Alban Hall, where Newman was Vice Principal, was appointed Anglican Archbishop of Dublin in 1831.

<sup>57</sup> Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836), son of Robert Hurrell Froude, was, like Newman, a fellow of Oriel and one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement until his early death.

<sup>58</sup> *Apologia*, 26.

<sup>59</sup> Ward, *Life of JHN*, 36.

<sup>60</sup> Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1: 114.

<sup>61</sup> Americo D. Lapati, *John Henry Newman* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), 21.

<sup>62</sup> *Apologia*, 22.

views of Church polity, which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian movement.<sup>63</sup>

Edward Hawkins, Newman's predecessor as the Vicar of St. Mary's and later Provost of Oriel, was another influence on Newman. He suggested that Newman read John Bird Sumner's *Treatise on Apostolical Preaching*,<sup>64</sup> which led Newman to forsake his remaining Calvinism and to accept the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.<sup>65</sup> In addition, Newman read the *Analogy of Religion* of Joseph Butler—a work that helped to place “his doctrinal views on a broad philosophical basis, with which an emotional religion could have little sympathy.”<sup>66</sup> With Butler, Newman was drawn into many significant issues such as the nature of the visible Church, the duties of external religion, the historical character of revelation, the logical cogency of faith, the sacramental principle, the foundations of religious certitude<sup>67</sup>—issues that Newman later treated in his sermons. In addition, owing to Butler's influence, Newman began looking on the world as an index of things unseen and began believing that conscience is the supreme director in which the Supreme Ruler and Judge is present.<sup>68</sup> As Newman later observed in his sermon on “The Immortality of the Soul”:

There are but two beings in the whole world, himself and God; for, as to this outward scene, its pleasures and pursuits, its honours and cares, its contrivances, its personages,

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>64</sup> John Bird Sumner (1780-1862) was appointed Bishop of Chester in 1828 and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1848.

<sup>65</sup> *Apologia*, 20.

<sup>66</sup> JHN, *Autobiographical Writings*, 78. Joseph Butler (1692-1752), an Anglican Bishop of Bristol (1738-50) and Durham (1750-52), was the author of *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed*.

<sup>67</sup> J.-H. Walgrave, *Newman the Theologian* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960), 32; hereafter cited: Walgrave, *Newman*.

<sup>68</sup> Ward, *Life of JHN*, 38; Sencourt, *Life of Newman*, 18.

its kingdoms, its multitude of busy slaves, what are they to us? Nothing—no more than a show . . . so that, after all, they vanish before the clear vision we have, first, of our own existence, next of the presence of the great God in us, and over us, as our Governor and Judge, who dwells in us by our conscience, which is His representative.<sup>69</sup>

For Newman conscience is the dwelling place of God, God's representative. As Newman latter asserted in his *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, if “we have our initial knowledge of the universe through sense, so do we in the first instance begin to learn about its Lord and God from conscience.”<sup>70</sup> It is through our conscience that we realize the presence of God in us and in the visible world. In his sermon, “Present Blessings,” he gave his point of view of the world.

[God] does not separate us from this world, though He calls us out of it; He does not reject our old nature when He gives us a new one; He does but redeem it from the curse, and purify it from the infection which came through Adam, and is none of His. He especially blesses the creation to our use, though we be regenerate. “Every creature of God,” says the Apostle, “is good and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.” [1 Tim. iv. 4, 5.] He does not bid us renounce the creation, but associates us with the most beautiful portions of it. He likens us to the flowers with which He has ornamented the earth, and to the birds that live solitary under heaven, and makes them the type of a Christian. He denies us Solomon's regal magnificence, to unite us to the lilies of the field and the fowls of the air.<sup>71</sup>

In 1826, Newman was appointed as a tutor of Oriel. Two years later Hurrell Froude was also chosen as a tutor. Newman's friendship with Froude was very deep and exercised a profound influence on his life: “His opinions arrested and influenced me, even when they did

---

<sup>69</sup> JHN, “The Immortality of the Soul,” *PPS* 1: 15-26, at 20-21; see Newman's description of his “first conversion” in *Apologia*, 16.

<sup>70</sup> JHN, *Grammar of Assent*, 63.

<sup>71</sup> JHN, “Present Blessings,” *PPS* 5: 270-283, at 274-275.

not gain my assent.”<sup>72</sup> Froude admired the Church of Rome and hated the Reformers. He loved Tradition and considered it as a main instrument of religious teaching. He was attracted to the Blessed Virgin, the saints, the Middle Ages, and the Mass. He had a deep devotion to the Real Presence.<sup>73</sup> Froude led Newman to look with admiration at the Church of Rome and fixed deep in him devotion to the Blessed Virgin and belief in the Real Presence.<sup>74</sup> Froude also taught Newman to detest what was called “Liberalism.”<sup>75</sup> At that time, under the influence of the Oriel Noetics—Whately and Hawskins—Newman was “drifting to the direction of the Liberalism of the day.”<sup>76</sup> He was awakened from his “Liberalism” at the end of 1827 by two great blows—his physical breakdown and the death of his sister, Mary. Under Froude’s influence, Newman reexamined his liberal views and gradually shifted to more “catholic” positions; as he later noted: “For 30, 40, 50 years I have resisted to the best of my powers the spirit of Liberalism in religion”—which he considered “an error overspreading, as a snare, the whole earth.” He described “Liberalism” as “the doctrine that there is no positive truth in religion”; “Liberalism was a desperate, and in the end fatal, attempt to save religion from the destructive forces of modernism by compromise and accommodation.”<sup>77</sup>

Newman was a man who could not accept any kind of compromise or accommodation in religion:

---

<sup>72</sup> Lilly, *Characteristics*, 16.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>74</sup> *Apologia*, 33.

<sup>75</sup> Sencourt, *Life of Newman*, 23.

<sup>76</sup> *Apologia*, 24.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 391.

The Liberals tried to make the best of both worlds. They welcomed the modern secular spirit, but at the same time they wanted to maintain a Christian or at least religious attitude and how was this to be done?<sup>78</sup>

Newman continued:

The liberal religionists of this day are a very mixed body . . . . There may be, and doubtless is, in the hearts of some or many of them a real antipathy or anger against revealed truth . . . . [They try] to prove that Christianity or that Scripture is untrustworthy.<sup>79</sup>

Newman's opposition to Liberalism found expression in his sermon, "Truth Hidden When Not Sought After": "That Truth, which St. Paul preached, addresses itself to our spiritual nature: it will be rightly understood, valued, accepted, by none but lovers of truth, virtue, purity, humility and peace."<sup>80</sup>

In sum, Newman was a lover of truth. It was by looking for the truth that he faced many difficulties and struggles and later became a Catholic. As Martin J. Svaglic has commented:

If the Church spreads the truth by warfare and conquest, then the man who receives or is converted to it must be a man who is conquered by truth. And this is precisely what he is for Newman: a convert to him is a man *subdued by* the word or "the force of truth."<sup>81</sup>

#### 4. Preacher at Saint Mary's

In February of 1828, Newman was chosen as Vicar of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, where, week after week for fifteen years, he preached the Good News. Most of the

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 392.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 200.

<sup>80</sup> JHN, "Truth Hidden When Not Sought After," *PPS* 8: 185-200, at 189.

<sup>81</sup> Martin J. Svaglic, "The Structure of Newman's *Apologia*," in DeLaura, ed., *Apologia*, 441-452, at 447.

sermons in the eight volumes of his *Parochial and Plain Sermons* were preached at St.

Mary's. He usually preached at the afternoon service at four o'clock on Sundays and Feast Days.<sup>82</sup> Through his sermons, Newman quickly gained an audience among both students and townspeople at Oxford: "From the first young men felt the impact of a surprising loftiness of power: in a short time he had become a legend to successive numbers of young men."<sup>83</sup>

Those attending the service felt that holiness was presented in both its beauty and its awfulness. When people listened to his homilies, they felt that "Paradise was opening and they had caught a secret from on high." His sermons pierced his listeners to their very centre: "He brought out meanings where none had been expected and threw over all an atmosphere of awe."<sup>84</sup>

People listening to Newman's preaching sensed a flame of fire burning in his heart: "His zeal consumed him; his imagination poured into poetry."<sup>85</sup> Bishop Samuel Wilberforce commented in the *Quarterly Review* for October 1864, "Those who listened were within a charmed ring, under the wand of an enchanter: there was music in his voice, fascination in his eye, and in his spare but lustrous countenance habitual command."<sup>86</sup> "He reached the heart of young Oxford;" Wilberforce continued, "man after man, in whom was the receptive faculty,

---

<sup>82</sup> Lawrence F. Barmann, ed., *Newman at St. Mary's* (Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962), xi. Also see Hermann Breucha, "Newman als Prediger," *Newman Studien* 1 (1948): 157-177.

<sup>83</sup> Sencourt, *Life of Newman*, 28.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 28-29.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>86</sup> Samuel Wilberforce, *Quarterly Review* (1864); quoted by Robert Sencourt, *Life of Newman*, 30; Samuel Wilberforce (1805-73), a son of William Wilberforce, was Anglican Bishop of Oxford (1845-1869) and Winchester (1869-1873).



received the living force of his words, and reproduced so far as he was able, the Master's spirit in himself."<sup>87</sup> James A. Froude commented in a similar way: "A sermon from him was a poem, formed on a distinct idea, fascinating by its subtlety, welcome—how welcome!—from its sincerity, interesting from its originality, even to those who were careless of religion, and to those who wished to be religious, but had found religion dry and wearisome, it was like the springing of a fountain out of a rock."<sup>88</sup> Henry Wilberforce in the *Dublin Review* of April 1869 described Newman's preaching in detail:

Through many of them [sermons] the preacher never moved anything but his head. His hands were literally not seen from the beginning to the end. The sermon began in a calm musical voice, though he slightly raised it as it went on; as the preacher warmed with his subject it seemed as if his soul and body glowed with suppressed emotion. There were times when in the midst of the most thrilling passages, he would pause, without dropping his voice, for a moment which seemed long, before he uttered with gathered force and solemnity a few weighty words. The very tones of his voice seemed as if they were something more than his own . . . . The great Church, the congregation all breathless with expectant attention, the gas light just at the left of the pulpit, lowered that the preacher might not be dazzled, themselves perhaps standing in the half darkness of the gallery, and then the pause before the words in the "Ventures of Faith" thrilled through them—they say unto him "We are able."<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid. Quoted in Robert D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam* (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), 8; hereafter cited: Middleton, *Newman & Bloxam*.

<sup>88</sup> James A. Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, 1907, vol. V, 204, quoted by Middleton, *Newman & Bloxam*, 9; James Anthony Froude (1818-1894), son of Robert Hurrell Froude and a younger brother of Richard Hurrell Froude, was later editor of *Fraser's Magazine*, rector of St. Andrew's University, and Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford.

<sup>89</sup> Henry Wilberforce, "F[ather] Newman's Oxford Parochial Sermons," *Dublin Review*, no. 12 (1869): 309-330, at 325. Henry Wilberforce was born in 1807, the youngest son of William Wilberforce. He studied classics and mathematics at Oriel College, Oxford, and was elected president of the Oxford Union. During his time in Oxford he had received tuition from John Henry Newman.

Newman's fame as a preacher spread. People who came to visit Oxford would stay to listen to his Sunday sermons. Students talked about his preaching in college and at home. His sermons were different from other preachers of that day. Their topics were usually very general. In contrast, the topics of Newman's sermons were very specific dealing with particular subjects, related to daily life.

The 191 sermons in the eight volumes of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* treated topics that are central to Christian doctrine: the Trinity and the Incarnation; the passion and resurrection; the Holy Spirit and the Church; salvation, grace and sin; etc. As Louis Bouyer once commented, "In the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* we have all of Christian doctrine treated as a whole."<sup>90</sup> However, Newman's sermons were not like a *summa theologiae*. His sermons were preached in the framework of the liturgy and worship of the Church of England. In other words, his sermons were not a theological treatise, but a living doctrine—to be heard and practiced by his audience.

Newman wanted his audience to listen to the Word of God in the Church—a word which was being proclaimed in a particular place, at a specific time and with a concrete subject. Accordingly, Newman's sermons were very biblical. In every sermon, Newman used a key biblical text as the basis for developing his sermon. The Bible was the foundation upon which Newman built his sermons. In addition, his sermons employed the Catholic tradition; for Newman, tradition "proceeds from the constant interplay between what he called the Prophetic and the Episcopal tradition, not as being two traditions, but as a single one,

---

<sup>90</sup> Louis Bouyer, *Newman's Vision of Faith* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 17; hereafter cited: Bouyer, *Newman's Vision*.

which could not survive outside the constant cooperation of the pastors and their flocks, including all their members.”<sup>91</sup> As Bouyer observed, Newman’s sermons were not *along with* tradition, but *within* the tradition.<sup>92</sup> In other words, Newman wanted people to live the Word of God *within* the tradition of the Church. In this respect, Newman was influenced by the patristic writers, who used Scripture as the foundation for all their teaching and preaching.

The influence of tradition on Newman can be traced to 1828, the year that he became the Vicar of St. Mary’s; that year, he also decided to read the writings of the Fathers of the Church chronologically. The Fathers became one of the main sources for his sermons; as he later acknowledged:

There is one remaining source of my opinion to be mentioned and that far from the least important. In proportion as I moved out of the shadow of that Liberalism which had hung over my course, my early devotion towards the Fathers returned; and in the long vacation of 1828 I set about to read them chronologically, beginning with St. Ignatius and St. Justin. About 1830 a proposal was made to me by Mr. Hugh Rose, who with Mr. Lyall (afterwards Dean of Canterbury) was providing writers for a Theological Library, to furnish them with a History of the Principal Councils, I accepted it, and at once set to work on the Council of Nicaea. It was to launch 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.<sup>93</sup>

Newman was attracted by teachings of the Fathers of the Church—especially the Ecumenical Councils and the Greek Fathers.<sup>94</sup> Particularly, Hugh James Rose (1795-1838)

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> *Apologia*, 33.

<sup>94</sup> Benjamin John King notes, “The High Church tradition of Anglican teaching was founded on two Testaments of scripture, three Creeds, and four Councils (only the Ecumenical Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon carried weight for Anglicans). Greek theologians, rather than Latins, were since the seventeenth century the favourites of High Churchmen; indeed, it is noticeable in that era how few Latin Fathers were

was the one who encouraged Newman to study the Greek Fathers.<sup>95</sup> Athanasius and the Cappadocians became his favorite figures: “Some portions of their teaching, magnificent in themselves, came like music to my inward ear . . . I had cherished so long.”<sup>96</sup> As will be seen, the teachings of Athanasius deeply influenced Newman’s sermons that treated the mystery of the Trinity and the Incarnation. In particular, the Athanasian Creed, which rejected Arianism, shone through his sermons. In presenting the doctrine of the Trinity, the Son’s coeternity and consubstantiality with God the Father, Newman relied on the Athanasian Creed—even wanting to be called “an Alexandrian Greek,” “a Greek of Alexandria . . . mystical, ascetic uncompromising.”<sup>97</sup>

It was from the Fathers that Newman learned the significance of the Gospel. As he later asserted in his *Apologia*: “Nature was a parable: Scripture was an allegory: pagan literature, philosophy, and mythology, properly understood, were but a preparation for the Gospel.”<sup>98</sup> By the Gospel, Newman also meant Jesus Christ himself. All humanity will be

---

printed in England, compared to Greek Fathers.” Benjamin John King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 5; hereafter cited: J. King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*.

According to Alexander Knox (1757-1831), a theologian and a pioneer of the Oxford Movement, the Greek Fathers had profound influences in the Church of England. Knox asserted that “the church of England is not protestant, but a reformed branch of the church catholic; that the English church is the only representative of the spirit of the *Greek* fathers, and that we ought to aim at union with the Greek church.” Quoted in “Index of Persons and Places,” Gerard Tracy, ed., *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vol. 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 803.

<sup>95</sup> J. King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, 13.

<sup>96</sup> *Apologia*, 34.

<sup>97</sup> Charles Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman and His Influence of Religious Life and Thought* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), 77; hereafter cited: Sarolea, *Newman*.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*

led to the “Living Truth,” “the Lord and Savior.” As will be seen, Newman’s sermons were very Christological; their central point was salvation through Christ; the ground for his analysis and arguments was the mystery of the Trinity. Although Newman’s sermons assigned different roles to the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, the Son is central, for the salvation of God is carried out *through* the Son, the manifestation and revelation of God. In other words, the mystery of Christianity, for Newman, is the mystery of Christ, whose Incarnation reveals the mystery of God the Trinity. We are invited to enter into this transcendent reality, which is manifested in the mystery of the Church in her unity: the union of all members with Christ the Lord, the Savior, the Head of the Body, in the Holy Spirit, in order that we be recapitulated in Christ and so united with the Father, the Source of all, so that “God will be all in all.” Newman derived this theological view from the Greek Fathers—especially Athanasius—and the Councils of Nicea and Chalcedon.<sup>99</sup>

The first major product of Newman’s study of patristic writings was *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833). In dealing with the arguments of the Arians, Newman entered deeply into the doctrine of the Trinity, working with the Old and New Testaments, the writings of the Fathers and the documents of the early Church, as well as with the philosophical terminology. All this material furnished a solid ground for Newman’s systematic theology. Newman’s knowledge of the Church Fathers also loomed large in the book that marked the change of his life, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845), and appeared again in *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (1870).

---

<sup>99</sup> Bouyer, *Newman’s Vision*, 13-14.

Newman's patristic-based Christology and Trinitarian theology appeared repeatedly in the sermons that he preached from the pulpit of St. Mary's. Although he was not a professor at Oxford University, his influence upon the students was greater than any professor of Oxford at that time. Newman wanted his audience to have a firm grounding in the Bible and in the traditional doctrines of Christianity, as a defense against the Liberalism and secularism of mid-nineteenth century England. Combating the Liberalism and secularism of the day through a retrieval of patristic teaching was also one of the main purposes of the Oxford Movement, of which Newman was one of the leading figures. In other words, Newman's sermons provided a theological basis for the Oxford Movement through their grounding in the Bible, patristic writings and theology. Newman's sermons were an important part of the return to the sources of Christian faith.

### 5. The Oxford Movement

On July 14, 1833, John Keble preached his famous Assize sermon "National Apostasy" at Oxford. He condemned the Liberalism of the day and drew attention to the miserable state into which the Church of England had fallen.<sup>100</sup> Thomas Arnold commented: "The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save."<sup>101</sup> On the one hand, most intellectuals espoused Liberalism, while the Anglican clergy "had become, for the most part, amiable and respectable gentlemen, who were satisfied to read morning and afternoon service

---

<sup>100</sup> Lapati, *Newman*, 31.

<sup>101</sup> Henry Donald Maurice Spence-Jones, *The Church of England, a History for the People*, vol. IV (London: Cassell and Company, Limited, 1898), 319.

on a Sunday, and to dislike Dissenters.”<sup>102</sup> The bishops, who had been appointed by Tory prime ministers, were considered “agents of a defunct Tory government and were known for their practice of nepotism and political patronage.”<sup>103</sup> The Church of England found itself under the control of a Parliament which could no longer be assumed to be even nominally Anglican. Abroad, the French Revolution had supported liberal and secularistic ideas, which Newman called “the triumph of irreligion.”<sup>104</sup> At least in retrospect, Newman regarded Keble’s sermon “as the start of the religious movement of 1833.”<sup>105</sup>

Subsequently, Froude, Palmer, Perceval, Rose, and Keble gathered at Hadleigh to plan a course of action;<sup>106</sup> they agreed on six resolutions:

The first of them called for a rallying to the principle of Apostolical Succession; the next, aimed straight at the Grey government and the reformed Commons, stated that it was sinful to allow interference of non-Church members in matters spiritual; the third said that the Church should attempt to secure a more popular base, insofar as consistent with Apostolicity; the fourth was a protest against the separation of Church and state, while the fifth warned of the need for preparation for such an eventuality; and the last resolution asserted the duty to stir up the clergy in these and similar matters.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1915), 17.

<sup>103</sup> Lapati, *Newman*, 30.

<sup>104</sup> Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1: 233. Keble’s Assize Sermon was preached—coincidentally—on Bastille Day—the symbolic beginning of the French Revolution.

<sup>105</sup> *Apologia*, 41.

<sup>106</sup> John Henry Newman, Richard Hurrell Froude, William Palmer, Arthur Philip Perceval, James Rose, Edward Bouverie Pusey, John Keble and Isaac Williams were among the members of the Oxford Movement. See Augustine B. Donaldson, *Five Great Oxford Leaders* (London: Rivingtons, 1900), 27; hereafter cited Donaldson, *Five Great Oxford Leaders*.

<sup>107</sup> Marvin R. O’Connell, *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45* (London: The Macmillan Company, 1969), 139; hereafter cited: O’Connell, *Oxford*.

In addition, the meeting proposed two means as a way of publicizing these ideas: an association for the defense of the Church and a set of publications.<sup>108</sup> Thus, “An Association of Friends of the Church” and a series of “Tracts for the Times” was started. The “Tractarians”—as they came to be known—published a series of 90 tracts on various subjects: Newman wrote 28, Keble 8 and Pusey 7.<sup>109</sup> Newman, who soon became one of the Oxford Movement’s leading figures, contributed not only by writing tracts and other articles, but also by preaching at St. Mary’s. In a sense, he turned the pulpit of St. Mary’s into the place where the spirit of renewal of the Oxford Movement could reach to the people. As he later acknowledged:

Out of my own head I began the Tracts [for the Times] . . . I had the consciousness that I was employed in that work which I had been dreaming about, and which I felt to be so momentous and inspiring.<sup>110</sup>

For Newman, the critical issue was that “the ancient religion had well-nigh faded out of the land, through the political changes of the last 150 years, and it must be restored.”<sup>111</sup>

Newman later enumerated the principles that he wanted to implement in the Church of England.

First was the principle of dogma: my battle was with Liberalism; by Liberalism I meant the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments. This was the first point on

---

<sup>108</sup> Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1: 379.

<sup>109</sup> O’Connell, *Oxford*, 157. Bill Fraatz, “Oxford Movement,” 2004, an article on [http://people.bu.edu/wildman/WeirdWildWeb/courses/mwt/dictionary/mwt\\_themes\\_478\\_oxfordmovement.htm#The\\_Oxford\\_Movement\\_Fraatz](http://people.bu.edu/wildman/WeirdWildWeb/courses/mwt/dictionary/mwt_themes_478_oxfordmovement.htm#The_Oxford_Movement_Fraatz).

Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882) was an Anglican priest and Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. He was one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement.

<sup>110</sup> *Apologia*, 47. The “ancient religion”, for Newman, means “primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church.” Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 28.



which I was certain. . . . Secondly, I was confident in the truth of a certain definite religious teaching, based upon this foundation of dogma, viz. that there was a visible Church, with sacraments and rites, which are the channels of invisible grace. I thought that this was the doctrine of Scripture, of the early Church, and of the Anglican Church.<sup>112</sup>

Newman exemplified these principles regularly at the Sunday service at St. Mary's. He did not repeat the *Tracts* in his homilies, but he chose a wide range of topics which may convey his principle of dogma.<sup>113</sup>

To illustrate the "principle of dogma," for example, Newman observed in his sermon on "The Incarnation":

The Word was from the beginning, the Only-begotten Son of God. Before all worlds were created, while as yet time was not, He was in existence, in the bosom of the Eternal Father, God from God, and Light from Light, supremely blessed in knowing and being known of Him, and receiving all divine perfections from Him, yet ever One with Him who begat Him. As it is said in the opening of the Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." If we may dare conjecture, He is called the Word of God, as mediating between the Father and all creatures; bringing them into being, fashioning them, giving the world its laws, imparting reason and conscience to creatures of a higher order, and revealing to them in due season the knowledge of God's will. And to us Christians He is especially the Word in that great mystery commemorated today, whereby He became flesh, and redeemed us from a state of sin. . . . He humbled Himself; suffering all the infirmities of our nature in the likeness of sinful flesh, all but a sinner,—pure from all sin, yet subjected to all temptation,—and at length becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.<sup>114</sup>

In this short paragraph, Newman guided his audiences to the very mystery of God—from His inner life to the divine economy of salvation for all humanity; from the relationship of the Son

---

<sup>112</sup> *Apologia*, 50-51.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. S. Parkes Cadman, *The Three Religious Leaders of Oxford and Their Movements* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), 555.

<sup>114</sup> *PPS* 2: 29-30.

with the Father in the mystery of the Triune God to the Incarnation and the cross. He effectively summarized the main points of Catholic doctrine in one short paragraph.

Speaking of Newman's sermons, R. D. Middleton stated, "The whole thought of his doctrinal message . . . is centered in and around the mystery of the Incarnation."<sup>115</sup> For Newman, Christ is the Light of the world. His life, death and resurrection are renewed in his Church and in his followers. Journeying in this world is journeying from darkness to light. This life is seen as a battle against the power of darkness. Secularism and Liberalism, for Newman, were the foes that he was fighting, and he sought to help people to triumph in these battles. As he proclaimed from St. Mary's, the weapon that he offered his fellow Christians was no other than the Light, the Truth: Jesus Christ.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, readers of Newman's sermons may find them very doctrinal, yet also contemporary and existential. One is reminded of Keble's comment about Newman:

He was... the most transparent of men. He told us what he believed to be true . . . Newman's mind was world-wide. He was interested in everything which was going in science, in politics, in literature. Nothing was too large for him, nothing too trivial, if it threw light upon the central question, what man really was, and what was his destiny . . . Newman studied modern thought and modern life in all its forms, and with all its many coloured passions.<sup>116</sup>

Newman's sermons were then very *real*, insofar as everyone could perceive how they touched their own lives.

In sum, Newman's sermons—designed to help the Church of England return to its apostolic roots—were a major contribution to the Oxford Movement. Along with writing

---

<sup>115</sup> R.D. Middleton, *Newman at Oxford: His Religious Development* (London-New York-Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1950), 101.

<sup>116</sup> Quoted in Ward, *Life of JHN*, 62.

*Tracts*, preaching and studying the Fathers of the Church, Newman also began to develop an ecclesiological theory—the *Via Media*. He wanted to show that the Church of England occupied a “middle way” between the doctrinal diminutions of continental Protestantism and the dogmatic exaggerations of Roman Catholicism. He wrote *Tracts 38* and *41* in 1834 on the *Via Media* and later publicized the doctrine in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism* (1837). Newman acknowledged that “the Catholic Church in all lands had been one from the first for many centuries.”<sup>117</sup> However, he insisted that Rome had later introduced many superstitions into the original body of divine truths. Nevertheless,

in both systems [Anglican and Roman] the same Creeds are acknowledged . . . . We both believed in the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement; in original sin; in the necessity of regeneration; in the supernatural grace of the Sacraments; in the Apostolical succession; in the obligation of faith and obedience, and in the eternity of future punishment.<sup>118</sup>

Although at this time Newman saw the Pope as the “Anti-Christ of prophecy,”<sup>119</sup> and the invocation of saints as idolatrous, he still regarded the Church of Rome as being in continuity with the ancient Church. Newman did not fear the Church of Rome. What he feared was the “anti-dogmatic principle” of the Liberals.<sup>120</sup> Accordingly, for Newman, one could identify

---

<sup>117</sup> *Apologia*, 65.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>119</sup> Newman wrote, “When I was fifteen years old. . . I read Newton on the Prophecies, and, in consequence, became most firmly convinced that the Pope was the Anti-Christ predicted by Daniel, St. Paul and St. John.” Lilly, *Characteristics*, 5.

<sup>120</sup> Thomas Wright, “Newman and Campion: A Comparison and Contrast,” *The Month – A Catholic Magazine*, vol. 111 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., January to June 1908), 78-82, at 79.

three different branches of the one Church of Christ: the Anglo-Catholic Church, the Greek Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church.

Newman considered Protestantism as “capriciously subtracted.”<sup>121</sup> On the one hand, Protestantism went to the extreme of allowing private judgment, while Romanism went to the extreme of claiming infallibility. The Anglican Church, for Newman, stood in the middle between these two extreme positions. The Anglican Church had remained faithful to the Primitive Church through its historic episcopate and had been faithful to Tradition in its interpretation of Scripture and doctrines, thereby presenting the unblemished divine truth throughout the centuries.<sup>122</sup> However, he was unhesitatingly critical because “the actual English Church has never adopted it [Via Media]: in spite of the learning of her divines, she has ranked herself among the Protestants, and the doctrine of the Via Media has slept in libraries.”<sup>123</sup> He also insisted: “The Church in England is not a body now, it has little or no substantiveness; it has dwindled down to its ministers, who are as much secular functionaries as they are rulers of a Christian people.”<sup>124</sup> For Newman, there were two main enemies: the invasion of Liberalism and the power of the State over the Church. Newman and the other leaders of the Oxford Movement were fighting in these battles. Through his preaching and teaching, Newman wanted to bring the Church of England back to its “True Light.”

---

<sup>121</sup> Lapati, *Newman*, 34.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>123</sup> JHN, “How to accomplish it,” (originally published as “Home Thoughts Abroad” [1834]), in *Discussion and Arguments* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), 18.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

## 6. Tract Ninety and the Conversion

In April 1839, Newman was studying the Monophysite controversy. The Monophysites, who rejected the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon (451), claimed that Christ had only a divine nature and that His humanity was only an appearance. The thought came to Newman that if the Monophysites were heretics, then Protestants and Anglicans must be as well. Like the Anglicans, the Monophysites took their stand on antiquity, refusing the teaching of the Council and the Pope Leo:

It was difficult to make out how the Eutychians or Monophysites were heretics, unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also; difficult to find arguments against the Tridentine Fathers, which did not tell against the Fathers of Chalcedon; difficult to condemn the Popes of the sixteenth century, without condemning the Popes of the fifth.<sup>125</sup>

Subsequently, in his *Apologia*, Newman expressed his shock:

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.<sup>126</sup>

In addition, in September, Wilberforce gave Newman an article of Wiseman on “Schism of the Donatists,” published in the *Dublin Review*.<sup>127</sup> Newman was struck by Augustine’s reply to the Donatists, who claimed to be Catholics adhering to antiquity: *securus*

---

<sup>125</sup> *Apologia*, 97.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>127</sup> See Wilfrid Philip Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, vol. I (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897), 320-343.

*judicat orbis terrarum*.<sup>128</sup> As Newman later confessed: “For a mere sentence, the words of St. Augustine struck me with a power which I never had felt from any words before.”<sup>129</sup>

To his former pupil, Frederic Rogers, Newman wrote on September 22, 1839:

Since I wrote to you, I have had the first real hit from Romanism which has happened to me. R. W., who has been passing through, directed my attention to Dr. Wiseman’s article in the new ‘Dublin.’ I must confess it has given me a stomach-ache. You see the whole history of the Monophysites has been a sort of alterative [sic]. And now comes this dose at the end of it. It does certainly come upon one that we are not at the bottom of things. At this moment we have sprung a leak; and the worst of it is that those sharp fellows, Ward, Stanley, and Co., will not let one go to sleep upon it. *Curavimus Babylonem et non est curata* was an awkward omen. I have not said so much to anyone.<sup>130</sup>

In tandem, Newman’s study of the Monophysite controversy and the statement of Augustine destroyed his theory of the *Via Media*: “By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesial history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverized.”<sup>131</sup> How could anyone regard “a separated Church as an authentic revival of the Primitive Church, if that same Primitive Church regarded such separation as a crime against itself.”<sup>132</sup> Nonetheless, Newman was still convinced that Rome had corrupted the primitive faith and that the Anglican Church was still a continuation of the one Church of Christ from the time of Athanasius and Augustine. Newman’s concern was:

---

<sup>128</sup> “The whole world judges right.” It means “the universal sense of the whole Church must be right against one local body.” Harrold, *Newman*, 40.

<sup>129</sup> *Apologia*, 98.

<sup>130</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (22 September 1839), *LD* 7, Gerard Tracy, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995): 154-155, at 154. Frederic Rogers (1811-1889), a pupil of Newman, who took a double first and became a Fellow of Oriel (1833-45), served in the government and was created Lord Blachford; after a falling out (1843-63), they were reconciled (*LD* 2: 413).

<sup>131</sup> *Apologia*, 99.

<sup>132</sup> Bouyer, *Newman*, 202.

“How can the Church of England win back its ‘Catholic’ character?” In *Tract 90*, he tried to answer this question.

In *Tract 90*, published on February 27, 1841, Newman claimed that the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were consistent with Roman Catholic doctrine. According to Newman, the Thirty-nine Articles—the key doctrinal standard of the Church of England—were not directed against the teachings of the early Church and the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, including the Council of Trent. He claimed that the Articles could not condemn the decrees of the Council of Trent, for they were composed several years before the Council adjourned. In addition, he made a distinction between the Catholic teachings of the first three centuries, the formal dogma of Rome, and recent popular beliefs and practices sanctioned by Rome, which he regarded as “dominant errors.” He then concluded that the Articles were not directed against the Catholic teachings on Purgatory, the Invocation of the Saints, the Mass, but only against the popular errors and exaggerations or “dominant errors” of the Roman Catholic Church. The Articles were also directed against the political supremacy of the Pope, but not against the supremacy of Church of Rome. In sum, Newman thought that this interpretation vindicated the Anglican claim to “Catholicity.”<sup>133</sup>

The reaction to *Tract 90* was immediate. Newman was denounced as a traitor to the Anglican Church and as an advocate of Popery and the Roman Catholic Church. On March 8, four tutors of Oxford colleges composed a protest against the *Tract*. A week later, the heads of houses, without waiting for any explanation of Newman, condemned the *Tract* as

---

<sup>133</sup> Lilly, *Characteristics*, 40; also see Lapati, *Newman*, 37, and Harrold, *Newman*, 42.

dishonorable. Copies of their condemnation were posted everywhere in Oxford. *Tract 90* was seen as “evasive hypocrisy.” A prominent churchman stated: “I should be sorry to trust the author of that Tract with my purse.”<sup>134</sup>

However, James A. Froude later wrote somewhat in defense: “Newman was only claiming a position for himself and his friends, which had been purposely left open when the constitution of the Anglican Church was formed.”<sup>135</sup> As Sarolea commented, “It was not Newman who was false and insincere; it was the very position of Anglicanism which was equivocal.”<sup>136</sup> Newman’s own reaction was surprisingly calm; as he wrote to his friend Bowden: “Do not think that all this will pain me. You see no *doctrine* is censured, and my shoulders shall manage to bear the charge.”<sup>137</sup> He also wrote to Rogers,

I now am in my right place, which I have long wished to be in, which I did not know how to attain, and which has been brought about without my intention, I hope I may say providentially, though I am perfectly aware at the same time that it is a rebuke and punishment for my secret pride and sloth. I do not think, indeed, I have not had one misgiving about what I have done, though I have done it in imperfection; and, so be it, all will turn out well. I cannot anticipate what will be the result of it in this place or elsewhere as regards *myself*. Somehow I do not fear for the *cause*.<sup>138</sup>

However, as Newman admitted to Pusey, “It is vain to deny that I shall be hurt and discouraged beyond measure if the Tract is suppressed at all.”<sup>139</sup> Newman’s bishop assured

---

<sup>134</sup> R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1966), 298-299.

<sup>135</sup> J. A. Froude, “The Oxford Counter-Reformation,” *Short Studies on Great Subjects: Four Series*, vol. V (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907), 166-260, at 221.

<sup>136</sup> Sarolea, *Newman*, 31.

<sup>137</sup> Quoted in Meriol Trevor, *Newman’s Journey* (Great Britain: Collins + World, 1974), 87.

<sup>138</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (In fest. S. Benedicti, 21 March 1841), *LD* 8: 107-108.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*



him that if the series of *Tracts* were ended, *Tract 90* would not be censured. Simultaneously, *Tract 90* was selling like hot cakes!<sup>140</sup>

Nonetheless, Newman could not help but feel rejected by the caustic criticisms of *Tract 90*. His way of dealing with such feelings seemed to be reflected in a sermon that he preached on April 9, 1841, on “The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World”:

It is the death of the Eternal Word of God made flesh, which is our great lesson how to think and how to speak of this world. His Cross has put its due value upon every thing which we see, upon all fortunes, all advantages, all ranks, all dignities, all pleasures; upon the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life. It has set a price upon the excitements, the rivalries, the hopes, the fears, the desires, the efforts, the triumphs of mortal man. It has given a meaning to the various, shifting course, the trials, the temptations, the sufferings, of his earthly state. It has brought together and made consistent all that seemed discordant and aimless. It has taught us how to live, how to use this world, what to expect, what to desire, what to hope. It is the tone into which all the strains of this world’s music are ultimately to be resolved. . . . Gaze upon the Cross.<sup>141</sup>

Apparently dealing with his own pain, Newman realized that the cross of Christ was the answer and gave meaning to all of what was happening to him. The cross of Christ was teaching him “how to live, how to use this world, what to expect, what to desire, what to hope.” “Gaze upon the Cross!” was what Newman was doing.

A few months later, in a sermon on “The Trial of Saul,” Newman seemingly reflected on the pain that he had been experiencing in the wake of *Tract 90*:

What a great trial this must have been! Here was a king who had been made king for the express purpose of destroying the Philistines; he is in presence of his powerful enemy; he is anxious to fulfill his commission; he fears to fail; his reputation is at stake; he has at best a most difficult task, as his soldiers are very bad ones, and are all afraid of the enemy. His only chance, humanly speaking, is to strike a blow; if he

---

<sup>140</sup> Trevor, *Newman’s Journey*, 89.

<sup>141</sup> JHN, “The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World,” *PPS* 6: 83-93, at 85-86.

delays, he can expect nothing but total defeat; the longer he delays, the more frightened his men will become. Yet he is told to wait seven days; seven long days must he wait; he does wait through them; and to his great mortification and despair, his soldiers begin to desert; day after day more and more leave him: what will be the end of this?<sup>142</sup>

After further reflection on the trials of Saul, Newman exclaimed: “How much is there in this melancholy history which applies to us, my brethren, at this day, though it happened some thousand years ago!”<sup>143</sup> But, unlike Saul, who distrusted and disobeyed God, Newman completely put his faith and life in the Lord’s hands. He said, “God give us grace to be in the number of those whose faith and whose love is without hypocrisy or pretence; who obey out of a pure heart and a good conscience; who sincerely wish to know God’s will, and who do it as far as they know it!”<sup>144</sup>

*Tract 90* was a turning point in Newman’s life. As he observed in his *Apologia*, “There were no converts to Rome, till after the condemnation of No. 90.”<sup>145</sup> He also concluded that “the Via Media was an impossible idea; it was what I had called ‘standing on one leg.’”<sup>146</sup> His yearning for Antiquity and Catholicity brought him to the Roman Catholic Church: “The Creeds tell us that the Church is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, I could not prove that the Anglican communion was an integral part of the One Church.”<sup>147</sup> In his *Apologia*, he summarized his position:

---

<sup>142</sup> JHN, “The Trial of Saul,” *PPS* 8: 33-47, at 37-38.

<sup>143</sup> *PPS* 8: 41.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 47. Chapter V *infra* will analyze in detail how the events of Newman’s life influenced the sermons that he published in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*.

<sup>145</sup> *Apologia*, 116.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 122.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*

I have nothing more to say on the subject of the change of my religious opinions. On the one hand I came gradually to see that the Anglican Church was formally in the wrong, on the other that the Church of Rome was formally in the right; then, that no valid reasons could be assigned for continuing in the Anglican, and again that no valid objections could be taken to joining the Roman. Then, I had nothing more to learn; what still remained for my conversion, was, not further change of opinion, but to change opinion itself into the clearness and firmness of intellectual conviction.<sup>148</sup>

Finally, in response to Manning, who asked why he left the Church of England, Newman replied: “I think the Church of Rome the Catholic Church.”<sup>149</sup>

The time between *Tract 90* (1841) and his entrance into the Roman Catholic Church (1845) was occupied with writing the book which eventually led him to the Church of Rome: *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* “in favor of the Roman Church.”<sup>150</sup> In this *Essay*, Newman explored the history of doctrines. He came to believe that all things had to develop and change in time including the Church. The Church was not static. In particular, the Church of Rome had developed over the centuries; the nineteenth century was different from the time of Athanasius, Cappadocians and Augustine; yet if ideas developed, and thus theology must develop, the line of development was still continuous and in an unbreakable connection to the Primitive Church. In contrast, the Church of England had separated itself from the Church of Rome, which was the centre of the unity of the Catholic Church. And the Pope, St. Peter’s successor, was the centre of the unity of the Church of Christ.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 157.

<sup>149</sup> Quoted in Trevor, *Newman’s Journey*, 106.

<sup>150</sup> *Apologia*, 148.

<sup>151</sup> Martin, *Newman*, 75-76.

On October 6, 1845, Newman signed the advertisement to the *Essay*; two days later he wrote to his sister Jemima:

I must tell you what will pain you greatly, but I will make it as short as you would wish me to do. This night Father Dominic, the Passionist, sleeps here. He does not know of my intention, but I shall ask him to receive me into what I believe to be the One Fold of the Redeemer.<sup>152</sup>

On October 9, 1845, Newman was received as a Roman Catholic by Fr. Dominic Barberi, who later wrote to his superior, “Newman was one of the most humble and lovable men I have met in my life.”<sup>153</sup>

Newman’s “conversion” was not a moral conversion. In Sarolea’s opinion: “Newman became a convert because Catholicism was adapted to his temperament, because there was a pre-established harmony between his character and the Catholic system, because his soul was *naturaliter catholica*.”<sup>154</sup> For Sarolea, Newman, touched by Divine Grace, converted to the Truth for which he had long been yearning and seeking and eventually found in the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church.<sup>155</sup> It was the Lord, who had guided Newman to the Church of Rome.

The last sermon that Newman published in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons* was on “The Shepherd of Our Souls.” In this sermon, Newman gave many scriptural examples of those who heard and responded to the voice of the Lord, the One Shepherd. Perhaps, again, Newman wanted to meditate on his situation in light of the Scriptures. The examples of

---

<sup>152</sup> Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 2: 418-419.

<sup>153</sup> Quoted in Trevor, *Newman’s Journey*, 115.

<sup>154</sup> Sarolea, *Newman*, 61.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

Moses, Samuel, Peter and particularly Paul—all of whom heard the voice of the Lord and changed their lives—provided a mirror in which to see his own life:

My brethren, we say daily, “We are His people, and the sheep of His pasture.” Again, we say, “We have erred and strayed from Thy ways, like lost sheep.” let us never forget these truths; let us never forget, on the one hand, that we are sinners; let us never forget, on the other hand, that Christ is our Guide and Guardian. He is “the Way, the Truth, and the Life.” [John xiv. 6.] He is a light unto our ways, and a lanthorn [sic] unto our paths. He is our Shepherd, and the sheep know His voice. If we are His sheep, we shall hear it, recognize it, and obey it. Let us beware of not following when He goes before: “He goes before, and His sheep follow Him, for they know His voice.” Let us beware of receiving His grace in vain. When God called Samuel, he answered, “Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth.” When Christ called St. Paul, he “was not disobedient to the heavenly vision.” Let us desire to know His voice; let us pray for the gift of watchful ears and a willing heart.<sup>156</sup>

In conclusion, nobody would deny that Newman had a great influence upon the Oxford Movement. His tracts, books and specially his *Parochial and Plain Sermons* helped shape the essential purpose of the Oxford Movement: to bring the Church of England back to its Apostolic and Catholic roots. In trying to achieve this aim, Newman did an extensive study of the early Church. The teachings of the Fathers of the Church became a great and joyful source for Newman’s theology, which was then wonderfully expressed in his sermons. The early Church was the significant period, which formed the foundation for all the main doctrines of the Church: the Trinity, Incarnation, passion and resurrection, redemption, final judgment etc. All these doctrines were profoundly manifested and beautifully addressed in Newman’s *Parochial and Plain Sermons*.

---

<sup>156</sup> JHN, “The Shepherd of Our Souls,” *PPS* 8: 230-243, at 241-242.

### Preview

The following Chapters—Two, Three, and Four—will examine Newman’s Trinitarian theology as presented in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. His Trinitarian theology was the foundation on which he built his theological arguments in his sermons. Undoubtedly Newman derived his theology from the Fathers of the Church—particularly the Greek Fathers, Athanasius and the Cappadocians, which were the main sources in forming the Trinitarian theology and Christology of the early Church. These chapters will analyze Newman’s Trinitarian theology as presented in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*: his systematic theology of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the immanent life of the Trinity and in the economy of salvation.

These sermons will be considered in chronological order in conjunction with the three periods of Newman’s involvement in the Oxford Movement. The first period (1833-34) – Chapter Two – may be seen as a time in which Newman deepened his understanding of the immanent Trinity. The second period (1835-38) – Chapter Three – may be considered a time when Newman developed his view of the economic Trinity. The third period (1839-43) – Chapter Four – may be seen as a time of “peace in believing” in the midst of the controversy raised by the publication of *Tract 90*. Each sermon will be considered within its own period and in relation to the other periods in order to see if there was any change or different focus in the various periods during the decade: 1833-1843. This examination of Newman’s Trinitarian theology will not be narrowed to consider only the “Trinity,” but—as was the theological practice of the Fathers—will consider the Trinity in relation to Christology, Pneumatology,

soteriology, revelation and faith, ecclesiology, anthropology, spirituality etc. This is the beauty and profundity of Newman's theology.

**CHAPTER II:**  
**THE FIRST PERIOD: 1833 - 1834**  
**THE IMMANENT LIFE OF THE HOLY TRINITY**  
**AND AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION**

One cannot read the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* of Newman for long without realizing that the mystery of the Holy Trinity pervades the whole of his theology. The mystery of the Trinity, for Newman, is not simply a doctrine of faith but the foundational core of Christian faith. The Christian faith is not built upon a belief in a god in general but in the God, who is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The core of Christian faith is not Christ alone, but the Christ, who is the Only-begotten Son and Eternal Word of the Father in the unity of the Holy Spirit. For Newman, there is no Christ the Son without the Father and his Spirit. Newman described Jesus Christ as being in an undivided and unbreakable relationship with the Father and the Holy Spirit. The inter-relationship of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is the perspective within which Newman viewed the mystery of the divine—God’s immanent life—and probed the mystery of the economy in which God self-reveals as Trinity in the history of salvation.

For Newman, the years 1829 to 1834 were a time when his theology turned in a new direction. In 1829, “came the formal break” with Dr. Whately,<sup>157</sup> while 1833 was the year

---

<sup>157</sup> JHN, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, Charles Kingsley, ed. (London: Longman, Green, 1864), 72.



that marked the birth of the Oxford Movement.<sup>158</sup> Since the purpose of the Oxford Movement was to “withstand the Liberalism of the day,”<sup>159</sup> Newman’s first principle in that battle was dogma—the defense of “fundamental doctrines”—particularly the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>160</sup> This first period was a time when Newman effectively turned the pulpit of St. Mary’s Church in Oxford into a podium where he taught the orthodox teachings of the ancient Catholic Church.

At the heart of orthodox teaching is the mystery of the Trinity; as Eugene D. Genovese has paraphrased the comments of Newman:

The victory of Trinitarianism constituted the victory of the faithful’s orthodoxy over the speculations of the theologians. At the Council of Nicea (325 A.D) the Church decreed as dogma that which had become embodied in Church tradition in the wake of vigorous debate among the common people, not merely the elite. From the Arians to the Unitarians, those who have rejected the Trinity have resisted doctrinal appeals to tradition.<sup>161</sup>

## I. From 1829 to 1833

### 1. The Mystery of the Holy Trinity and Knowledge through Grace

For Newman, the mystery of the Trinity is not merely a matter for theological disputations. It is the mystery of faith that Christian believers can only perceive through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Newman began his sermon, “The Christian Mysteries,” preached on

---

<sup>158</sup> Walter Walsh, *The History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England 1833-1864* (London: James Nisbet, 1900), 18.

<sup>159</sup> *Apologia* (Kingsley, 1864), 195.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

<sup>161</sup> Eugene D. Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 786.

Trinity Sunday in 1829, by highlighting the connection of the feast of the Trinity and the feast of Pentecost:

There is much instruction conveyed in the circumstance, that the Feast of the Holy Trinity immediately succeeds that of Whit Sunday. On the latter Festival we commemorate the coming of the Spirit of God, who is promised to us as the source of all spiritual knowledge and discernment.<sup>162</sup>

Newman made this connection for two reasons: First, the Holy Spirit is “the source of all spiritual knowledge and discernment”; one cannot understand the Holy Trinity without his grace.<sup>163</sup> However, the Holy Spirit “does not remove” “mysteries,” “difficulties” and “secret things” in the Gospel. His grace is given to us “not that we may know more but that we may do better”, to “influence, guide and strengthen us” in living our duty towards God and human beings; it is given to everyone not “mere reasoners, disputers or philosophical inquirers.”<sup>164</sup> Second, the mystery of the Trinity is “not a light accorded to the reason”; therefore, the celebration of Trinity Sunday should warn us that the enlightenment given us is not an understanding of “all mysteries and all knowledge,” but that love or charity which is “the fulfilling of the Law.”<sup>165</sup>

In this sermon, Newman was apparently rejecting rationalism. He strongly opposed what he called “rational religion,” which argued that “no doctrine which was mysterious, i.e., too deep for human reason, or inconsistent with their self-devised notions, could be contained

---

<sup>162</sup> JHN, “The Christian Mysteries,” *PSS* 1: 203-214, at 203.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, 204.

in Scripture.”<sup>166</sup> Newman’s focus was the priority of faith with respect to the rational inquiry of reason. He did not deny the significant role of reason, but he wanted to prioritize faith. He followed Augustine’s *dictum*: “We must believe before we can understand.”<sup>167</sup> He also seconded Anselm: “The believer does not seek to understand, that he may believe, but he believes that he may understand.”<sup>168</sup> Similarly, Aquinas firmly rejected rationalism; he acknowledged “fitting arguments” that show the coherence and intelligibility of faith and avoid errors contrary to the faith.<sup>169</sup> For Aquinas, as Newman quoted, “the light of Faith makes things seen that are believed;” and “believers have knowledge of things of Faith, not in a demonstrative way, but so as by the light of Faith it appears to them that they ought to be believed.”<sup>170</sup> Newman highlighted the priority of faith in his sermon, “Faith without Sight,” in 1834:

The true religion is in part altogether above reason, as in its Mysteries; and so again, it might have been introduced into the world without that array of Evidences, as they are called, which our reason is able, and delights to draw out; yet it would not on that account have been less true. As far as it is above reason, as far as it has extended into any countries without sufficient proof of its divinity, so far it cannot be called rational.

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 205.

<sup>167</sup> Augustine, *The Trinity*, VIII, 5, 8, *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 45, Stephen McKenna, trans. (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963): 253.

<sup>168</sup> Anselm, *Proslogium; Monologium: An Appendix, In Behalf of the Fool, by Gaunilon; and Cur Deus Homo*, Sidney Norton Deane, trans. (Chicago: The Opencourt Publishing Co., 1903), 3.

<sup>169</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 32, a. I, ad 2. Michael Dauphinais, Barry David, and Matthew Levering, *Aquinas the Augustinian* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 2007), 18; hereafter cited Dauphinais, *Aquinas the Augustinian*.

<sup>170</sup> JHN, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 14<sup>th</sup> impression (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), 336; hereafter cited JHN, *Essay on Development*. In fact, Newman did study Aquinas. Newman and Pusey translated and edited a work of Aquinas, entitled *Catena Aurea—Commentary on the Four Gospels*, 4 vols. (Oxford: J. G. F. and J. Rivington, 1841); Newman wrote the preface of this work.

Indeed, that it is at all level to the reason, is rather a privilege granted by Almighty God, than a point which may be insisted on by man; and unless received as an unmerited boon, may become hurtful to us.<sup>171</sup>

Faith, in Newman's mind, could not be subjected to reason. To do so would reduce faith to a rational conclusion. This was Newman's reaction to the rationalism of Richard Whately. As a new fellow of Oriel College, Newman was greatly influenced by Whately. Gradually, however, Newman came to reject rationalism, for it subjected the truths of faith to the proofs of reason. Rather, the truths of faith must be treated with great reverence. If one wants to be a true inquirer, let him be like Nicodemus, who "was startled at the mysteries of the Gospel." Nicodemus raised questions: "How can these things be?" He felt the temptation, but then he "overcame it."<sup>172</sup>

In this sermon, Newman was touching the Mystery of all mysteries, the Trinity. He did not want to use reason to examine the mystery as an object of disputation. This is the mystery of faith. Only by grace can a person make an act of faith. Thus, in his sermon, "The Christian Mysteries," after emphasizing the importance of celebrating the feast of the Trinity after that of Pentecost, he immediately talked about grace. We are standing before the mystery of God. We, thus, need God's initiation. God has initiated the revelation, particularly in the Scriptures; and by grace God is influencing the believer's acceptance of divine revelation. For Newman, the Holy Scriptures are one of the main sources of God's revelation.

---

<sup>171</sup> JHN, "Faith without Sight," *PPS* 2: 13-25, at 24.

<sup>172</sup> *PPS* 1: 205.

Although Newman insisted that the mystery of the Trinity is not “a light accorded to the reason,” he observed that

this doctrine of the Trinity *is not proposed in Scripture as a mystery*. It seems then that, as we draw forth many remarkable facts concerning the natural world which do not lie on its surface, so by meditation we detect in Revelation this remarkable principle, which is not openly propounded, *that religious light is intellectual darkness*. As if our gracious Lord had said to us; “Scripture does not *aim* at making mysteries, but they are as shadows brought out by the Sun of Truth. When you knew nothing of revealed light, you knew not revealed darkness. Religious truth requires you should be told *something*, your own imperfect nature prevents your knowing *all*; and to know *something*, and *not all*,—*partial knowledge*,—must of course perplex; doctrines imperfectly revealed must be mysterious.”<sup>173</sup>

When Newman asserted that the doctrine of the Trinity “*is not proposed in Scripture as a mystery*,” he highlighted two significant points. First, the doctrine of the Trinity is revealed in the Scriptures through Christ, for “doctrines imperfectly revealed must be mysterious.” In his sermon, “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity” in 1831, Newman asserted

if there be an eternal mystery in the Godhead, such as we aver, then, from the nature of the case, there could not but be a difficulty in the words in which He [Christ] revealed it. Christ, in that case, makes no mystery for the occasion; He uses the plainest and most exact form of speech which human language admits of.<sup>174</sup>

Newman went further and said that even in the Creed, the words

are only common words used in their common sense, as “Lord” and God,” “eternal” and “almighty,” “one” and “three;” nor again are the statements difficult. There is no difficulty, except such as is in the nature of things, in the Adorable Mystery spoken of, which no wording can remove or explain.<sup>175</sup>

Second, the doctrine of the Trinity can be perceived but not by the knowledge of reason. Newman was suggesting another way of perceiving the mystery by drawing out a

---

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., 210-211.

<sup>174</sup> JHN, “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” *PPS* 6: 343-361, at 346.

<sup>175</sup> *PPS* 6: 347.

“remarkable principle,” that is “religious light is intellectual darkness.” In other words, he pointed to a type of knowledge, Trinitarian knowledge—*knowledge through grace*. Only through grace can we receive “religious light.” Only through grace are we brought into “the Sun of Truth.” In a word, the knowledge of the Trinity is *knowledge through grace*, based on the scriptural revelation that God has initiated and invited us to detect. This knowledge through grace is none other than the *knowledge of faith*, “which receives with reverence and love whatever God gives, when convinced it is His gift.”<sup>176</sup> One, thus, may perceive the doctrine of the Trinity by the knowledge of faith. In that sense, one might realize what Newman meant when he said the Holy Trinity “*is not proposed in Scripture as a mystery*.”<sup>177</sup>

## 2. The Immanent Life of the Holy Trinity

The starting point of Newman’s Trinitarian theology is the biblical formula: “In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” (Matt. xxviii. 19). It was Jesus who revealed this mystery to his disciples. They are Jesus’ own words, the words of the Son of God, the Word incarnate. Based on the very statement of Jesus, Newman started to deepen his understanding of each divine person in their relationship to one another, and built it as a frame for his theology. Within this framework, he interpreted the oneness of God in three persons. It is also within this framework that he placed the work of the Trinity in the economy of salvation. In other words, the relationship of the divine persons in the Trinity is

---

<sup>176</sup> *PPS* 1: 211.

<sup>177</sup> One might ask, “Is this statement theological or exegetical?” This statement of Newman could be seen as exegetical. It is *exegetical*, for it was the response of Newman to the Socinians and Unitarians, who considered the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as an “inexplicable mystery” and a “chief stumbling block” for their reason. We will consider this point in more detail in chapter V, which places Newman’s Trinitarian theology in its context.

the key with which Newman opened what can be called the Immanent Trinity and the Economic Trinity.

In his sermon “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” preached on Trinity Sunday, 1831, Newman began his Trinitarian theology.

He [Jesus] does but say, “in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” I consider, then, that on the very face of His sacred words there is a difficulty, till the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is made known to us. What can be meant by saying, in the Name, not of God, but of Three? It is an unexpected manner of speech. . . . Surely even then it would be strange and inexplicable that Christ should say, “the Father and Son,” and not “God and the Son,” or “God and Christ,” or the like; whereas the Name of God does not occur at all, and the two words used instead are what are called *correlatives*, one implies the other, they look from the one to the other. . . . And the force of this remark is increased by our Lord’s making mention, in addition, of the Holy Ghost, which much confirms this impression that the Three Sacred Names introduced have a meaning relatively to each other, and not to any temporal dispensation.<sup>178</sup>

Newman raised a very interesting question, “What can be meant by saying, in the Name, not of God, but of Three?” Newman started his Trinitarian thought in the very centre of the mystery—“in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,” which is revealed in the Scriptures, through the teaching of Jesus Christ. These titles “Father, Son, Holy Spirit,” for Newman, are “correlative terms.” They have “a meaning relatively to each other.” They tell that the first is designated as fatherhood, the second as sonship, and the third as procession. We do not profess “God and the Son,” or “God and Christ,” or “in the Name of God, Jesus Christ, and the Comforter,”<sup>179</sup> This is the significant point of Newman. The name of each

---

<sup>178</sup> *PPS* 6: 344-5.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*

divine person indicates a relationship: “one implies the other, they look from the one to the other.”

Newman, like Athanasius and the Cappadocians, realized that God is a *relational* being.<sup>180</sup> The “Three Sacred Names”—Father, Son, Holy Spirit— have “a meaning relatively to each other.”<sup>181</sup> The “Father” signifies the existence of the Son. The title “Son” points to the Father. And the “Holy Spirit” calls to the Father and the Son. In addition, the names—Father, Son, Holy Spirit—are human terms taken from fragile human relationships. In order to obviate any misinterpretation, Newman added one phrase, that these names could not be understood as “any temporal dispensation.” “Father, Son and Holy Spirit” are inseparable, indivisible and unbreakable relationships:

The God of all, who is revealed in the Old Testament, is the Father of a Son from everlasting, called also His Word and Image, of His substance and partaker of all His perfections, and equal to Himself, yet without being separate from Him, but one with Him; and . . . from the Father and the Son proceeds eternally the Holy Spirit, who also

---

<sup>180</sup> Cf. John D. Zizioulas, *Communion & Otherness*, Paul McPartlan, ed. (New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 35.

<sup>181</sup> Newman quoted the Fathers: Basil said, “*Father* is a term of relationship” (Eunom. ii. 24). Gregory of Nyssa stated, “The title ‘Son’ does not simply express the being from another, but *relationship according to nature*” (Eunom. ii). Cyril added, “The term ‘Son’ denotes the *substantial* origin from the Father.” (Dial. v). JHN, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, vol. II (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), 287-8; hereafter cited, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*.

Newman, in 1842, contributed to the Oxford Library of the Fathers two volumes entitled *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*. The first volume is the translation of the discourses of Athanasius against the Arians. The second volume contains the theological notes that Newman made during his time of study of Athanasius and other Fathers of the Church from 1828. All the notes were alphabetically arranged as a kind of theological lexicon to the Father’s writings. In treating Newman’s sermons, we will use this second volume to illustrate some of his thoughts that were probably influenced by the Fathers. See Joseph John Rickaby, *An Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914, republished by BiblioBazaar, 2008), 27.



is of one substance, Divinity, and majesty with Father and Son. Moreover we learn that the Son or Word is a Person,—that is, is to be spoken of as “He,” not “it,” and can be addressed; and that the Holy Ghost also is a Person. Thus God subsists in Three Persons, from everlasting to everlasting; first, God is the Father, next God is the Son, next God is the Holy Ghost; and the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Holy Ghost, nor the Holy Ghost the Father. And God is Each of these Three, and nothing else; that is, He is either the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Ghost. Moreover, God is as wholly and entirely God in the Person of the Father, as though there were no Son and Spirit; as entirely in that of the Son, as though there were no Spirit and Father; as entirely in that of the Spirit, as though there were no Father and Son. And the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, while there is but one God; and that without any inequality, because there is but One God, and He is without parts or degrees; though how it is that that same Adorable Essence, indivisible, and numerically One, should subsist perfectly and wholly in Each of Three Persons, no words of man can explain, nor earthly illustration typify.<sup>182</sup>

Newman was attempting to describe each divine person as God wholly entire, but simultaneously not three gods, but only one God, who is “the Father of a Son from everlasting, and . . . from the Father and the Son proceeds eternally the Holy Spirit.” Newman used very simple language in order to depict the relations of each divine person to one another in the immanent Trinitarian life. His language was relational—which unbreakably and inseparably ties each divine person to the others but simultaneously distinguishes each one from the others. Newman emphasized that the Son is a “Person,” and the Holy Spirit is a “Person.” This emphasis is significant, for it shows the “otherness” and “communion” in God.<sup>183</sup>

Newman, at this time, did not define what he meant by the term “person.” This term could be taken in the sense of the *hypostasis* of the Cappadocians, since from 1828 Newman

---

<sup>182</sup> *PPS* 6: 357-8.

<sup>183</sup> In his sermons, Newman emphasized that each divine person is distinct from the other two, but simultaneously the three divine persons are always in undivided and inseparable relationships with each other.

had been studying the Fathers of the Church. The characteristic point of the Cappadocians was that they took their starting point not from the divine *ousia* but from the *hypostases*. The three *hypostases* are united in the Holy Trinity, which consists of three equally, wholly, entirely divine hypostases.<sup>184</sup> Although, Newman did not define the term “person,” he did relate “substance” to “person,” especially to the person of the Father. This is also very crucial. When Newman mentioned the term “substance,” that term did not stand by itself but is connected to the person of the Father. In the Cappadocian view, “substance” never exists in an independent state—i.e., without hypostasis, without “a mode of existence.”<sup>185</sup> However, Newman did not explain the importance of this connection. The only assertion is that the Son is of the substance of the Father. Newman highlighted the person of the Father. He did not separate *ousia* from the *hypostasis* of the Father. Newman always gave the Father priority as the ground of the Trinity. He always spoke of the one substance of God the Father with reference to the Son and the Holy Spirit. Newman insisted that the Son shares the one substance *of* the Father and is “partaker of all His perfections, and equal to Himself, . . . one with Him;” and “the Holy Spirit, who also is *of* one substance, Divinity, and majesty with the Father.”

Newman here and elsewhere in his sermons identified the “one God” with the Father. Relying on the Scriptures, he indicated the oneness of God and that God the Father is the cause. Newman asserted that “God is one.” He cited biblical passages: “Hear, O Israel,” says

---

<sup>184</sup> Cf. Sergius Bulgakov, *The Comforter* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 31.

<sup>185</sup> John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002), 41.

Moses, “the Lord our God is one Lord.” “To us there is but one God, the Father,” says St. Paul; “one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all;” “one God, and one Mediator between God and men.” [Deut. vi. 4. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Eph. iv. 5, 6. 1 Tim. ii. 5.]<sup>186</sup> Newman explained that “God is one” should be understood “in the simplest and strictest sense, as all Scripture shows; this is true, whatever else is true: not in any nominal or secondary sense.”<sup>187</sup> For Newman, God is one “not in name, or by figure, or by accommodation, or by abstraction, but one in Himself, or, as the Creed speaks, one in substance or essence.”<sup>188</sup>

What does “one in Himself” mean? Newman reasoned, “All that He is, is Himself, and nothing short of Himself; His attributes are He.”<sup>189</sup> Has God wisdom? He *is* wisdom. Has He love? He *is* love. Has he omnipresence? He *is* omnipresent. All his divine attributes, for Newman, are He, “all one and the self-same He.” Human beings are incapable of “conceiving of Him as He is.”<sup>190</sup> What we have of God are no more than glimpses and partial views. Newman especially noted that we call God by “different names, as if He had attributes;” we use “human, sensible, and material terms” to speak of God “as if He could be angry, who is not touched by evil; or could repent, in whom is no variableness; or had eyes, or arms, or breath, who is a Spirit; whereas He is at once and absolutely all perfection.”<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>186</sup> *PPS* 6: 348.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, 349.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*

Newman insisted, “Whatever is He, is all He is, and He is Himself always and altogether.”<sup>192</sup>

Newman here clarified his theological point. God is always “One” and “Being.” He *is* He, for His Name is I AM.

Newman admitted that human language was poor in expressing the mystery of God. Newman acknowledged the “inability of human nature to comprehend God;” yet, according to Athanasius, from illustrations and images that Scripture has proposed, “we might be able to form ideas” although “poorly and dimly.”<sup>193</sup> This reminds us of the statements of Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine and Aquinas. Gregory stated that God is “incapable of being grasped by any term, or any idea, or any other device of our apprehension.”<sup>194</sup> Augustine said: “If thou hast been able to comprehend what thou wouldest say, it is not God; if thou hast been able to comprehend it, thou hast comprehended something else instead of God.”<sup>195</sup> Aquinas asserted: “The realities of the faith are proposed to the understanding of believers not in themselves but through certain words which *do not suffice* to express them and through certain similitudes which *do not suffice* to present them; that is why it is said that one knows them *through a*

---

<sup>192</sup> Ibid.

<sup>193</sup> Athanasius, Orat. ii. 32, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 93.

<sup>194</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*, 1, 42, Phillip Schaff, ed., *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2<sup>nd</sup> series, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954): 99.

<sup>195</sup> Augustine, “Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament,” Sermon II (52), 16, Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1<sup>st</sup> Series, vol. VI, St. Augustine: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007): 263.

*mirror in an enigma.*”<sup>196</sup> Newman surely would have agreed with Aquinas. Newman recognized the contrariety and limitation in human language:

This we cannot avoid; nor need we be perplexed about them, nor shrink from declaring any one of them. That simple accuracy of statement which would harmonize all of them is beyond us, because the power of contemplating the Eternal, as He is, is beyond us. We must be content with what we can see, and use it for our practical guidance, without caring for the apparent contradiction of terms involved in our profession of it.<sup>197</sup>

Newman realized the difficulty of expressing the fact that “while God is in His essence most simply and absolutely one, yet there is a real sense in which He is not one.”<sup>198</sup> What we have in contemplating “Almighty God” are only earthly things, which “are partial reflexions of Him.” Therefore, there is a danger that “when they fail us, we are lost.”<sup>199</sup> Accordingly, Newman concluded: “We must be content to take it on faith, without comprehending how it is, or having any clear understanding of our own words.”<sup>200</sup> Although human expressions and language, for Newman, are very limited in themselves, the Scriptures used them to assert the Truth that “there is only one God,” and “God is one.” The words “one God” in Scriptures, for Newman, are attached to the Father; i.e., the oneness of the Trinity is placed in the person of the Father.<sup>201</sup> Although Newman at this time (1831) did not used the

---

<sup>196</sup> III *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, dist. 24, q. I, a. 2, q. 3, sol; quoted in Dauphinais, *Aquinas the Augustinian*, 20.

<sup>197</sup> *PPS* 6: 351.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, 356.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>201</sup> Newman asserted in his sermon, “The God of all, who is revealed in the Old Testament, is the Father.” “Now the passages in the New Testament in which this Sacred Mystery is intimated to us, are such as these. First, we read, as I have said already, that God is One; next, that He has an Only-begotten Son; further, that this Only-begotten Son is ‘in the

terms “*arche*” or “*monarchia*” for the Father, he did point out that the Father is He out of whom and toward whom the Son and the Holy Spirit are reckoned, and by the communication of *His substance* He makes the unity of the Trinity. The Father is the one, who causes the other two divine persons to be “distinct Persons.” This is apparent in the part Newman spoke of the Son.

He [the Father] has an Only-begotten Son; further, . . . this Only-begotten Son is “in the bosom of the Father;” and . . . “He and the Father are One.” Further, . . . He is also the Word; . . . “the Word is God, and is with God;” moreover, . . . the Son is in Himself a distinct Person, in a real sense, for He has taken on Him our nature, and become man, though the Father has not. What is all this but the doctrine, that that God who is in the strictest sense One, is both entirely the Father, and is entirely the Son? or that the Father is God, and the Son God, yet but One God? Moreover the Son is the express “Image” of God, and He is “in the form of God,” and “equal with God,” and “he that hath seen Him, hath seen the Father,” and “He is in the Father and the Father in him.” Moreover the Son has all the attributes of the Father: He is “Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;” “by Him were all things created, visible and invisible;” “by Him do all things consist;” none but He “knoweth the Father,” and none but the Father “knoweth the Son.” He “knoweth all things;” He “searcheth the hearts and the reins;” He is “the Truth and the Life;” and He is the Judge of all men.<sup>202</sup>

Newman, in this paragraph, obviously emphasized the intimate, unbreakable and inseparable communion of the Father and the Son. Newman used the Scriptures to highlight this relationship: “In the bosom of the Father,” “are One,” “with God,” “the express ‘Image’ of God,” “in the form of God,” “equal with God,” “hath seen Him, hath seen the Father,” “in

---

bosom of the Father;” and that “He and the Father are One.” *PPS* 6: 348, 357-8. Also in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, Newman insisted, “The Father the only God, or God is said to be ingenerate, [*agenetos*], this is not in contrast to the Son, but to all things which are distinct from God.” (Vid. Athan. Orat. iii. 8; Naz. Orat. 30. 13; Cyril. Thesaur. 142). “There is One God, because Father is One, and Son is God, having identity as Son towards Father . . . The Father has Being perfect and without defect, being root and fount of the Son and the Spirit.” *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 141, 319.

<sup>202</sup> *PPS* 6: 358-59.

the Father and the Father in him,” “knoweth the Father,” “the Father knoweth the Son,” “has all the attributes of the Father.” Newman put these phrases, which are very Johannine and Pauline, together in order to help his audiences see clearly the immanent life of God, which is revealed in the Scriptures. Again, Newman insisted that the Son is a “distinct Person, in a real sense,” who “has taken on Him our nature, and become man, though the Father has not.” This is a clear distinction of the Son from the Father.

Newman pointed out the “otherness” in God. On the one hand, Newman wanted to clarify that the person of the Son is distinct from that of the Father. On the other hand, in every sentence, Newman firmly tied the Son with the Father in an unbreakable relationship. The term “person,” for Newman, is understood “in a real sense,” namely it is distinct but simultaneously relational. It calls to a relationship. One person cannot stand alone. A person is only a person when another person exists: “I” only find my identity as long as “You” exist. The Son is recognized as Son only in relationship with the Father and vice versa.<sup>203</sup> “Otherness” in God absolutely exists. “The Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Holy Ghost, nor the Holy Ghost the Father.”<sup>204</sup> “God is as wholly and entirely God in the person of the Father, as though there were no Son and Spirit; as entirely in that of the Son, as though there were no Spirit and Father; as entirely in that of the Spirit, as though there were no Father and

---

<sup>203</sup> Newman highlighted this point by quoting Athanasius: “If our Lord be not a Son, let Him be called a work ... and let God be called, not Father, but Framer only and Creator, ... and not of a generative nature. But if the Divine substance be not fruitful (*karpogonos*), but barren, as they say, as a light which enlightens not, and a dry fountain, are they not ashamed to maintain that He possesses the creative energy?” (Orat. ii. § 2), *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 108.

<sup>204</sup> *PPS* 6: 357.

Son.”<sup>205</sup> The Father, the Son and the Spirit are distinguished hypostatically. None of them is subject to confusion with the other two. However, each divine person is different not by substance but by way of being who he is. In this sense, one might understand why Newman very much emphasized both the personhood of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and their unbreakable and inseparable relationships revealed in the Scriptures.

In his sermon on “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” Newman emphasized the especial part of the Holy Spirit:

And again, what is true of the Son is true of the Holy Ghost; for He is “the Spirit of God;” He “proceedeth from the Father;” He is in God as “the spirit of a man that is in him;” He “searcheth all things, even the deep things of God;” He is “the Spirit of Truth;” the “Holy Spirit;” at the creation, He “moved upon the face of the waters;” “Whither shall I go,” says the Psalmist, “from Thy Spirit?” He is the Giver of all gifts, “dividing to every man severally as He will;” we are born again “of the Spirit.” To resist Divine grace is to grieve, to tempt, to resist, to quench, to do despite to the Spirit. He is the Comforter, Ruler, and Guide of the Church; He reveals things to come; and blasphemy against Him has never forgiveness. In all such passages, it is surely implied both that the Holy Ghost has a Personality of His own, and that He is God.<sup>206</sup>

In the very first sentence, Newman connected the Holy Spirit with the Son and the Father. If his audience believed that the Son is God, Newman wanted them also to believe the same in regard to the Holy Spirit, for “He is God.” Newman seems to be following Basil who, in his tract *On the Holy Spirit*, maintained the full divinity of the Holy Spirit against the Pneumatomachi, who considered the Holy Spirit only a creature.<sup>207</sup> Newman listed biblical passages in order to prove that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son.

---

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., 358.

<sup>206</sup> *PPS* 6: 359.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. Bulgakov, *The Comforter*, 38.



The Holy Spirit is God in the full sense as the Father and the Son; moreover, the Holy Spirit “has a Personality of His own.” Newman insisted that the person of the Holy Spirit is distinct from that of the Father and that of the Son; indeed, the Holy Spirit has his own titles and functions, which are distinct from those of the Father and the Son: “the Comforter, Ruler, and Guide of the Church,” “the Spirit of Truth,” “the Giver of all gifts” etc. Moreover, “He is the Spirit *of* God;” “He is *in* God.” The word “God” here is transparently attached to the Father;<sup>208</sup> and the prepositions “of” and “in” signify an unbreakable and inseparable relationship of the Holy Spirit with the Father. For Newman, “otherness” in God does not mean division but *communion*.

In treating the Holy Spirit, Newman insisted that the Holy Spirit “proceedeth from the Father.” Newman did not mention “and the Son”; the *filioque* was omitted. This omission is seemingly intentional, for in the paragraph about the Father, Newman did say, “From the Father *and the Son* proceeds eternally the Holy Spirit”<sup>209</sup>; presumably Newman, as an Anglican, did not have any problem with *filioque*. But in the paragraph treating the Holy Spirit, Newman may have wanted to emphasize the priority of the Father in the Trinity. In any case, Newman concisely professed that the Holy Spirit “proceedeth from the Father.” In

---

<sup>208</sup> Newman wrote, according to Athanasius, “the Holy Ghost is never in Scripture called simply ‘Spirit’ without the addition ‘of God,’ or ‘of the Father,’ . . . or of ‘Holy,’ or ‘The Paraclete,’ or ‘of truth.’” (Serap. i. 4-7), *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 304.

<sup>209</sup> *PPS* 6: 357.

addition, Newman did not say the Holy Spirit proceeded from the “substance” of the Father, but simply “from the Father.” This could be another influence of the Cappadocians.<sup>210</sup>

Although Newman began his treatment of the Trinity “in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” by analyzing the personhood and relationship of the divine persons to each other, he emphasized that biblically

we must begin by laying down the great Truth that there is One God in a simple and strict sense, and then go on to speak of Three, which is the way in which the mystery was progressively revealed in Scripture. In the Old Testament we read of the Unity; in the New, we are enlightened in the knowledge of the Trinity.<sup>211</sup>

This is a very basic assertion of the Catholic faith. This is also what Athanasius steadfastly asserted in his Trinitarian theology.<sup>212</sup> The Creed that Newman used in his analysis in this sermon was the Athanasian Creed.<sup>213</sup> Athanasius, however, had left the term “person” an open question, for he was not satisfied with *proposon* and *hypostasis*, nor had he distinguished between *ousia* and *hypostasis*.<sup>214</sup> Newman in 1831 did not have any need to define the term “person”; however, in these three paragraphs concerning the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, Newman distinctively characterized each of the three divine persons by their

---

<sup>210</sup> Newman, in discussing the procession of the Holy Spirit, gave a reference to Gregory of Nazianzen: “The Holy Ghost . . . proceedeth from the Father; Who, inasmuch as He proceedeth from That Source, is no Creature; and inasmuch as He is not Begotten is no Son; and inasmuch as He is between the Unbegotten and the Begotten is God.” (Orat. xxxi. 8), *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 308. Also see Thomas F. Torrance, *The Christian Doctrine of God* (New York: T & T Clark, 1996), 186.

<sup>211</sup> PPS 6: 349-50.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. Thomas F. Torrance, *Trinitarian Perspectives towards Doctrinal Agreement* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 137.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. Ono Ekeh, “John Henry Newman on the Mystery of the Trinity,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 74 (2009): 202-223, at 206-8.

<sup>214</sup> JHN, *Arians of the Fourth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), 438-439; hereafter cited: *Arians*.

own titles, personalities, properties—completely distinct yet unbreakably relational; “otherness” yet in communion: “none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another; but the whole Three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal.”<sup>215</sup> In sum,

The Eternal Three are worshipped by the Catholic Church as distinct, yet One;—the Most High God being wholly the Father, and wholly the Son, and wholly the Holy Ghost; yet the Three Persons being distinct from each other, not merely in name, or by human abstraction, but in very truth, as truly as a fountain is distinct from the stream which flows from it, or the root of a tree from its branches.<sup>216</sup>

This paragraph summarizes Newman’s Trinitarian theology in terms of the formula of the Athanasian Creed: “Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity.”<sup>217</sup> This formula became the very core of his Trinitarian theology.

## II. From 1833 to 1834

### 1. Against Rationalism – Faith in the Holy Trinity

In 1833, Newman did not give any sermons on the Trinity;<sup>218</sup> however, this was the year that he published his book on *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, in which he discussed the mystery of the Trinity in depth.<sup>219</sup> In 1834, Newman gave a special sermon on Trinity Sunday on “The Gospel, a Trust Committed to Us” in which he raised the question: “Why the doctrine of the Trinity itself should be essential; and if it is essential nevertheless, why should

---

<sup>215</sup> *PPS* 6: 360.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 352.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, 360.

<sup>218</sup> Cf. Placid Murray, ed., *John Henry Newman Sermons 1824-1843*, 1: 365-6.

<sup>219</sup> This book will be discussed later in relation to points in Newman’s sermons.

not any other [doctrine be]?”<sup>220</sup> In other words, what is the position of the mystery of the Trinity in matters of faith? For Newman, other doctrines such as the Incarnation, death and resurrection, ascension, etc. are “in the series of doctrines from that of the Trinity in Unity, which is the foundation of the whole Dispensation.”<sup>221</sup> Newman considered the doctrine of the Trinity as the foundation of all the doctrines of faith: “This doctrine . . . is necessary to be believed by every one in order to salvation.”<sup>222</sup> This is the “Gospel doctrine,” which is “delivered down to us from the first ages, together with the original baptismal or Apostles’ Creed itself.”<sup>223</sup>

As all nations confess to the existence of a God, so all branches of the Church confess to the Gospel doctrine; as the tradition of men witnesses to a Moral Governor and Judge, so the tradition of Saints witnesses to the Father Almighty, and His only Son, and the Holy Ghost.”<sup>224</sup>

For Newman, the doctrine of the Trinity was found within the two main sources of revelation, Scripture and Tradition. We believe in the mystery of the Trinity, not only on the basis of the Scriptures, but also from the witnesses of “the tradition of Saints” and “the original baptismal or Apostles’ Creed.” Newman once again reminded his audience that the Trinitarian doctrine is not the result of human reason, deduction and arguments. The doctrine comes from the very revelation of God in the Scriptures and tradition of the Church: “It is put

---

<sup>220</sup> JHN, “The Gospel, a Trust Committed to Us,” *PPS* 2: 255-273, at 272.

<sup>221</sup> *PPS* 2: 271.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, 257.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*

into our hands.” Therefore, Newman insisted, “We have but to commit it to our hearts, to preserve it inviolate, and to deliver it over to our posterity.”<sup>225</sup>

Newman continually repeated such assertions because he wanted to alert his audiences against what he called “a fashion of the day.”<sup>226</sup> This fashion—a type of rationalism—supposed that “all insisting upon precise Articles of Faith is injurious to the cause of spiritual religion, and inconsistent with an enlightened view of it.”<sup>227</sup> This was, for Newman, an attempt of “reasoners of this age,” who wanted to lump Articles of Faith together, “to weigh and measure them, to analyze, simplify, refashion them; to reduce them to system, to arrange them into primary and secondary, to harmonize them into an intelligible dependence upon each other.”<sup>228</sup> He considered such an approach a great harm to revealed Truths, for “it argues a deficient insight into the principles and ends, a narrow comprehension of the spirit of His Revelation.”<sup>229</sup> The worst thing about such reasoning is that it taught people to scrutinize doctrinal Truths, “with a view of separating the inward holy sense from the form of words, in which the Spirit has indissolubly lodged them.”<sup>230</sup>

This “fashion” indeed distorted revealed truths. It used the revelation of God for human purposes. Revelation, for Newman, is “beyond the reach of our present reason.”<sup>231</sup> In a series of letters to his brother, Charles Robert Newman, in 1825, Newman asserted many

---

<sup>225</sup> Ibid.

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., 259.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., 260.

<sup>231</sup> JHN to Charles Robert Newman (14 April 1825), *LD* 1: 224-228, at 226.

times: “The very idea of a revelation seems almost to imply the revelation of something indiscoverable by human reason.”<sup>232</sup> He strongly insisted:

I deprecate the practice of measuring those contents [of Revelation] by any preconceived standard or morals or philosophy . . . . The *credentials* then of a revelation are for the most part distinct from its contents.<sup>233</sup>

Rather, revealed truths should be approached in a positive frame of mind. Only when we trust in God, can we “expect to possess real knowledge and true peace.”<sup>234</sup>

In addition, the “reasoners of this age” often argued that “God is love.” And on the basis of God’s love, they denied “the doctrine of eternal punishment,” for it is “inconsistent with this notion of Infinite Love.”<sup>235</sup> They then resolved “such expressions as the ‘wrath of God’ into a figure of speech.”<sup>236</sup> As a result, they also denied the atonement, “viewed as a real reconciliation of an offended God to His creatures.”<sup>237</sup> For them,

the object of the Gospel Revelation is merely practical, and therefore, . . . theological doctrines are altogether unnecessary, mere speculations, and hindrances to the extension of religion; or, if not purely injurious, at least requiring modification.<sup>238</sup>

Accordingly, “Creeds are but fetters on souls,” and “faith is a mere temper and a principle, not the acceptance for Christ’s sake of a certain collection of Articles.”<sup>239</sup>

Newman’s critique of rationalism seems like that of the Fathers of the Church against Sabellianism and Arianism. For Newman, this “fashion of the day” is no less dangerous than

<sup>232</sup> JHN to Charles Robert Newman (7 July 1825), *LD* 1: 240-241, at 240.

<sup>233</sup> *LD* 1: 226.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>235</sup> *PPS* 2: 260.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*, 261.

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>239</sup> *Ibid.*

the heresies of the early Church. Like the heretics of the early Church, the rationalists' theories and arguments were against the orthodox teachings of the Church, distorting the revealed truths and turning Scriptures into "materials" of reason.

Newman insisted on the priority of "the unchangeable Apostolic Rule of Faith . . . of which we are bound to be so jealous."<sup>240</sup> He defined faith as a "Form of sound words," for we have to profess loudly; faith is also an "Outline," which it is our duty "to fill up and complete in all its parts."<sup>241</sup> The essential point of faith, as an "Outline" containing Articles, is none other than the doctrine of Christ, specifically "the Crucifixion of Christ," which is "one essential part of the outline of sound words, preached and delivered by the Apostle."<sup>242</sup> In this sermon, "The Gospel, a Trust Committed to Us," Newman did not analyze why the crucifixion of Christ is essential; however, he did not separate the crucifixion from the resurrection: "The doctrine of the Resurrection is added to that of the Crucifixion."<sup>243</sup> Five years later in 1839, in an essay on Ignatius of Antioch, he insisted that "those who omit the Resurrection in their view of the divine economy, are as really defective in faith as if they omitted the Crucifixion."<sup>244</sup>

Again in response to rationalism, "God's grace" is apparently Newman's main point. Newman took Timothy as an example. He was a man of faith. He received the sacred truths, and

---

<sup>240</sup> Ibid.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid., 262.

<sup>243</sup> Ibid.

<sup>244</sup> JHN, *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. I (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907), 217.

by God's grace, he was enabled so to commit them [sacred truths]; and they being thus transmitted from generation to generation, have, through God's continued mercy, reached even unto us "upon whom the ends of the world are come."<sup>245</sup>

Faith, for Newman, always involves grace. It is grace which helps believers to receive revealed truths. It is grace which helps believers to activate their faith. It is grace which has transmitted the sacred truths from generation to generation. As in the sermon's beginning, Newman insisted that the mystery of the Trinity is perceived only by *knowledge through grace* or *knowledge of faith*. Five years earlier in 1829, Newman had advanced this view in his sermon, "Truth Hidden When not Sought After": "Ability of mind is a *gift*, and faith is a *grace*."<sup>246</sup> In other words, grace is God's prompting through the Holy Spirit that enables the mind to receive sacred truths and helps the person to make the act of faith.<sup>247</sup> God initiates revelation and God's grace enables the person to accept revelation. Here is an echo of Augustine, who, in interpreting Romans 9, 10-29, said: "A man begins to receive grace from the moment when he begins to believe in God."<sup>248</sup> For Augustine, "grace precedes faith"; the implanting of grace in the soul by God is necessary as "a preliminary condition for the production of real faith."<sup>249</sup> Aquinas also quoted Augustine: "The most certain sciences are

---

<sup>245</sup> *PPS* 2: 268.

<sup>246</sup> JHN, "Truth Hidden When not Sought After," *PPS* 8: 185-200, at 188.

<sup>247</sup> Cf. John R. Connolly, *John Henry Newman* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005), 19; hereafter cited Connolly, *John Henry Newman*.

<sup>248</sup> J. H. S. Burleigh ed., *Augustine's Early Writings* (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1953), 386.

<sup>249</sup> Augustine, *On the Gift of Perseverance*, 41, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. V, Peter Holmes, trans. (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1887): 542.



like things lit up by the sun so that they may be seen. But it is God who gives the light.”<sup>250</sup>

Aquinas concluded, “Perfect be the human mind, it cannot by reasoning know any truth without the light of God, which belongs to the aid of grace.”<sup>251</sup>

When mentioning grace, Newman identified the particular role of the Holy Spirit. The sacred truths that we receive are through grace, i.e., through the activity of the Holy Spirit. It is the “work of His Unseen Spirit,” which is “beyond the power of man to insure or ascertain.”<sup>252</sup> The Creeds, for Newman, are sacred truths that the Church has received. And the Church as “the pillar and the ground of the Truth”<sup>253</sup> preserves and confesses the Creeds everyday “in the Office for Baptism,” “in the Visitation of the Sick,” “in the Communion Service, in the midst of its solemn praises to the God of all grace, when Angels and Archangels are to be summoned to join in the Thanksgiving.”<sup>254</sup>

It is in the same spirit that the most precise and systematic of all the Creeds, the Athanasian, is rather, as the form of it shows, a hymn of praise to the Eternal Trinity; it being meet and right at festive seasons to bring forth before our God every jewel of the Mysteries entrusted to us, to show that those of which He gave us we have lost none.<sup>255</sup>

Newman called the Creed “a hymn of praise to the Eternal Trinity,” for by reciting it believers profess their faith in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. All the mystery of the Trinity is proclaimed in the Creed. The Creed is not a result of reason’s deduction; it is a

---

<sup>250</sup> Aquinas, *ST*, I.2ae, Q. 109, Art. I, 2, A. M. Fairweather, ed., *Aquinas on Nature and Grace – Selections from the Summa Theologica* [sic] (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 138.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> *PPS* 2: 269.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid., 263.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., 270.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid.

“hymn of praise,” for it comes from God and is received and sung by hearts. The Creed is not there to satisfy arguments, but rather to be confessed and believed. “Such is faith as it exists in the multitude of those who believe, arising from their sense of the presence of God,” as Newman explained in his sermon “Faith without Sight.” The Creed was “originally certified to them by the inward voice of conscience.”<sup>256</sup> The voice of conscience does not give proofs of faith, but awakens and step by step leads believers to faith in God. When believers initially profess their faith, their reason could not completely perceive the mysteries, but Newman reminded them that “faith is content with but a little light to begin its journey by.”<sup>257</sup> With this “little light,” believers begin to act upon their faith, which “looks off from self to Christ; and instead of seeking impatiently for some personal assurance, is set by obedience, saying, ‘Here am I; send me.’”<sup>258</sup> “It is in like manner,” Newman concluded,

towards every institution of Christ, His Church, His Sacraments, and His Ministers, it acts not as a disputer of this world, but as the disciple of Him who appointed them. Lastly, it rests contented with the revelation made to it; it has “found the Messiah,” and that is enough.<sup>259</sup>

## **2. A Pneumatological Introduction to the Economy of Salvation**

There is not only the “inward voice of conscience” within the faithful but also “the leadings of God’s Spirit within them.”<sup>260</sup> In 1834, in his sermon “The Indwelling Spirit,” Newman beautifully described the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the faithful.

---

<sup>256</sup> JHN, “Faith without Sight,” *PPS* 2: 13-25, at 19.

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>260</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

The Holy Ghost, I have said, dwells in body and soul, as in a temple . . . . His indwelling is far more perfect; for He is all-knowing and omnipresent, He is able to search into all our thoughts, and penetrate into every motive of the heart. Therefore, He pervades us (if it may be so said) as light pervades a building, or as a sweet perfume in the folds of some honourable robe; so that, in Scripture language, we are said to be in Him, and He in us.<sup>261</sup>

For Newman, the Holy Spirit indwells within the believer not simply to play the role of leading or guiding him to faith in God, but moreover sanctifying and transforming him so that he becomes a “partaker of the divine nature,” and has “power” or authority “to become the son of God.” He becomes “a new creation.”<sup>262</sup> “His rank is new; his parentage and service new.” He is “of God,” and “is not his own.”<sup>263</sup> By the coming of the Holy Spirit, “all guilt and pollution are burned away as by fire, the devil is driven forth, sin, original and actual, is forgiven, and the whole man is consecrated to God.”<sup>264</sup> Newman, therefore, called the Holy Spirit “the earnest” that Christ has died for us; He is our “seal unto the day of redemption.”<sup>265</sup> The thought of the Holy Spirit and the terms “earnest” and “seal” here probably Newman borrowed from Cyril and Athanasius.

Get you *the earnest of the Holy Spirit*, through faith, that you may be able to be received *into the everlasting habitations*.<sup>266</sup>

He [Holy Spirit] will give gifts of grace of every kind, if thou grieve Him not by sin; for it is written, *And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye have been sealed unto the day of redemption*.<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>261</sup> JHN, “The Indwelling Spirit,” *PPS* 2: 217-231, at 222.

<sup>262</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>263</sup> *Ibid.*, 223.

<sup>264</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>266</sup> Cyril, Lecture I, 2, *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril*, John Henry Newman, trans. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845), 11.

<sup>267</sup> Cyril, Lecture XVI, 37, *ibid.*, 238.

From Him [Christ] . . . we have begun to receive the unction and the seal, John saying, *And ye have an unction from the Holy One*; and the Apostle, *And ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise*.<sup>268</sup>

What Cyril and Athanasius had said was echoed by Newman. Indeed, the Holy Spirit is our unction and seal of salvation, through him we become “partakers of the divine nature.”<sup>269</sup> Newman described the activity of the Holy Spirit:

The Holy Ghost by whom we are new-born, reveals to us the God of mercies, and bids us recognise and adore Him as our Father with a true heart. He impresses on us our Heavenly Father’s image, which we lost when Adam fell, and disposes us to seek His presence by the very instinct of our new nature. He gives us back a portion of that freedom in willing and doing, of that uprightness and innocence, in which Adam was created. He unites us to all holy beings, as before we had relationship with evil. He restores for us that broken bond, which, proceeding from above, connects together into one blessed family all that is anywhere holy and eternal, and separates it off from the rebel world which comes to nought. Being then the sons of God, and one with Him, our souls mount up and cry to Him continually . . . “ . . . Abba, Father.”<sup>270</sup>

This activity of the Holy Spirit, Newman summarized in one word: “Regeneration.”<sup>271</sup>

Newman had various names for the Holy Spirit which expressed His work in the economy of salvation: “The life-giving Spirit,” “the Soul of universal nature,” “the Strength of man and beast,” “the Guide of faith,” “the Witness against sin,” “the inward Light of patriarchs and prophets,” “the Grace abiding in the Christian soul,” and “the Lord and Ruler of the Church.”<sup>272</sup> After praising the different titles of the Holy Spirit, Newman immediately insisted:

---

<sup>268</sup> Athanasius, Discourse I, 13, 79, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 1: 228.

<sup>269</sup> Cyril, Lecture I, 3, *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril*, 11.

<sup>270</sup> *PPS* 2: 224-5.

<sup>271</sup> *Ibid.*, 223.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.

Therefore let us ever praise the Father Almighty, who is the First Source of all perfection, in and together with His Co-equal Son and Spirit, through whose gracious ministrations we have been given to see “what manner of love” it is wherewith the Father has loved us.<sup>273</sup>

Newman did not consider the activities of the Holy Spirit as a separate work of a divine person. He envisioned all the work of the third divine person in the plan of the Trinity, where the Almighty Father is “the First Source of all perfection.” “Almighty” is the special term that Newman used only for the Father. He did not use this term in speaking of the Son or the Holy Spirit. Newman used this term to emphasize the priority of the Father as “Cause,” “Source,” “Fountain-head of Divinity.”<sup>274</sup>

In the above passage, in addition, in order to see the unity of the Trinity in the work of salvation, Newman named the Holy Spirit “the Infinite Love”<sup>275</sup> “the Eternal Love whereby the Father and the Son have dwelt in each other.”<sup>276</sup> Newman’s view that within the unity of the Trinity in the work of salvation, the Father is the *First Source* of all perfection, operating *in and together* with the Son and the Holy Spirit, reflects the thoughts of the Fathers, as Newman quoted:

There is but one Face ([*eidōs*], character) of Godhead, which is also in the Word, and One God, the Father, existing by Himself according as He is above all; and appearing in the Son according as He pervades all things; and in the Spirit according as in Him

---

<sup>273</sup> Ibid.

<sup>274</sup> Ibid., 224. Newman, in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, gave an interpretation of the “Almighty Father”: “The idea of an Almighty, All-perfect Being, in its fulness involves the belief of His being the Father of a co-equal Son, and this is the first advance which a habit of devout meditation makes towards the intellectual apprehension of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as soon as that doctrine has been received with the claim and the sanction of its having been revealed.” *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 107.

<sup>275</sup> PPS 2: 217.

<sup>276</sup> Ibid., 229.

He acts in all things through the Word. And thus we confess God to be One through the Trinity.<sup>277</sup>

We preach One God by One Son with the Holy Ghost . . . The Father through the Son with Holy Ghost bestows all things. . . All things have been made from the Father through the Son in Holy Ghost.<sup>278</sup>

As the “First Source” was the title of the Father, Newman also named him the “Divine Author of our salvation.”<sup>279</sup> Newman did not use this name for the Son and the Holy Spirit, but insisted that our salvation was carried out “through the Son” and “perfected in the Holy Spirit.” Newman asserted, “By His [the Holy Spirit’s] wonder-working grace all things tend to perfection.”<sup>280</sup> The perfection to which the Holy Spirit leads is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, “the Living and Eternal Law of Truth and Perfection.”<sup>281</sup>

Every faculty of the mind, every design, pursuit, subject of thought, is hallowed in its degree by the abiding vision of Christ, as Lord, Saviour, and Judge. All solemn, reverent, thankful, and devoted feelings, all that is noble, all that is choice in the regenerate soul, all that is self-denying in conduct, and zealous in action, is drawn forth and offered up by the Spirit as a living sacrifice to the Son of God.<sup>282</sup>

Indeed, Jesus Christ is the “focus point” of all the work of the Holy Spirit. In his sermon on the Holy Spirit, Newman’s first sentence began: “God, the Son,” who has revealed “the Father to His creatures from without; God the Holy Ghost, by inward communications.”<sup>283</sup> Newman then devoted the first paragraph of the sermon to introducing the Son in his relationship with the Father in the immanent life and in the economic plan. Just

---

<sup>277</sup> Athanasius, Orat. iii. § 15, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 76.

<sup>278</sup> Cyril, Cat. xvi. 4, 24, *ibid.*, 2: 77.

<sup>279</sup> *PPS* 2: 224.

<sup>280</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>281</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid.*

as the Father sent the Son, the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father. Then Newman pointed out that “the condescension of the Blessed Spirit is as incomprehensible as that of the Son.”<sup>284</sup> One might say then that Newman began his Pneumatology from Christology, or, in other words, he viewed Pneumatology in the light of Christology: “The heavenly Gift is not simply called the Holy Ghost, or the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of Christ, that we might clearly understand, that He comes to us from and instead of Christ.”<sup>285</sup> Newman continued:

The Comforter who has come instead of Christ, must have vouchsafed to come in the same sense in which Christ came; I mean, that He has come, not merely in the way of gifts, or of influences, or of operations, as He came to the Prophets, for then Christ’s going away would be a loss, and not a gain, and the Spirit’s presence would be a mere pledge, not an earnest; but He comes to us as Christ came, by a real and personal visitation . . . . We are able to see that the Saviour, when once He entered into this world, never so departed as to suffer things to be as before He came; for He still is with us, not in mere gifts, but by the substitution of His Spirit for Himself, and that, both in the Church and in the souls of individual Christians.<sup>286</sup>

Newman here depicted his Pneumatology in three points. First, the Holy Spirit is not simply called “the Spirit of God but the Spirit of Christ.” There is only one Holy Spirit who is of the Father and of the Son; accordingly, He plays the role of *communio* of the Father and the Son, as Newman said: “He Himself perchance in His mysterious nature, is the *Eternal Love* whereby the Father and the Son have dwelt in each other.”<sup>287</sup> In his very “mysterious nature,” the Holy Spirit is the “Eternal Love” of the Father and the Son. It is because of the Spirit and *in his very person*, that the Father and the Son are one in unity. Ratzinger summarized this point by saying that the Holy Spirit is “the *communio* of the Father and the

---

<sup>284</sup> Ibid., 218.

<sup>285</sup> Ibid., 220.

<sup>286</sup> Ibid., 220-221.

<sup>287</sup> Ibid., 229.

Son . . . The Spirit is Person as unity, unity as Person.”<sup>288</sup> Although Newman beautifully highlighted this point, he did not develop it further. This theme of the Holy Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son was profoundly developed by Augustine, for whom *Love* is a proper name for the Holy Spirit. As proceeding from the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is their mutual bond. The Holy Spirit is the key to understanding “the ineffable communion of the Father and the Son.”<sup>289</sup> Aquinas later followed Augustine in saying that in the person of the Holy Spirit as Love, the relation of the Father and the Son is considered as that of Lover and Beloved.<sup>290</sup> In the twentieth century, Yves Congar also developed this point:

The Father and the Son are for each other, they are relative to each other. The Spirit is the one in whom they are united, in whom they receive each other, in whom they communicate with one another, and in whom they rest.<sup>291</sup>

Second, the Holy Spirit came “to us as Christ came, by a real and personal visitation.” Newman here repeated what he had said in 1831 in his sermon, “The Holy Spirit is a *Person*.” The Holy Spirit is not substance; he proceeds from [the person of] the Father. In the language of the Cappadocians, “person ‘causes’ God to be.”<sup>292</sup> The Holy Spirit is a divine person. The coming of the Holy Spirit is not simply his gift or grace but himself, *real* and *personal*. Believers receive “not the mere gifts of the Spirit, but His very presence, Himself, by a real

---

<sup>288</sup> Joseph Ratzinger, “The Holy Spirit as Communio: Concerning the Relationship of Pneumatology and Spirituality in Augustine,” *Communio* 25 (Summer 1998): 326.

<sup>289</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity* 5,12, *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 45: 190.

<sup>290</sup> Matthew Levering, *Scripture and Metaphysics: Aquinas and the Renewal of Trinitarian Theology* (New York: Blackwell, 2004), 194.

<sup>291</sup> Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. III, David Smith, trans. (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2001), 148.

<sup>292</sup> Zizioulas, *Communion & Otherness*, 192.



not a figurative indwelling.”<sup>293</sup> The Spirit is a divine person distinct from the Father and the Son, having a significant role in the economy of salvation. His work, however, is not separated from that of the Son, for he “comes to us from and instead of Christ.” We should note that “from Christ” here is not a reference to the *filioque*; Newman was speaking in the sense of the economy. Newman himself personally accepted the *filioque*, as he indicated in his sermon “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity.” “Instead of Christ” is understood as a continuation of the work of Christ, but not in the sense that Christ finished and then the Spirit continued. Christ in “His Spirit” is completing his work. Newman clarified this point by insisting that Christ “never so departed as to suffer things to be as before He came; for He still is with us, not in mere gifts, but by the substitution of His Spirit for Himself.”<sup>294</sup> Christ now lives in the Holy Spirit. In Pauline terms, the Spirit is the Spirit of the Glorified Lord; and Christ is the “life-giving Spirit” (1 Cor 15: 45). The ongoing work of the Holy Spirit is the ongoing work of Christ. As Newman stated:

The Spirit came especially to “glorify” Christ; and vouchsafes to be a shining light within the Church and the individual Christian, reflecting the Saviour of the world in all His perfections, all His offices, all His works.<sup>295</sup>

Third, the work of Holy Spirit is “in the Church and in the souls of individual Christians.” In the Church, the Holy Spirit “inspired” and “directed” the Evangelists “to record the life of Christ.” He has illuminated “the birth, the life, the death and resurrection of Christ.” Newman interestingly said that it is the Holy Spirit who “has made history to be

---

<sup>293</sup> *PPS* 2: 220.

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

<sup>295</sup> *Ibid.*, 227.

doctrine.”<sup>296</sup> In addition, the Spirit “continued His formation of the Church, superintending and overruling its human instruments, and bringing out our Saviour’s words and works, and the Apostles’ illustrations of them, into acts of obedience and permanent Ordinances.”<sup>297</sup> Moreover, he joins the Church’s “triumphant hymns in honour of Christ, and listens wistfully to her voice in inspired Scripture, the voice of the Bride calling upon and blest in the Beloved.”<sup>298</sup> The life of the Church, for Newman, cannot be separated from the Holy Spirit. Newman did not call the Holy Spirit “the soul of the Church,” yet he did show that the Holy Spirit is the *life* of the Church, *working* in the Church in order to *form* her as the Church of Christ, the Bride of Christ waiting for the coming of the Bridegroom.

According to Newman, “in the souls of individual Christians,” the Holy Spirit “impresses the Divine image.”<sup>299</sup> The Spirit regenerates the soul with his “Living Water.” Newman called the Holy Spirit “the Gift of grace,” which “manifests itself in the regenerate soul.”<sup>300</sup> Newman also called the Holy Spirit “Heavenly Gift.”<sup>301</sup> He is the Gift of the Father and the Son for us. This “Heavenly Gift” will fix “the eyes of our mind upon the Divine Author of our salvation,”<sup>302</sup> leading us to the Father. He dwells within our hearts and utters the cry, “Abba, Father;” and with “the infallible voice of Him,” he “maketh intercession for

---

<sup>296</sup> Ibid., 227-228.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., 228.

<sup>298</sup> Ibid.

<sup>299</sup> Ibid., 223.

<sup>300</sup> Ibid., 224.

<sup>301</sup> Ibid., 220, 224.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., 224.

the Saints in God's way."<sup>303</sup> Moreover, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit raises the soul, "not only to the thought of God, but of Christ also."<sup>304</sup> It is the Spirit, who conveys the "system of Truth . . . to the heart of each individual Christian in whom He dwells." Thus the Spirit is the one who edifies the whole of humankind in faith and holiness.<sup>305</sup> For Newman, what the Holy Spirit "is in heaven, that He is abundantly on earth." The Spirit always "lives in the Christian's heart, as the never-failing fount of charity." "Where He is, 'there is liberty' from the tyranny of sin, from the dread."<sup>306</sup> There will be the joy of the Gospel, "the hope of heaven and the harmony of a pure heart, the triumph of self-mastery, sober thoughts, and a contented mind."<sup>307</sup> All will be drawn into his perfection, "being joined together in His mysterious work."<sup>308</sup>

Newman's view of the Holy Spirit as "Gift," "Heavenly Gift," "Gift of grace" could have been taken from Athanasius, Basil and Augustine, as Newman discussed in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*. Athanasius said, "The Spirit is God's gift." Similarly Basil asserted, "Spirit is in us as a gift from God."<sup>309</sup> For Augustine, his favorite text about the Holy Spirit as Love and Gift was Romans 5: 5: "The love of God has been poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us." Augustine also appealed to John 4: 7-14, when Jesus in conversation with the Samaritan woman was talking about the "gift of

---

<sup>303</sup> Ibid., 226.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid., 226-227.

<sup>305</sup> Ibid., 228.

<sup>306</sup> Ibid., 230.

<sup>307</sup> Ibid.

<sup>308</sup> Ibid.

<sup>309</sup> Athanasius, Orat. ii. § 18; and Basil, de Sp. S. 57, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 307.

God” of which he is the Giver. Augustine also commented on Hebrews 6:4, where he spoke of the faithful who “have once been enlightened and tasted the heavenly gift and shared in the Holy Spirit.”<sup>310</sup> Augustine clearly described the Holy Spirit as Love and Gift in his *On the Trinity*.

In this Trinity only the Son is called the Word of God, and . . . only the Holy Spirit is the Gift of God, and . . . only He, of whom the Son was begotten, and from whom the Holy Spirit principally proceeds, is God the Father.... Substance is not one thing, and love another thing, but that substance itself is love, and that love itself is substance, whether in the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit, and yet . . . the Holy Spirit is specially called Love.<sup>311</sup>

With the title “Gift,” Newman said that Augustine made “it a personal characteristic of the Third Person in the Holy Trinity,”<sup>312</sup> for “the Holy Spirit came forth, not as one born, but as one given.”<sup>313</sup> For Augustine, “the Gift of the Holy Spirit is nothing else than the Holy Spirit . . . for He is so given as the Gift of God that He also gives Himself as God.”<sup>314</sup> Newman, probably influenced by Augustine, did emphasize that the Holy Spirit “manifested Himself as the source of various gifts;” and in giving gifts He gives “His very presence, *Himself*,”<sup>315</sup> He comes to us “by a *real* and *personal* visitation.”<sup>316</sup> He “can be *personally* present at once with every Christian.” That personal presence at once manifests “the divinity

---

<sup>310</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 15: 33, *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 45: 498. Also see Joseph Ratzinger, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church as Communion* (New York: Ignatius Press, 2005), 47.

<sup>311</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 15: 29, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 307.

<sup>312</sup> *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 307.

<sup>313</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity* 5; 15, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 307.

<sup>314</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity* 15: 36, *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 45: 502.

<sup>315</sup> *PPS* 2: 219-221.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

of the Holy Spirit,” for only “God himself” can do it.<sup>317</sup> Newman in fact followed the Fathers, particularly Augustine, to present the Holy Spirit as a Gift given by the Father and the Son and also giving Himself as God to every believer by his *real* and *personal* presence within them.

In sum, Newman was giving his audiences a Pneumatological introduction to the economy of salvation. Newman emphasized the Father as the “First Source” of all, operating in and together with the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son. The Holy Spirit is the “Eternal Love” and “Communion” of the Father and the Son. He is person as communion and communion as person. The Holy Spirit is the Gift given to us by the Father and the Son, but simultaneously he is also giving himself as God to us, being within us, helping us to cry out “Abba, Father,” and leading us to the Truth, Jesus Christ. With this introduction, one might say, Newman was placing a Pneumatological ground for understanding the economy of salvation.

### **3. A Christological Introduction to the Economy of Salvation**

Newman’s last sermon of 1834, “The Incarnation,” was preached on Christmas Day. Newman began the sermon by speaking of the “Incarnation of the Eternal Word,”<sup>318</sup> rather than “the Incarnation of the Son of God.” For him, this terminology manifests a salvific view in the economic love of God:

The Word was from the beginning, the Only-begotten Son *of* God. Before all worlds were created, while as yet time was not, He was in existence, *in* the bosom of the Eternal Father, God from God, and Light from Light, supremely blessed in knowing

---

<sup>317</sup> Ibid., 222.

<sup>318</sup> JHN, “The Incarnation,” *PPS* 2: 26-40, at 26.

and being known of Him, and receiving all divine perfections from Him, yet ever One with Him who begat Him. As it is said in the opening of the Gospel: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” If we may dare conjecture, He is called the Word of God, as mediating between the Father and all creatures; bringing them into being, fashioning them, giving the world its laws, imparting reason and conscience to creatures of a higher order, and revealing to them in due season the knowledge of God’s will. And to us Christians He is especially the Word in that great mystery commemorated today, whereby He became flesh, and redeemed us from a state of sin.<sup>319</sup>

Newman asserted that the Word was the “Only-begotten Son of God.” These two titles of “Word” and “Son” are really very significant, since they describe two aspects of the second divine person. In his *Arians of the Fourth Century* in 1833, Newman explained that “the title of the *Son* marks His derivation and distinction from the Father, that of the *Word* denotes His inseparable inherence in the Divine Unity.”<sup>320</sup> In addition, “Only-begotten,” refers to the “heavenly nature” of the Son, and it “relates to something higher than any event occurring in time.”<sup>321</sup> Newman also noted that the term “generation” (*genesis*) for the Fathers, signifies “the fact of the Son’s full participation in the divinity of Him who is His Father.”<sup>322</sup> Newman used images to highlight the relationship of the Father and the Son such as “the sun and its radiance, the fountain and the stream, the root and its shoots, a body and its exhalation, fire and the fire kindled from it.”<sup>323</sup> And in order to preserve the priority and divinity of the Father, Newman illustrated the generation of the Son from the Father as

---

<sup>319</sup> *PPS* 2: 29-30; italics added for emphasis.

<sup>320</sup> *Arians*, 157.

<sup>321</sup> *Ibid.*, 158-159.

<sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*, 162.

<sup>323</sup> *Ibid.*

when a light is kindled from another, the original light remains entire and undiminished, though you borrow from it many like itself; so That which proceeds from God, is called at once God, and the Son of God, and Both are One.<sup>324</sup>

In addition, Newman used the term “generation” in an economic sense, which “is also applied to certain events in our Lord’s mediatorial history: to His resurrection from the dead [“You are my son; this day I have *begotten* you” Act 13:33]; and . . . to His original mission in the beginning of all things to create the world; and to His manifestation in the flesh.”<sup>325</sup> In sum, Newman concluded that the generation of the Son is a “reiteration of the One Infinite Nature of God, a communicated divinity, in the Person of our Lord.”<sup>326</sup> It is noteworthy that Newman used the term “communicated divinity”—a term that expresses a communication in the Triune God. The divinity of God is not something passive and tranquil but very active and alive as the sun, or fountain, or fire, which always gives and generates but remains fully as it is. The divinity of the Son is called “communicated divinity,” for the Son is always in communion with the Father, and received his divinity from the Father. Newman used this term indeed both to signify the origin of the Son and the Son’s relationship with the Father. For Newman, the titles “Son” and “Word” together “witness to the mystery, that He [the Son] is at once *from*, and yet *in*, the Immaterial, Incomprehensible God.”<sup>327</sup>

Newman was particularly interested in the title “the Word.” When speaking about the mystery of the Incarnation, Newman began with “The Incarnation of the Eternal Word.” For Newman, the title “the Word” not only “denotes His inseparable inherence in the Divine

---

<sup>324</sup> Ibid.

<sup>325</sup> Ibid., 158-159.

<sup>326</sup> Ibid., 163.

<sup>327</sup> Ibid., 157.

Unity,” but specifically signifies the role of the second divine person in the relationship of God the Creator and his creation. According to Newman, the Word of God should be understood in two ways: “First, to denote His essential presence in the Father, in as full a sense as the attribute of wisdom is essential to Him; secondly, His mediatorship, as the Interpreter or Word between God and His creatures.”<sup>328</sup> It is the role of “bringing into being, fashioning, giving laws, imparting reason and conscience, revealing God, and finally becoming flesh and redeeming the humans from a state of sin.”<sup>329</sup> However, in order to eschew the tendency of obliterating the notion of the Word’s personality that Sabellianism introduced, which “inferred that the Divine Word was but the temporary manifestation of God’s glory in the man Christ,”<sup>330</sup> Newman asserted that when the Fathers of the Church spoke of the Word, they “speak of Him as the Word in an *hypostasis*, the permanent, real, and living Word.”<sup>331</sup> In 1831, in his sermon on the “Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” Newman asserted the “Son is a Person”; two years later in *Arians of the Fourth Century*, Newman went a step further in insisting that the Word is an *hypostasis*. This time Newman did not use the English word *person*, but the Greek word *hypostasis*, which is the original term that the Fathers used in talking about the divine persons of the Trinity. In 1831, Newman did not mention the term *hypostasis*; he used the word *person* without any specific definition. In

---

<sup>328</sup> Ibid., 169.

<sup>329</sup> *PPS* 2: 30.

<sup>330</sup> *Arians*, 171.

<sup>331</sup> Ibid.



1833, Newman noted that “the word *Person* requires the rejection of various popular senses, and a careful definition.”<sup>332</sup> He continued:

The word *Person*, used in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, would on first hearing suggest Tritheism to one who made the word synonymous with *individual*; and Unitarianism to another, who accepted it in the classical sense of a mask or *character*.<sup>333</sup>

Newman wanted to avoid these errors in his Trinitarian theology; thus, in 1833, he used the term *hypostasis*. For Newman, when we speak of the “*Person* of Christ,” “we mean to include . . . the two *natures* which are predicated of Him.”<sup>334</sup>

In 1833, when Newman published his book, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, which discussed *hypostasis* and the “Person of Christ,” George Hill and Alexander Hill also published *Lectures in Divinity*, which devoted a chapter to discussing the “Person of Christ.”<sup>335</sup> In his Notebooks between January 1827 and his death 1834, Samuel Taylor Coleridge included the argument about the “Person of Christ” by Unitarians, who viewed Christ as a mere man although they regarded him as a Messiah.<sup>336</sup> In 1834, there was a discussion on Unitarianism between Rev. John Scott and Rev. Daniel Bagot, in which the “Person of Christ” was the main point of their arguments.<sup>337</sup> In sum, the “Person of Christ”

---

<sup>332</sup> Ibid., 432.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid., 433.

<sup>334</sup> Ibid.

<sup>335</sup> George Hill and Alexander Hill, *Lectures in Divinity* (Edinburgh: Waugh and Innes, 1833), 447-461.

<sup>336</sup> Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge: 1827-1834* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 5480-1.

<sup>337</sup> John Scott Porter, Daniel Bagot, *Authentic Report of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy Between the Rev. John Scott Porter and the Rev. Daniel Bagot M. A., Held on April 14, 1834* (London: Simms & M’Intyre, 1834, original from Oxford University).

was a significant theological issue during the first decade of the Oxford Movement (1833-1843).<sup>338</sup>

Newman examined the long and complex history of the term person (*hypostasis*). He acknowledged that “at least in the West, and in St. Athanasius’s day, it was usual to speak of one *hypostasis*, as of one *ousia*, of the Divine Nature.”<sup>339</sup> Even Athanasius had not really clarified its meaning:

In his *In illud Omnia* he [Athanasius] speaks of “the three perfect *Hypostases*.” On the other hand, he makes *ousia* and *hypostasis* synonymous in *Orat.* iii. 65, 66, *Orat.* iv. 1 and 33 fin.<sup>340</sup>

Newman then commented, “It is difficult to believe that so accurate a thinker as Athanasius really used an important term in two distinct, nay contrasted senses.”<sup>341</sup> John Zizioulas later made comments similar to Newman’s; in any case, the current meaning of the term *hypostasis* is due to the Cappadocians.<sup>342</sup> Newman indeed recognized the problem, but did not show how the Cappadocians had defined the term. Newman explained the meaning of the term *hypostasis*.

This, then, is what I conceive that he [Athanasius] means by sometimes speaking of one, sometimes of three *hypostases*. The word *hypostasis* stands neither for *Person* nor for *Essence* exclusively; but it means the one Personal God of natural theology, the notion of whom the Catholic corrects and completes as often as he views him as a Trinity; of which correction Nazianzen’s language (*Orat.* xxviii. 9) contrasted with his usual formula (vid. *Orat.* xx. 6) of the Three *Hypostases*, is an illustration. The specification of three *hypostases* does not substantially alter the sense of the word

---

<sup>338</sup> This topic will be considered in chapter V.

<sup>339</sup> *Arians*, 435.

<sup>340</sup> *Ibid.*, 437.

<sup>341</sup> *Ibid.*, 438.

<sup>342</sup> John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002), 36-39.

itself, but is a sort of *catachresis* by which this Catholic doctrine is forcibly brought out (as it would be by the phrase “three monads”), viz. that each of the Divine Persons is simply the *Unus et Singularis Deus*.<sup>343</sup>

In the above passage quoted from the sermon “The Incarnation,” there are two details which are very important for Newman in his Trinitarian theology: first, “the Only-begotten Son of God,” and second, “*in* the bosom of the Eternal Father.”<sup>344</sup> The prepositions *in* and *of* really play particular roles in his Trinitarian theology and form two significant “doctrines.” First, “*in* God” or “*in* the bosom of the Eternal Father” or “the Son is *in* the Father and the Father *in* the Son,” (John 14: 11) and the Holy Spirit “is *in* God as ‘the spirit of a man that is in him,’”<sup>345</sup> is, for Newman, “in the language of theology, the doctrine of the *coinherence*.”<sup>346</sup> This doctrine was used in the early Church “on the authority of Scripture, as a safeguard and witness of the Divine Unity.”<sup>347</sup> In his sermon on “The Incarnation,” Newman first insisted on “the indwelling of the Father *in* the Son,”<sup>348</sup> then he professed that the Son “dwelt *in* the

---

<sup>343</sup> *Arians*, 440-441. As Newman noted, he used the word “natural theology” not in the sense of “*Naturalis Theologia*,” but, “in the sense in which Paley uses it in the work which he has so entitled.” See a footnote in JHN, *The Idea of a University* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891), 449.

William Paley (1743-1805), a British Christian apologist and philosopher, in his book *Natural Theology* (Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1857), contributed one chapter particularly discussing “of Personality of Deity.” He insisted, “Wherever we see marks of contrivance, we are led for its cause to an *intelligent* author” (p. 232). “Now that which can contrive, which can design, must be a person. These capacities constitute personality, for they imply consciousness and thought” (230). “The marks of *design* are too strong to be gotten over. Design must have had a designer. That designer must have been a person. That person is God” (246).

<sup>344</sup> *PPS* 2: 30; italics added for emphasis.

<sup>345</sup> *PPS* 2: 30; 6, 358-359; *Arians*, 173.

<sup>346</sup> *Arians*, 173.

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>348</sup> *PPS* 2: 35.

inner-most love of the Everlasting Father, in the glory which He had with Him before the world was.”<sup>349</sup> Newman distinguished between the dwelling of God in the believer and that of the Father in the Son. God dwells in us as adopted sons and daughters, by the “grace of Christ,” of his Incarnation, renewing “our carnal souls” and “repairing the effects of Adam’s fall.”<sup>350</sup> In other words, it is in Christ the Son incarnate that we become “partakers of the divine nature” (2 Peter 1:4). However, the indwelling of the Father in the Son “is infinitely above this, being quite different in kind,” for the Son is “not merely of a divine nature, divine by participation of holiness and perfection, but Life and Holiness itself, such as the Father is.”<sup>351</sup>

In 1831, Newman did emphasize the dwelling of each divine person in each other in his sermon, “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity”; however, he did not speak of “the doctrine of the *coinherence*.” In 1833 and 1834, Newman repeated this view and this time stated: “This doctrine of the *coinherence*, as protecting the Unity without intrenching on the perfections of the Son and Spirit, may even be called the characteristic of Catholic Trinitarianism as opposed to all counterfeits, whether philosophical, Arian, or Oriental.”<sup>352</sup> To confirm this doctrine, Newman quoted St. Basil:

If any one truly receives the Son, he will find that He brings with him on one hand His Father, on the other the Holy Spirit. For neither can He from the Father be severed, who is of and ever in the Father; nor again from His own Spirit disunited, who in It operates all things . . . . For we must not conceive separation or division in any way; as if either the Son could be supposed without the Father, or the Spirit disunited from

---

<sup>349</sup> Ibid., 38-39.

<sup>350</sup> Ibid., 34-35.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., 35.

<sup>352</sup> *Arians*, 174.

the Son. But there is discovered between them some ineffable and incomprehensible, both communion and distinction.<sup>353</sup>

“Communion” and “distinction” are indeed the main characteristics of the *coinherence*, which is “the characteristic of Catholic Trinitarianism.” Newman at this time emphasized the essential role of *coinherence* in Trinitarian doctrine, but he allocated only a page for this discussion.

If “*in* God,” as understood by the Fathers, led Newman to the “doctrine of the *coinherence*,” so will the “*of* God” lead to the “doctrine of the *monarchia*.” This is another substantial aspect in Newman’s theology of the Triune God. “The Only-begotten Son *of* God,” “*of* the Eternal Father,” “the Word *of* God,” “God *of* the substance *of* the Father, begotten before the worlds, perfect God”<sup>354</sup> are cardinal phrases, which appeared many times in “The Incarnation” and in other sermons. For Newman, the preposition *of* really plays a prominent role in the doctrine of *monarchia*, manifesting “one Principle or *arche*.”<sup>355</sup> Newman’s sermons always prioritized the Father with titles such as “Everlasting Father,”<sup>356</sup> “Father Almighty,”<sup>357</sup> “Almighty God,”<sup>358</sup> “Divine Author,”<sup>359</sup> “Eternal Author,”<sup>360</sup> “the First Source.”<sup>361</sup> All those titles signify that the Father alone “is the *arche*, or *origin*, and the Son

---

<sup>353</sup> Basil, Petav. iv. 16, § 9, *Arians*, 174.

<sup>354</sup> *PPS* 2: 30, 37, 38.

<sup>355</sup> *Arians*, 38.

<sup>356</sup> *PPS* 2: 38.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid.*, 256.

<sup>358</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>359</sup> *Ibid.*, 224.

<sup>360</sup> *PPS* 1: 23.

<sup>361</sup> *PPS* 2: 218.

and Spirit are not origins.”<sup>362</sup> For Newman, the preposition *of* expresses the belonging of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father: They are *of* and *from* Him, the First and Only Source, the “Fount of Divinity.”<sup>363</sup> Newman quoted Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzen to highlight the point:

“We do not teach three Origins, as our illustration shows; for we do not speak of three Suns, but of the Sun and its radiance”<sup>364</sup> (Athanasius). Thus, “there is One God, seeing that the Son and Spirit are referred to One Cause”<sup>365</sup> (Gregory Nazianzen).

Newman also showed that the Scriptures and the Creeds always give priority to the Father:

In naming the Father, we imply the Son and Spirit, whether They be named or not. Without this key, the language of Scripture is perplexed in the extreme. Hence it is, that the Father is called “the only God,” at a time when our Lord’s name is also mentioned, John xvii. 3, 1 Tim. i. 16, 17, as if the Son was but the reiteration of His Person, who is the Self-Existent, and therefore not to be contrasted with Him in the way of number.<sup>366</sup>

Similarly, in the Creed of the Apostles, the title of God stands “in the opening against the Father’s name, while the Son and Spirit are introduced as distinct forms or modes, (so to say,) of and in the One Eternal Being.”<sup>367</sup> Thus, Newman came to the conclusion:

Accordingly it is impossible to worship One of the Divine Persons, without worshipping the Others also. In praying to the Father, we only arrive at His mysterious presence through His Son and Spirit; and in praying to the Son and Spirit, we are necessarily carried on beyond them to the source of Godhead from which They are

---

<sup>362</sup> *Arians*, 182.

<sup>363</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>365</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>366</sup> *Ibid.*, 175-176.

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid.*

derived. . . . as in the ordinary doxologies “to the Father through the Son and by the Spirit,” or “to the Father and Son in the unity of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>368</sup>

The doctrine of *monarchia* takes a very significant position in Newman’s Trinitarian theology, for it safeguards the unity of the Trinity. The Father is the Cause of the unity of the divine persons. The unity of the Trinity is not in the divine substance but in the person of the Father, who is the Source and Fount of divinity. Therefore, everything will return to its Source, “to the Father through the Son and by the Spirit” or “to the Father and Son in the unity of the Holy Spirit.” Newman was using the doxologies in order to synthesize his Trinitarian theology. Indeed, he highlighted the rule “Lex orandi, lex credendi.” His sermon on “The Mystery of the Trinity” in 1831 had highlighted the person of the Father as the Origin and Cause of the Trinity, but he had not developed what two years later he called the “doctrine of *monarchia*,” which apparently was influenced by Athanasius and the Cappadocians.

This doctrine is the one that Orthodox theologians have attempted to develop as the “cardinal point” in their Trinitarian theology. These theologians have claimed that the West has followed Augustine by basing the unity of the Trinity on the divine substance, in contrast to the Greek Fathers who based Trinitarian unity on the person of the Father.<sup>369</sup> Contrary to this pattern, John Henry Newman in 1833 and 1834 developed the point of view of the Greek Fathers in his Trinitarian theology. A few decades later in 1895, T. C. Edwards, in his discussion of the Incarnation and the Trinity, quoted Newman’s *Arians of the Fourth Century*

---

<sup>368</sup> Ibid., 177.

<sup>369</sup> Cf. Zizioulas, *Communion & Otherness*, 33; and *Being as Communion*, 36-37. Bulgakov, *The Comforter*, 40-41.

and emphasized the doctrine of *monarchia*.<sup>370</sup> In effect, Newman's Trinitarian view of *monarchia*, derived from the Church Fathers, influenced other theologians.

In addition to the doctrines of *coinherence* and *monarchia*, Newman also clarified the term the "First-born" or "First-begotten."<sup>371</sup> According to Athanasius, this term "means His [the Son] coming to the creature, that is, His exalting the creature into a Divine sonship by a union with His own Sonship."<sup>372</sup> For Newman, "First born" expresses the "creative *office*"<sup>373</sup> of the Son. Newman made a clear distinction of two terms "First born" and "Only-begotten":

Only-begotten because of His *genesis*, First-born because of His *condescension*. ... "Only-begotten" is internal to the Divine Essence; "First-born" external to It: the one is a word of *nature*, the other, of *office*.<sup>374</sup>

In other words, "Only-begotten" is *immanent*; "First-born" is *economic*.<sup>375</sup> The term "First-born" always goes with "of creation." This term indicates that "The *Word* applies His own Sonship to the creation, and makes Himself, who is the real Son, the first and the representative of a family of adopted sons."<sup>376</sup> This term denotes the relationship of the Son "not towards God, but towards the creature."<sup>377</sup> It is the term for the mystery of Incarnation, of *condescension*:

With a wonderful condescension He came, not as before in power, but in weakness, in the form of a servant, in the likeness of that fallen creature whom He purposed to

---

<sup>370</sup> T. C. Edwards, "On the God-Man," *The Expositor*, vol. 2, 5<sup>th</sup> series, William Robertson Nicoll, ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895), 81-92, at 84.

<sup>371</sup> *PPS* 2: 26.

<sup>372</sup> *Arians*, 419.

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*, 418.

<sup>374</sup> *Ibid.*, 420.

<sup>375</sup> The Scriptures do not speak of the "First born of God."

<sup>376</sup> *Arians*, 419-420.

<sup>377</sup> *Ibid.*, 420.



restore. So He humbled Himself; suffering all the infirmities of our nature in the likeness of sinful flesh, all but a sinner,—pure from all sin, yet subjected to all temptation,—and at length becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.<sup>378</sup>

For Newman, the purpose of the Incarnation is clear—to “restore” fallen creation, to “repair the evil which sin had caused.”<sup>379</sup> The Word came “down again from His Father’s bosom to do His will.”<sup>380</sup> The adverb “again” is a reminder of the first work of the Word at the beginning of creation when God with his Word and Holy Spirit created the world. The Word as the mediator of the Father and all creatures, brought them into being, “fashioning them, giving the world its laws, imparting reason and conscience to creatures of a higher order, and revealing to them in due season the knowledge of God’s will.”<sup>381</sup> Now because of his “unsearchable love” for creation, He came *again*, using “His own Sonship” with the Father to restore and bring fallen creation into a “Divine Sonship” by *union* with him, which is the Incarnation: “The Word became flesh”:

He came into this world, not in the clouds of heaven, but born into it, born of a woman; He, the Son of Mary, and she (if it may be said), the mother of God. Thus He came, selecting and setting apart for Himself the elements of body and soul; then, uniting them, to Himself from their first origin of existence, pervading them, hallowing them by His own Divinity, spiritualizing them, and filling them with light and purity, the while they continued to be human, and for a time mortal and exposed to infirmity. And, as they grew from day to day in their holy union, His Eternal Essence still was one with them, exalting them, acting in them, manifesting Itself through them, so that He was truly God and Man, One Person,—as we are soul and body, yet one man, so truly God and man are not two, but One Christ.<sup>382</sup>

---

<sup>378</sup> *PPS* 2: 30.

<sup>379</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>380</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>381</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>382</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

Newman, in so describing the mystery of the “Word became flesh,” utilized verbs such as “pervading,” “hallowing,” “spiritualizing,” “filling,” “exalting,” “acting,” “manifesting.” All these terms are what John of Damascus and Gregory of Nyssa called “assume.” Newman, in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, discussed this issue, giving a reference to John of Damascus and quoting directly from Gregory of Nyssa,

He [the Word became flesh] did not transform the nature of His divinity into the substance of His flesh, nor the substance of His flesh into the nature of His divinity, and neither did He effect one compound nature out of His divine nature and the human nature which He had assumed.<sup>383</sup>

Because of the perfect union of the flesh which was assumed, and of the Godhead which assumed it, the names are interchanged, so that the human is called from the divine and the divine from the human. Wherefore He who was crucified is called by Paul, Lord of glory, and He who is worshipped by all creation of things in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, is named Jesus.<sup>384</sup>

Aquinas also interpreted this term “assume” in his *Summa Theologiae*.<sup>385</sup> In the twentieth century, Rahner, in treating “the Word became flesh” concluded that “God ‘creates by assuming’ and ‘assumes by creating.’”<sup>386</sup> Although Newman did not use the term “assume,” it seems that all the terms that he did use expressed the idea of “assuming.”

In interpreting the “became flesh” of the Word, Newman sharply insisted on the unity between the Godhead and the manhood in Jesus Christ:

---

<sup>383</sup> John of Damascus, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, 3:3, *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 37, Frederic H. Chase, JR., trans. (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958): 271. See *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 368.

<sup>384</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, Apoll., t. iii, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 368.

<sup>385</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae: 3a. 1-6* (London; Cambridge University Press, 1990): 143-148.

<sup>386</sup> William V. Dych, *Karl Rahner* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 77.

There could be no real separation, no dissolution. Even when His body was dead, the Divine Nature was one with it; in like manner it was one with His soul in paradise. Soul and body were really one with the Eternal Word,—not one in name only,—one never to be divided. Therefore Scripture says that He rose again “according to the Spirit of holiness;” and “that it was not possible that He should be holden of death.” [Rom. i. 4. Acts ii. 24.]<sup>387</sup>

Here Newman did not use the term “hypostatic union” to describe the union of the human and divine natures in Christ; however, his expressions of “no real separation, no dissolution” and “truly God and man, one Person” call to mind the Chalcedonian dogma, which confesses two natures in Jesus Christ: “Without confusion, without change, without division, without separation,” “in one *prosopon* and one *hypostasis*.”<sup>388</sup> In addition, Newman insisted that even when the body of Christ was dead, the divine nature still was one with it. Soul and body were always one with the Eternal Word—an idea that Newman inherited from Athanasius:

For when the flesh suffered, the Word was not external to it; and therefore is the passion said to be His; and when He did divinely His Father’s works, the flesh was not external to Him, but in the body itself did the Lord do them.<sup>389</sup>

Newman, following Athanasius, saw that there is no reason that either Christ’s body or his soul was separated from the Word. Although Newman at this time did not go deeper in analyzing the doctrine of hypostatic union, he gave his audience the basic orthodox teaching of the Church on the union of the divinity and humanity in Christ.

In considering the *flesh* or *manhood* that the Word would assume, Newman named the Word “the immaculate ‘seed of the woman,’” for His manhood came “from the substance of

---

<sup>387</sup> PPS 2: 34.

<sup>388</sup> Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine: From the First Century to the Present* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), 92.

<sup>389</sup> Athanasius, Orat. iii. § 31, 32, 3, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 367-8.

the Virgin Mary.”<sup>390</sup> With the term “immaculate,” Newman asserted that the Word came “by a new and living way,” “selecting and purifying unto Himself a tabernacle out of that which existed.”<sup>391</sup> Therefore, Mary, His Mother “was set apart, ‘as a garden inclosed, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed,’ to yield a created nature to Him who was her Creator.”<sup>392</sup> On March 25, 1832, on the feast of the Annunciation, Newman gave a sermon entitled “The Reverence Due to the Virgin Mary,” in which he raised questions of Mary’s Immaculate Conception:

Who can estimate the holiness and perfection of her, who was chosen to be the Mother of Christ? If to him that hath, more is given, and holiness and Divine favour go together (and this we are expressly told), what must have been the transcendent purity of her, whom the Creator Spirit condescended to overshadow with His miraculous presence? What must have been her gifts, who was chosen to be the only near earthly relative of the Son of God, the only one whom He was bound by nature to revere and look up to; the one appointed to train and educate Him, to instruct Him day by day, as He grew in wisdom and in stature? This contemplation runs to a higher subject, did we dare follow it; for what, think you, was the sanctified state of that human nature, of which God formed His sinless Son; knowing as we do, “that which is born of the flesh is flesh,” and that “none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?” [1 John iii. 6. Job xiv. 4.]<sup>393</sup>

A dozen years later in 1844, J.C. Crosthwaite in the *British Magazine* started a series of papers entitled *Modern Hagiology*, which published many writings of the Tractarians. Newman’s sermon on the feast of the Annunciation in 1832 was discussed in chapter XL; the author raised a question about “Mr. Newman’s doctrine”—particularly, the language that Newman used for the Virgin Mary:

---

<sup>390</sup> *PPS* 2: 31.

<sup>391</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>392</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>393</sup> JHN, “The Reverence Due to the Virgin Mary,” *PPS* 2: 127-138, at 131-132.

What can Mr. Newman mean by such language as this? Does he mean to propagate the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception – and if not, what is the meaning or force of his argument?<sup>394</sup>

The author considered the biblical phrase that Newman quoted [“that which is born of the flesh is flesh,” and that “none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?”] as “a ground” for the “sanctity and perfection of the Virgin Mary”.<sup>395</sup>

It is obvious, her nature could not have been such as he [Newman] supposes it necessary it should be, unless it had been kept free from original sin by an immaculate conception, as is commonly taught by Romanists.<sup>396</sup>

Then the author concluded: “Nor is it easy to believe that so shrewd a writer as Mr. Newman, could have penned such an argument without having perceived its force.”<sup>397</sup>

This article was published almost a decade before the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception on December 8, 1854 by Pope Pius IX. A dozen years later, in 1866, Newman published *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey* that discussed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.<sup>398</sup> In 1869, Edward Bouverie Pusey published his *First Letter* to Newman in reply.<sup>399</sup> In addition, in his *Meditations and Devotions*,<sup>400</sup> Newman continued his

---

<sup>394</sup> John Clarke Crosthwaite, “Mr. Newman’s Doctrine,” *Modern Hagiology: An Examination of the Nature and Tendency of Some Legendary and Devotional Works Lately Published Under the Sanction of the Rev. J. H. Newman, the Rev. Dr. Pusey, and the Rev. F. Oakley*, vol. I (London: J. W. Parker, 1846 [republished by BiblioBazaar, 2009]), 284-303, at 285.

<sup>395</sup> Ibid.

<sup>396</sup> Ibid.

<sup>397</sup> Ibid.

<sup>398</sup> JHN, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on His Recent Eirenicon* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900).

<sup>399</sup> Edward Bouverie Pusey, *First Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.: In Explanation Chiefly in Regard to the Reverential Love Due to the Ever-blessed Theotokos, and the Doctrine of Her Immaculate Conception; with an Analysis of Cardinal de*

reflections on the Immaculate Conception—a doctrine which Newman felt played a significant role in soteriology. Newman reasoned that “our nature was corrupt since Adam’s fall.” In order to redeem us, the Word of God had to come “by a new and living way,” for what “is born of the flesh is flesh” [John iii. 6].<sup>401</sup> Christ inherited human nature and flesh from the Virgin Mary, who was preserved in “holiness and perfection,” who was kept away from the stain of original sin.

Thus the Son of God became the Son of Man; mortal, but not a sinner; heir of our infirmities, not of our guiltiness; the offspring of the old race, yet “the beginning of the” new “creation of God.”<sup>402</sup>

Newman did not see the Incarnation as just the moment that the Word of God was born in the world. For Newman, it included “His ministry”:

He preached the Gospel, chose His Apostles, suffered on the cross, died, and was buried, rose again and ascended on high, there to reign till the day when He comes again to judge the world. This is the All-gracious Mystery of the Incarnation.<sup>403</sup>

The ministry of the Word, for Newman, is from the moment the Word incarnated in the womb of the Virgin Mary until his second coming in glory. What Newman called “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us” is the Incarnation, the *economic ministry* of the Word in doing the Father’s will. Newman’s view of the Incarnation of the Word as an indissoluble whole of being born, preaching, dying, rising, ascending, and coming again in glory, is indeed

---

*Turrecremata’s Work on the Immaculate Conception* (London: J. Parker & Co., 1869); hereafter cited, Pusey, *First Letter to Newman*.

<sup>400</sup> See JHN, *Meditations and Devotions of the Later Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907), 8-26.

<sup>401</sup> *PPS* 2: 31.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

the mystery of salvation. It is the mystery of God the Son “taking our flesh” and “raising [our] human nature with Him.” It is the mystery of “Man [who] has redeemed us, Man [who] is set above all creatures, as one with the Creator, Man [who] shall judge man at the last day.”

<sup>404</sup> It is the mystery of Jesus Christ, “who is our only hope, our only salvation.”<sup>405</sup>

### Conclusion

In this first period of Newman’s *Parochial and Plain Sermons*—those up to 1834—Newman’s Trinitarian theology focused primarily on the immanent life of the Trinity. He analyzed the relationship of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. He emphasized the personhood of each divine person in order to see “otherness” in God, namely the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are completely distinct from each other but fully in communion with each other. “Otherness” is a constitutive relation; it does not create any division but rather creates unity and communion. Otherness in God is absolute, thus communion in God is absolute, for *hypostasis* “is otherness in communion and communion in otherness.”<sup>406</sup> In treating the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit, Newman gave each divine *hypostasis* very distinct titles, functions, and personality, but simultaneously each one is always in an inseparable and unbreakable relationship to the others. Newman particularly emphasized the person of the Father as the Cause, Source and Fountain of the divinity and the unity of the Trinity.

---

<sup>404</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>405</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>406</sup> Zizioulas, *Communion & Otherness*, 9.

Newman's language for the Father is special—reserving specific terms for the Father such as “Almighty,” “Source,” “Fountain,” “Cause.” In his sermons of 1829 through 1831, Newman established all the basic assertions of the Trinitarian doctrine. However, with the sermons of 1833 to 1834, while continuing to rely on Scripture and Church documents, Newman went into specific doctrines such as *coinherence* and *monarchia*, and defined the term *hypostasis*. This made Newman's theology of the Trinity sharper and more concrete, focused on the central points of Trinitarian otherness and communion. This change could be seen as a significant step of Newman from 1831 to 1834.

At the end of 1834, Newman's theology of the Trinity began to turn to the economic perspective with his two sermons on the Holy Spirit and the Incarnation, respectively,—which could be seen as the beginning of Newman's Pneumatology and Christology. In these sermons' analysis of the Holy Spirit and the Word incarnate, Newman treated the second and the third divine persons in a Trinitarian perspective. He first analyzed the Holy Spirit and the Son-Word of God in their relationship with the Father in the immanent life of the Trinity; then he opened this “immanent” relationship to the “economic” activities of the Trinity. However, this is only an introduction to the economy of salvation; Newman only mapped the basic ground of Pneumatology and the Incarnation of the Word of God.

Finally, it is evident that Newman's Trinitarian theology was very patristic. One could hardly deny the influence of the Fathers of the Church in his thought, particularly that of Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Cyril, John of Damascus and Augustine. In his Trinitarian theology, Newman came to grips with the thoughts of the Fathers. There was no gap between



the Greek Fathers and Augustine in Newman's mind. In contrast, in modern Trinitarian theology, it is sometimes claimed that the Western Trinitarian theology under the influence of Augustine insists on the unity of the Trinity in the divine substance, while the Orthodox Trinitarian theology influenced by the Greek Fathers emphasizes the unity of the Trinity in the person of the Father.<sup>407</sup> Newman's Trinitarian theology, however, did not have this division. His theology is very Athanasian and Cappadocian, but simultaneously Augustinian. However, this is just the first period of Newman's Trinitarian theology in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. One needs to look further in his second and the third periods in order to see how Newman's theology developed and the impact of the Fathers of the Church on his thought. Is there a further meeting of the Western and Eastern Trinitarian theologies that would open an ecumenical perspective in Trinitarian theology?

---

<sup>407</sup> Cf. Francesca Aran Murphy and Christopher Aspray, eds., *Ecumenism Today – The Universal Church in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 99. Luigi Gioia, *Theological Epistemology of Augustine's De Trinitate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 14. Kallistos (Bishop of Diokleia), *The Orthodox Church* (New York: Penguin Books, 1993), 214.

**CHAPTER III:**  
**THE SECOND PERIOD: 1835 - 1838**  
**THE HOLY TRINITY IN THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION**

**I. From 1835 to 1836**

**1. The Incarnation and the Atonement in the Gracious Economy**

1835 was a year of “Incarnation and Atonement.” It was the year that Newman developed his doctrine of the Incarnation and atonement. Newman, however, built this doctrine upon the Trinitarian ground. In 1835, Newman profoundly analyzed how the Son of God, in the Holy Spirit, was carrying out the Father’s will, in the mystery of the Incarnation and so redeeming humanity from sin and death. 1835 was the year that Newman deepened his theology of the Trinity in the economy of salvation. The revelation of the immanent Trinity, for Newman, is the Incarnation of the Word; and its summit is neither the moment of the conception of the Word in the Virgin Mary’s womb nor his birth, but “the humiliation of the Son of God to temptation and suffering.”<sup>408</sup> Newman called it “the chief mystery of our holy faith.”<sup>409</sup> He asserted, “In truth, it is a more overwhelming mystery even than that which is involved in the doctrine of the Trinity.”<sup>410</sup>

The humiliation of the Son in his passion is the absolute zenith of the revelation of the economic Trinity’s love for humanity. The economy of salvation is the work of the Father,

---

<sup>408</sup> JHN, “The Humiliation of the Eternal Son,” *PPS* 3: 156-172, at 156.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid.

<sup>410</sup> Ibid.

Son and Holy Spirit. It is the mystery of the “immanent” self-revealing as “economic.” It is the revelation of *theologia* in *oikonomia*. The economy of salvation is a mystery which is “quite beyond our reason;”<sup>411</sup> but thanks to the Incarnation, the human intellect now can perceive the “truths relating to the incommunicable and infinite essence of Almighty God.”<sup>412</sup>

Newman described the Incarnation:

The Eternal Son has taken into Himself a creature’s nature, which henceforth became as much one with Him, as much belonged to Him, as the divine attributes and powers which He had ever had. . . . The Son of God, who “had glory with the Father” from everlasting, was found, at a certain time, in human flesh, offering up prayers and supplications to Him, crying out and weeping, and exercising obedience in suffering!<sup>413</sup>

“The Eternal Son,” “Eternal Word,” “Incarnate Word,” “Only begotten Son” and “Son of God” are the favorite titles that Newman used to designate the second divine person. Only rarely did Newman speak of “Jesus.” Newman preferred to speak of “Christ” and when he used this title, it was always before or after he mentioned the “Eternal Son” or “Son of God.” Newman purposely made this point in order to remind his audience of the divinity of the Son of God, who is now “our Lord and Savior.” Newman explained the title “Son of God”:

It is meant that our Lord is the very or true Son of God, that is, His Son by nature. We are but *called* the sons of God—we are adopted to be sons—but our Lord and Saviour is the Son of God, really and by birth, and He alone is such. Hence Scripture calls Him the Only-begotten Son. “Such knowledge is too excellent for” us; yet, however high it be, we learn as from His own mouth that *God is not solitary*, if we may dare so to speak, but that in His own incomprehensible essence, in His perfection of His one indivisible and eternal nature, His Dearly-beloved Son has ever existed with Him, who is called the Word, and, being His Son, is partaker in all the fulness of His Godhead.<sup>414</sup>

---

<sup>411</sup> Ibid.

<sup>412</sup> Ibid.

<sup>413</sup> Ibid., 157.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid., 162.

Emphasizing the divinity of the Son of God, for Newman, is extremely significant in presenting God's economy of salvation. Newman insisted that the economy was not a plan which was designed and carried out by humans. It was God's plan, and God himself had carried it out, by the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit, for "God is not solitary." This is the plan and work of the Holy Trinity. This is truly and radically beyond all human imaginations and reasons. Newman called it "His gracious economy."<sup>415</sup>

This "gracious economy" of God was revealed publicly first of all in the temptations of the Son of God. How could we understand that the One, who "is altogether separate from imperfection and infirmity,"<sup>416</sup> who "had glory with the Father" from everlasting," now had "a creature's nature" and underwent temptations? Newman saw the temptation of the Son of God as "a renewal, apparently, of Adam's temptation, in the person of the 'second Man.'"<sup>417</sup> This is the work of the Son, according to the Father's will, by power of the Holy Spirit, who "*driveth* Him into the wilderness."<sup>418</sup> It is all for "our redemption."<sup>419</sup> Newman named it "a great Divine Work."<sup>420</sup>

Secondly, "His gracious economy" was revealed in the sufferings of the Son of God, who was "all-holy, all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, eternal, infinite," "ever one with and in" the Father, "one indivisibly," "since there is only one God."<sup>421</sup> Now, in the Incarnation, he

---

<sup>415</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>416</sup> Ibid., 157.

<sup>417</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>418</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>419</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>420</sup> Ibid.

<sup>421</sup> Ibid., 162.

was carrying out the “gracious economy” “at a certain time, in human flesh,”<sup>422</sup> “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.”<sup>423</sup> He was the one of whom it was true that “in His Eternal union with God there was no distinction of will and work between Him and His Father;” He shared the same “life” and “glory” with the Father; He was the “Co-equal Minister in all things” with the Father.<sup>424</sup> But now he took “a lower nature,” “the form of a servant.”<sup>425</sup> He took “on Himself a separate will and a separate work, and the toil and sufferings incident to a creature.”<sup>426</sup> All of these Newman described by saying the Word “assumed” flesh.<sup>427</sup> In 1835, Newman used the term *assume* of John of Damascus and Gregory of Nyssa—a term that Newman had not used in 1834 in his sermon “The Incarnation.” Newman explained what he meant by *assume*:

He took into His own Infinite Essence man’s nature itself in all its completeness, creating a soul and body, and, at the moment of creation, making them His own, so that they never were other than His, never existed by themselves or except as in Him, being properties or attributes of Him (to use defective words) as really as His divine goodness, or His eternal Sonship, or His perfect likeness to the Father.<sup>428</sup>

Thus Newman concluded, “While thus adding a new nature to Himself, He did not in any respect cease to be what he was before.”<sup>429</sup> Newman, with the definition of *assume*, indeed safeguarded the unity of the Trinity in the immanent life. The Son incarnate, “God and man at once,” was still and always in communion with the Father and the Holy Spirit, “though He

---

<sup>422</sup> Ibid., 157.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid., 163.

<sup>425</sup> Ibid.

<sup>426</sup> Ibid.

<sup>427</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>428</sup> Ibid.

<sup>429</sup> Ibid.

had assumed a nature short of His original perfection.”<sup>430</sup> In addition, in emphasizing the divinity of the Son, Newman used the language of the doctrine of *coinherence* such as “ever *one with* and *in*” in order to safeguard the *communio* in the Triune God.

In addition to analyzing the term *assume*, Newman commented that the flesh which the Son “had assumed was but the *instrument* through which He acted,”<sup>431</sup> “for our redemption through our own nature.”<sup>432</sup> In other words, He “clothed Himself with a created essence, He made it the *instrument* of his humiliation; He acted in it, He obeyed and suffered through it.”<sup>433</sup> The term *instrument* could easily lead to Nestorianism, which held that the human flesh and nature was assumed by the Word merely as an instrument, and not into the unity of the hypostasis, or to Apollinarianism, which held that in Christ the divine nature “supplied the place” of the rational human soul, and the human flesh was no more than a passive instrument.<sup>434</sup>

Newman probably took the term *instrument* from Athanasius. For Newman, the term *instrument* is rightly used to talk about “our Lord’s manhood relatively to His Divine Person,” as Athanasius asserted,

The Godhead dwelt in the flesh bodily; which is all one with saying, that, being God, He had a body proper to Him, and using this as an instrument, [*organoi*], He became man for our sakes; and because of this, things proper to the flesh are said to be His, since He was in it, as hunger, thirst, pain, fatigue, and the like, of which the flesh is

---

<sup>430</sup> Ibid., 166.

<sup>431</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>432</sup> Ibid., 165.

<sup>433</sup> Ibid.

<sup>434</sup> JHN, “The Heresy of Apollinaris,” *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), 301-328; hereafter cited, JHN, *Tracts Theological*. Also see J. King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, 151-154.

capable; while the works proper to the Word Himself, as raising the dead, and restoring sight to the blind, and curing the issue of blood, He did Himself through His body.<sup>435</sup>

Khaled Anatolios explains that Athanasius spoke of the term *instrument* as “a medium for the immanent revelation of the transcendent God.” It is not taken in the sense of a “passive instrument” being “directly and physically” moved by the Word. Athanasius, in speaking of the body as instrument, meant primarily considering the “bodiliness of Christ as the privileged medium for the self-disclosure of the invisible God in human form.”<sup>436</sup> John of Damascus in his *Orthodox Faith* stated that “the flesh served as an *instrument* of the divinity.”<sup>437</sup> For Aquinas, who wanted to avoid the misunderstanding of Nestorius and Apollinarius, to say that the flesh of Christ is “the instrument of his Divinity is perfectly orthodox,” for it is “assumed in the unity of an hypostasis, ... the *hypostasis* of the person assuming it.”<sup>438</sup> Aquinas also asserted: “Damascus held that the human nature in Christ is an instrument belonging to the unity of the hypostasis.”<sup>439</sup> Damascus himself, of course, did not forget to clarify his point.

---

<sup>435</sup> Athanasius, Orat. iii. § 31, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 294; also see p. 450-451.

<sup>436</sup> Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 72. Also see Sergius Bulgakov, Sergei Nikolaevich Bulgakov, Boris Jakim, *The Lamb of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007), 8.

<sup>437</sup> John of Damascus, *Orthodox Faith* 3:15, in Frederic H. Chase, ed., *The Fathers of the Church—Saint John Damascus*, vol. 37 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1958): 311. See JHN, *Tracts Theological*, 307, 314.

<sup>438</sup> William Humphrey, William Gilson Humphry, *A Digest of the Doctrine of S. Thomas on the Incarnation: Contained in Q. I-LIX. of the Third Part of the “Summa” and Its Supplement, Q. LXIX. to End* (London: J. T. Hayes, 1868), 21.

<sup>439</sup> Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Pt. III, Q. 2, Art. 7, Fathers of the English Dominican Province, trans. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1913): 39.

There was no division whatsoever of either form, but all actions of each form at all times belonged to one Person . . . . And so, Christ acts through each of His natures and in Him each nature acts in communion with the other.<sup>440</sup>

Aquinas, in his discussion on the passion of Christ, asserted once again:

The flesh in which Christ endured his passion is the *instrument* of the Godhead; his suffering and actions, therefore, have a divine power to drive out sin. . . . His flesh was the instrument of his divinity.<sup>441</sup>

In 1846, Edward Bouverie Pusey, a friend of Newman, followed Newman in his discussion on redemption: “That Flesh will one day be torn, and that Blood shed upon the Cross, and will be the instrument and the price of the redemption of mankind.”<sup>442</sup> Later in 1881, Pusey published a book on *Latter Treatises of St. Athanasius* in which he, in his notes, quoted Newman’s sermon “The Humiliation of the Eternal Son” together with the statements of Athanasius and Aquinas in order to highlight the point.<sup>443</sup> Newman’s views on this topic were also mentioned in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines* in 1880.<sup>444</sup> Newman indeed never used the term *instrument* in the sense of Nestorius or Apollinaris. He used it in the sense of the Greek Fathers in the doctrine of the hypostatic union, and placed it in the context of soteriology: the Word assumed flesh “for our

---

<sup>440</sup> John of Damascus, *Orthodox Faith* 3:15.

<sup>441</sup> Aquinas, *The Passion of Christ*, 3a. 49, I, Richard T. A. Murphy, trans. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006): 97.

<sup>442</sup> J. C. Crosthwaite, “Fanaticism – Specimens from Dr. Pusey,” *Modern Hagiology*, vol. II (London: John W. Parker, 1846), 58-121, at 118.

<sup>443</sup> Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Later Treatises of S. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria: With Notes, and an Appendix on S. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret* (London: J. Parker, 1881), 84.

<sup>444</sup> Cf. William Smith, Henry Wace, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines: Being a Continuation of “The Dictionary of the Bible”* (London: J. Murray, 1880), 361.



redemption through our own nature, which in His great mercy He attached to His own Person, as if an attribute, simply, absolutely, indissolubly.”<sup>445</sup> Newman described how Christ is truly God and truly man.

Before He came on earth, He was infinitely above joy and grief, fear and anger, pain and heaviness; but afterwards all these properties and many more were His as fully as they are ours. Before He came on earth, He had but the perfections of God, but afterwards He had also the virtues of a creature, such as faith, meekness, self-denial. Before He came on earth He could not be tempted of evil; but afterwards He had a man’s heart, a man’s tears, and a man’s wants and infirmities. His Divine Nature indeed pervaded His manhood, so that every deed and word of His in the flesh savoured of eternity and infinity; but, on the other hand, from the time He was born of the Virgin Mary, he had a natural fear of danger, a natural shrinking from pain, though ever subject to the ruling influence of that Holy and Eternal Essence which was in Him.<sup>446</sup>

Newman called the *before* and *afterwards* “a double assemblage of attributes, divine and human.” Indeed, it is “a contradiction of terms” in the very form of language.<sup>447</sup> “Still he was all-powerful, though in the form of a servant; still He was all-knowing, though seemingly ignorant; still incapable of temptation, though exposed to it.”<sup>448</sup> Newman was concerned about the real distinction between the divinity and humanity after the Incarnation, but simultaneously emphasized the personal unity of Christ—which was also the chief concern of Athanasius, as Newman quoted: “As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.”<sup>449</sup>

---

<sup>445</sup> *PPS* 3: 165.

<sup>446</sup> *Ibid.*, 166.

<sup>447</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>448</sup> *Ibid.*, 167.

<sup>449</sup> Athanasian Creed, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 326.

Newman, influenced by Athanasius, was deeply concerned about the unity of the person of Christ. For Newman, “man is partly soul and partly body; he is *of* body and soul, not body and soul; but Christ is wholly God, and wholly man, [*holos Theos, holos anthropos*]. He is as simply God as if He were not man, as simply man as if He were not God.”<sup>450</sup>

Newman borrowed an image used by Basil.

What was the manner of the Godhead in flesh? as fire in iron, not transitively, but by communication. For the fire does not dart into the iron, but remains there and communicates to it of its own virtue, not impaired by the communication, yet filling wholly its recipient.<sup>451</sup>

Newman strongly rejected the position of those who distinguished “between the Christ who lived on earth and the Son of God Most High, speaking of His human nature and His Divine nature so separately as not to feel or understand that God is man and man is God.”<sup>452</sup>

Newman really wanted his audiences to avoid the thinking of “Sabellians,” “Nestorians,” and “Ebionites,”<sup>453</sup> who tended “to deny Christ’s Divinity altogether.”<sup>454</sup> However, was Newman mindful of what today some theologians call the “weakness of Athanasius’ Christology,” which has no prominent place for the human soul of Christ?<sup>455</sup>

---

<sup>450</sup> Athanasius, Orat. iv. 35, *ibid.*

<sup>451</sup> Basil, t. 2, *ibid.*, 2: 329.

<sup>452</sup> *PPS* 3: 171.

<sup>453</sup> Ebionites were those who “regarded Jesus as born in the ordinary way from Joseph and Mary; and they clung to Mosaism as necessary to salvation, *for Gentiles as well as Jews.*” Francis William Newman, *Christianity in Its Cradle* (London: Trübner, 1886), 154.

<sup>454</sup> *PPS* 3: 171.

<sup>455</sup> T. E. Pollard, *Johannine Christology and the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 243-44. Hans Schwarz, *Christology* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 151-2.

Aloys Grillmeier commented that the Athanasian Christology is deepened in the “Logos-sarx framework”; and that the human soul of Christ was not yet considered a theological principle.<sup>456</sup> Both Arius and Apollinaris denied the human soul of Christ, because for them the Word has taken its place. Athanasius of course denied this view of Arius. However, for Grillmeier, Athanasius’ debate with Arius, which was seemingly silent about the soul of Christ, “was tantamount to a denial.”<sup>457</sup> Thomas Weinandy disagreed with Grillmeier, saying that this could be a “misconception of Athanasius’ Christology.”<sup>458</sup> According to Weinandy, Athanasius asserted that the Son “assumed the whole of what it means to be human;” it is only right for the Son “in putting on human flesh, to put it on whole with the passions proper to it.”<sup>459</sup> Obviously, Athanasius did speak of the Son’s “hunger, thirst, pain, fatigue, and the like,” as Newman had mentioned in his discussion.<sup>460</sup> For Athanasius, “the human Nature of Christ [is] complete, not Body only.”<sup>461</sup> Newman, from the Athanasian point of view, stated,

He [Christ] is one, as He was from eternity,—the same “He” to whom also belong body and soul, and all their powers and affections, as well as the possession of

---

<sup>456</sup> Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. I (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 325. Also see Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 73.

<sup>457</sup> Ibid.

<sup>458</sup> Thomas G. Weinandy, *Athanasius* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007), 94.

<sup>459</sup> Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, 3, 32, *ibid.*, 92.

<sup>460</sup> Athanasius, Orat. iii. 31, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 294; cf. *supra*, 108. See more of Weinandy’s arguments in his book *Athanasius*, 91-96.

<sup>461</sup> “The Savior had not a body without a soul, nor without sense or intelligence; for it was not possible, when the Lord had become man for us, that His body should be without intelligence: nor was the salvation effected in the Word Himself a salvation of body only, but of the soul also.” Athanasius, Tome, 7, Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. IV (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1892): 485.

divinity. He it is, God the Son, who was born, who had a mother, who shed His blood, who died and rose again.<sup>462</sup>

In 1835, Newman did talk about the human soul of Christ in his sermons. He explained that “the Word became flesh,” meant the Word “took into His own Infinite Essence man’s nature itself in all its completeness, creating a soul and body, . . . making them His own, so that they never were other than His, never existed by themselves or except as in Him.”<sup>463</sup> Newman apparently believed in the human soul of Christ, and viewed it in the doctrine of the hypostatic union. Moreover, Newman pointed out the purpose of “taking into him a human soul and body, in order that thoughts, feelings, affections might be His, which could respond to ours and certify to us His tender mercy.”<sup>464</sup> In his sermon “Bodily Suffering” in 1835, Newman insisted on the “travail” of the human soul of Christ in the passion.

When He [Christ] said, “It is finished,” He showed that He was still contemplating, with a clear intellect, “the travail of His soul, and was satisfied;” and in the solemn surrender of Himself into His Father’s hand, He showed where His mind rested in the midst of its darkness.<sup>465</sup>

In Newman’s view, the human soul of Christ underwent all the inner suffering, fear and affliction of the passion. Although Newman did treat the human soul of Christ in this sermon, his concern was the Eternal Word accepting suffering for our atonement. As Newman stated in the very beginning of the sermon “Bodily Suffering”:

---

<sup>462</sup> *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 293.

<sup>463</sup> *PPS* 3: 164.

<sup>464</sup> JHN, “Tears of Christ at the Grave of Lazarus,” *PPS* 3: 128-183, at 132.

<sup>465</sup> JHN, “Bodily Suffering,” *PPS* 3: 139-155, at 149; “travail” can mean torment, agony, labor.

It was the untold sufferings of the Eternal Word in our nature, His body dislocated and torn, His blood poured out, His soul violently separated by a painful death, which has put away from us the wrath of Him whose love sent Him for that very purpose. This only was our Atonement; no one shared in the work. He “trode the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with Him.” When lifted up upon the cursed tree, He fought with all the hosts of evil, and conquered by suffering.<sup>466</sup>

The term “wrath” signifies that of the Father. Although it sounds like Newman considered the sufferings of Christ as satisfaction to God the Father, in a letter to Henry Wilberforce, Newman clarified his position: “I do not believe we are informed that Christ’s death is a satisfaction to God’s *justice* – This is going beyond Scripture, to show *how* it is a satisfaction.”<sup>467</sup> Newman said that he did not know “*how* His wrath is put away,” for it “is not revealed,” but “to say it is by His justice being satisfied . . . is a Calvinistic gloss.”<sup>468</sup> Newman, indeed, strongly opposed the theology of satisfaction. This was also the theological position of Gregory of Nazianzen, which differed from that of Origen. In his forty-fifth *Oration*, delivered in the year 385, Gregory rejected the theory of satisfaction as an audacious thought: “The precious and famous Blood of our God and High priest and Sacrifice” was neither a payment to the evil one, nor to God the Father. Gregory reasoned:

On what principle did the Blood of His Only begotten Son delight the Father, Who would not receive even Isaac, when he was being offered by his Father, but changed the sacrifice, putting a ram in the place of the human victim? Is it not evident that the Father accepts Him, but neither asked for Him nor demanded Him; but on account of the Incarnation, and because Humanity must be sanctified by the Humanity of God, that He might deliver us Himself, and overcome the tyrant, and draw us to Himself by the mediation of His Son, Who also arranged this to the honour of the Father, Whom it

---

<sup>466</sup> Ibid., 139.

<sup>467</sup> JHN to Henry Wilberforce (11 August 1836), *LD* 5: 337-39, at 337.

<sup>468</sup> Ibid.

is manifest that He obeys in all things? So much we have said of Christ; the greater part of what we might say shall be revered with silence.<sup>469</sup>

For Gregory of Nazianzen, this is the “fact and dogma,” which was “neglected by most people.”<sup>470</sup> He strictly rejected the idea of the atonement as a payment to Satan or as satisfaction to the Father. For Gregory, as Newman quoted, Christ is “Redemption, because He sets us free, who were held captive under sin, giving Himself a Ransom for us, the Sacrifice to make expiation for the world. And [He is] Resurrection, because He raises up from hence, and brings to life again us, who were slain by sin.”<sup>471</sup> Newman also pointed out the views of Basil and Athanasius.

One thing has been found sufficient for all men at once, which was given as the price of ransom of our soul, the holy and most precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which He poured out for us all.<sup>472</sup>

Formerly the world, as guilty, was under judgment from the Law; but now the Word has taken on Himself the judgment, and, having suffered in the body for all, has bestowed salvation on all.<sup>473</sup>

Newman accepted the term “ransom” or “prince of ransom” but not in the sense of a payment to Satan or satisfaction to the Father. It was the love of Christ for us. For Newman, God the Father “might have saved us without a price,” “but to show His love for us He took a price,” and that was the “death of His Son in our nature.”<sup>474</sup> For Newman, the theory of

---

<sup>469</sup> Gregory of Nazianzen, *The Second Oration on Easter*, 22, Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> series, vol. VII, Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow, trans. (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1894): 431.

<sup>470</sup> Ibid.

<sup>471</sup> Gregory of Nazianzen, Orat. 30, 20, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 60.

<sup>472</sup> Basil, Psalm. 48, n. 4, *ibid.*

<sup>473</sup> Athanasius, Orat. i. § 60, *ibid.*, 2: 61.

<sup>474</sup> JHN, *Meditations and Devotions*, 166.

satisfaction is completely against the Scriptures and the “Economic Mercy” of God the Father. For Gregory, it was not because of sin that the Word became flesh, but first of all for the sanctification the humanity. God the Father wanted to sanctify all humanity and draw all to him, so he sent his Only-begotten Son as the mediator to carry out his plan. In line with Gregory’s theology, Newman saw the Incarnation and all the sufferings of the Son of God as needful for “the regeneration” of human nature, for partaking of the divine nature.<sup>475</sup>

Newman did not see the sufferings of the Lord as cause for sorrow, but as “most joyful and glorious.” For him, “hope, light, peace, spiritual freedom, holy influences, religious knowledge and strength, all flow from a fount of blood.”<sup>476</sup> Newman insisted: “A work of blood is our salvation; and we, as we would be saved, must draw near and gaze upon it in faith, and accept it as the way to heaven.”<sup>477</sup> Newman looked at the blood of Christ as the fountain of salvation. The passion of Christ is the glory and joy of God’s saving work for human beings. The passion is a work of transformation. Since the Son of God became flesh, taking all human sufferings in Himself, the reality of human life has been changed:

Pain is no longer a curse, a necessary evil to be undergone with a dry submission or passive endurance—it may be considered even as a blessing of the Gospel, and being a blessing, admits of being met well or ill.<sup>478</sup>

This is the will of the Father, the “Almighty God,” who gave us “a new and comfortable light,”<sup>479</sup> “turning a punishment into a privilege.”<sup>480</sup> “We who are children of

---

<sup>475</sup> *PPS* 3: 140.

<sup>476</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>477</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>478</sup> *Ibid.*, 143.

<sup>479</sup> *Ibid.*

wrath, are made through Him children of grace.”<sup>481</sup> Our pains are the “foretastes of hell” which now through the “sprinkling” of Christ’s blood have been changed “into a preparation for heaven.”<sup>482</sup> Newman insisted that Christ “bore [sufferings] in expiation of our sins.”<sup>483</sup> Although he mentioned “the wrath of God,” Newman did not view the blood of the Son of God as a payment or satisfaction to God. Newman’s use of “the wrath of God” may have been directed against the Evangelicals, who taught a doctrine of substitution.<sup>484</sup>

According to the Evangelical and the High-Church schools, the wrath of God towards the sinner must be appeased by the substitution of a victim to suffer in his stead, and that victim was found in the person of Jesus Christ, who was both God and man.<sup>485</sup>

Newman’s earliest years were influenced by Evangelicalism; he held “the strictly orthodox ideas on vicarious atonement, on eternal punishment, and other kindred doctrines . . . accepting the Evangelical framework of orthodoxy, with its positive individualism.”<sup>486</sup> Although Newman used the Evangelical term “the wrath of God,” he carefully explained it in the light of Scriptures and the Greek Fathers: the sufferings of the Son of God in the passion are not a substitution or payment or satisfaction but a transformation and sanctification of

---

<sup>480</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>481</sup> Ibid., 155.

<sup>482</sup> Ibid.

<sup>483</sup> Ibid., 140.

<sup>484</sup> Vernon Faithfull Storr, *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913), 68.

<sup>485</sup> J. M. Capes, “Purgatory, Heaven and Hell,” *The Contemporary Review*, 22 (1873): 731-753, at 731. Also see Timothy Larsen, Daniel J. Treier, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 81-82.

<sup>486</sup> J. M. Capes, “Parallel and a Contrast,” *The Gentleman’s Magazine* (July-December, 1872): 33-44, at 39. Also see Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002), 114-122.



humanity. For Newman, the work of God's love and mercy in transforming and sanctifying humanity is in order that all humankind "through Him"<sup>487</sup> will become the children of God. However, Newman mentioned that how the wrath of God "is put away is not revealed!"<sup>488</sup> — but he did not develop this idea any further.<sup>489</sup>

## 2. The Passion – Theology of Glorification

In discussing the Incarnation, Newman was particularly interested in the passion of Christ as the glorification of humanity. Newman did not see the sufferings of the Lord as cause for sorrow, but as "most joyful and glorious," for "hope, light, peace, spiritual freedom, holy influences, religious knowledge and strength, all flow from a fount of blood."<sup>490</sup> Newman particularly emphasized the intimate relationship of the Father and the Son in the ultimate moment of suffering and death. Newman looked at Christ in a Johannine perspective: "Christ underwent [the passion] voluntarily"; Christ was "cheerfully doing God's

---

<sup>487</sup> *PPS* 3: 155.

<sup>488</sup> *LD* 5: 336.

<sup>489</sup> Newman also seems to have been familiar with the Catholic versions of the doctrine of satisfaction: the "doctrine of Satisfaction" in "Roman Theology" "declares that the death of Christ upon the Cross has put away the wrath of God from us, and reconciled Him to us: that this precious Atonement is applied to every individual on his Baptism, and that it is realized in his soul and body in a peculiar way in the Holy Eucharist" [JHN, *Via Media*, vol. I (London: Longmans, 1901), 93-94]. Pusey later discussed this issue with Newman: "Catholics teach with one common consent, that Jesus Christ, at once God and Man, could Alone, through the Infinite dignity of His Person, offer to God a sufficient satisfaction for our sins. . . that Jesus Christ once paid the price, whereby we shall be, one day, entirely delivered from all the evils which overwhelm us" [Pusey, *Is Healthful Reunion Impossible? - A Second Letter to J. H. Newman* (London: Rivingtons, 1870), 71-72]. However, both Newman and Pusey only presented the doctrine and did not criticize it, for they looked for "English and Roman Communion," which will be "done by the grace of Christ" [ibid. 73].

<sup>490</sup> *PPS* 3: 140.

will, as the Gospel history sets before us.”<sup>491</sup> Newman stated that the work that the Son was doing is the “Father’s business.”<sup>492</sup> Athanasius, in talking about the passion, had also called it the “Father’s works” and insisted that “the Father’s works are also works of the Son.”<sup>493</sup> This implies that the passion is not only the “will” of the Father, but also his “business” or “works”--which the Son is carrying out. In other words, the passion is the work of the Father and the Son. Newman particularly emphasized the obedience and the inseparable union of the Son with the Father in the passion:

He “learned obedience by the things that He suffered;” “He was about His Father’s business,” “a noble and severe surrender of Himself to His Father’s will;” a “solemn surrender of Himself into His Father’s hand;” “His mind was stayed upon His Father’s sovereign will and infinite perfections.”<sup>494</sup>

All these “things” Newman called “active obedience” and “filial duty.”<sup>495</sup> The term “*active* obedience” here signifies the voluntariness and cheerfulness of the Son in his obedience to the Father. Why did Newman highlight this point? In *Arians of the Fourth Century* and *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, Newman mentioned the arguments between the Cappadocians and Eunomius on the obedience of the Son.<sup>496</sup> In his *Profession of Faith*, Eunomius insisted on the subordination of the Son, who was made obedient: “Because He is ‘Son’ and was begotten ‘Only-begotten God,’ [he is] obedient in his works, obedient in his

---

<sup>491</sup> Ibid., 148.

<sup>492</sup> Ibid., 149.

<sup>493</sup> Athanasius, *Orations against the Arians*: 2, 20, in Khaled Anatolios, ed., *Athanasius*, 115.

<sup>494</sup> *PPS* 3: 149.

<sup>495</sup> Ibid., 150.

<sup>496</sup> Cf. *Arians*, 339-340. *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 34.

words.”<sup>497</sup> Basil explained that, for Eunomius, “Only-begotten” meant that “the Son alone was begotten and *created* by the Father alone.” Thus, Basil concluded, “there is no distinction between the Son and a creature! And how unworthy a conception of the Father that he should need a servant to do His work!”<sup>498</sup> Gregory of Nyssa followed Basil’s argument to say that if the Son “was obedient for this reason only that He was so made, then of course He is not on an equal footing even with humanity.”<sup>499</sup> The Cappadocians wanted to clarify that the Son’s obedience was not a compulsory submission to the will of the Father. Gregory of Nazianzen insisted, “In His character of the Word He was neither obedient nor disobedient.”<sup>500</sup> By saying this, Gregory wanted to highlight the inseparable unity of the Father and the Son. What the Father wills and what the Son wills are always one, for “We have one Godhead, so We have one Will.”<sup>501</sup> “The Father signifies, the Word accomplishes, not servilely nor ignorantly, but with knowledge and sovereignty, and, to speak more suitably, in the Father’s way [*patrikōs*].”<sup>502</sup> Similarly, Gregory of Nyssa asserted, “His immediate union does not exclude the Father’s will, nor does that will separate the Son from the Father.”<sup>503</sup> Basil added, “His own will is connected in indissoluble union with the Father.”<sup>504</sup>

---

<sup>497</sup> Eunomius, *The Extant Works*, Richard Paul Vaggione, trans. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 155.

<sup>498</sup> Basilus Caesariensis, *Letters and Select Works* (London: Continuum, 1989), xxxvii.

<sup>499</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*, 2:11, Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 5: 122.

<sup>500</sup> Gregory of Nazianzen, *The Fourth Theological Oration*, 6, Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 7: 311

<sup>501</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 7: 314.

<sup>502</sup> Gregory of Nazianzen, Orat. 30. 11, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 217.

<sup>503</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Contr. Eunom.* vii, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 391.

In his sermons, Newman did not deepen the issue of the will of Christ. He, nevertheless, emphasized the willingness and joyfulness of the Son in doing his Father's "business." Newman asserted that the obedience of the Son is "not grudgingly or of necessity"<sup>505</sup>—terms which could be implying the theory of Eunomius on the obedience of the Son. Newman strongly rejected this theory. For him, the passion was taken in voluntariness and cheerfulness, for it was the work of giving glory. Newman's sermon on "The Gift of the Spirit" in November 1835, went more deeply into the issue of glory and shows Newman's view of the Son's obedience and the economy of salvation.

In "The Gift of the Spirit," Newman linked the promise of God to Moses in Exodus with the last prayer of Jesus in John 17 as the starting point of his sermon: God said to Moses, "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of Lord" [Ex. xxxiv. 30], and Jesus prayed to the Father, "The glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given them" [John xvii. 22].<sup>506</sup> Newman saw that the promise of God to Moses and the prophets was fulfilled "when Christ came." "The glory as of the Only-begotten" [John i. 14] that the Son had received from the Father in the immanent life of God now was given to humanity through his passion, so that all the earth was filled with the glory of the Lord. The passion was the moment the Son gave all humanity the glory of the Almighty God. That glory was the gift of the Holy Spirit or, in other words, the Holy Spirit himself. Newman called the Spirit "the Spirit of

---

<sup>504</sup> Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, 8:20, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 8: 14. See Newman's references to the Fathers on this issue in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 216-222.

<sup>505</sup> *PPS* 3: 148.

<sup>506</sup> JHN, "The Gift of the Spirit," *PPS* 3: 254-270, at 254-255.

glory”<sup>507</sup> and “the gift of ‘the Spirit,’ the gift of ‘glory.’”<sup>508</sup> Newman placed the terms “Spirit” and “glory” in quotation marks and in parallel as if to highlight the Spirit as the glory, the “glory of the Father,” the “glory of the Only-begotten Son.” The Spirit as the glory, when he is given to humankind, will glorify and make them all become glory. The Spirit is the “Gift” of God the Father and the Son to all humanity. If the believer “carefully cherishes the Gift, he is.... ‘changed from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.’”<sup>509</sup> “The character of that Gift,” Newman stated, “attends on the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, and which is called the gift of glory.”<sup>510</sup>

For Newman, the term “gift” “cannot be defined. It cannot be limited; it cannot be divided, and exhausted by a division.”<sup>511</sup> It “is in fact incomprehensible and unfathomable.”<sup>512</sup> Newman sometimes used “gift” in the singular, sometimes in the plural. When it is used in the plural, Newman wanted to show the various activities of the Spirit in giving us abundantly different gifts. When it is used in the singular, he wanted to emphasize the uniqueness of all those gifts, which come from one source, and the Holy Spirit himself is the Gift.

In addition, “Spirit” and “gift” are connected to “glory.” As Newman pointed out, these three terms are one and sometimes replace each other. In particular, the term “glory”

---

<sup>507</sup> Ibid., 261.

<sup>508</sup> Ibid., 256.

<sup>509</sup> Ibid., 267.

<sup>510</sup> Ibid., 260.

<sup>511</sup> This is not the issue of the term that cannot be defined, but the reality of the gift. Newman asserted “the Spirit is God’s gift”, and gift is “a personal characteristic of the Third Person.” *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2:307.

<sup>512</sup> PPS 3: 260.

expresses the immanent life of the Holy Trinity, in which the Father and the Son glorify each other in the glory which is the Spirit himself. The glory of the immanent life of God, through the passion of Christ, is pouring out into the world through the Church, so that all might be in the “state of glory,” sharing the glory of God, sitting

together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus . . . Through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father . . . In whom [Christ] ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.”<sup>513</sup>

Here Newman is leading us from “gift” to “Spirit” to “glory” and then “into a mystery.”<sup>514</sup>

“A mystery” here should be taken not in the sense of something that cannot be explained, but rather in the salvific sense, namely “through Christ” and “in Christ,” “by one Spirit” and “through the Spirit,” all is drawn “unto the Father,” so that all “might be filled with all the fullness of God.”<sup>515</sup>

For Newman, glorification—being drawn into the glory of God—is the “privilege and birthright” of believers:

At length the glory of God in full measure was the privilege and birthright of all believers, who now, “in the unveiled face of Christ their Saviour, beheld the reflection of the Lord’s glory,” and were “changed into His likeness from one measure of glory to another.”<sup>516</sup>

Newman’s language here is similar to that of Basil, who also used the image of the face of Christ being “glorified by the manifestation of God” in indication that “the Lord is now called the Spirit,” and the one who believes in Christ “by the Spirit’s glory [is] somehow

---

<sup>513</sup> Ibid., 262.

<sup>514</sup> Ibid., 261.

<sup>515</sup> Ibid., 263.

<sup>516</sup> Ibid., 255.

transfigured into greater splendor, having his heart lighted up.”<sup>517</sup> This Basil called “being changed from the glory of the Spirit ‘into’ His own glory.”<sup>518</sup> For Basil, believers are not only irradiated by the glory of the Spirit, reflecting the Spirit’s glory, but they are transformed into “His own glory.” Newman’s expression is in harmony with Basil, but seems more emphatic by stating that the “glory of God in full measure” or “the Holy Spirit” is “the privilege and birthright” of the believers. At the very moment that believers, through baptism, are born into a new life in Christ, they immediately possess that “privilege and birthright”—being “born of water and of the Spirit” (Jn. 3:5).<sup>519</sup> For Newman, it is the moment that, by the Holy Spirit, Christ—the Lord and Savior—makes them become not only “reflections” of his glory, but transforms them into “His likeness.” Namely, the Lord gives them the glory that he has received from the Father (Jn. 17, 22); the glory with which the Son glorified the Father, and the Father glorified the Son; the glory that the Son had before the world began (Jn. 17, 4-5); his eternal glory in the immanent life of the Holy Trinity. With that glory, the Son glorifies those who believe in him “from one measure of glory to another.”

For Newman, “immanent glorification” does not cease in the Trinity, but flows into the world, thereby drawing all human beings into that circle of glory. This is the deification or glorification of humankind, for all are “changed into the glorious image of Christ, ‘by the Spirit of the Lord.’”<sup>520</sup> Such glorification is a “gracious truth” and “gracious dispensation.”<sup>521</sup>

---

<sup>517</sup> Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, 21: 52.

<sup>518</sup> Ibid.

<sup>519</sup> *PPS* 3: 255.

<sup>520</sup> Ibid.

<sup>521</sup> Ibid.

From Newman's discussions on the Spirit and glory, one might infer that if the Spirit were not glory, then the Spirit could not unify the Father and the Son within the immanent Trinity, and humankind would be a collection of individuals without the inner unity of the Trinity. Thus, the Holy Spirit is both glory as communion and communion as glory.

For Newman, believers, who by the Holy Spirit are transformed into the "glorious image of Christ," constitute the Church, which comes under the "gracious dispensation," by the "ministration of the Spirit."<sup>522</sup> "And further," Newman continued, "the Church, as being thus honoured and exalted by the presence of the Spirit of Christ, is called 'the Kingdom of God,' 'the Kingdom of Heaven.'"<sup>523</sup> Newman used the image of the "Kingdom" to describe the Church:

It became "a kingdom which cannot be moved," being sweetened, purified, and spiritualized by the pouring out of Christ's blood in it. It became once more an integral part of that unseen, but really existing world, of which "the Lord is the everlasting Light;" and it had fellowship with its blessed inhabitants.<sup>524</sup>

The Church, journeying on earth, has been "sweetened, purified and spiritualized" by the redeeming blood of Christ. Newman considered the Church "the earthly Sion," *and* the triumphant one "unseen" or "invisible" in heaven, which is "the heavenly Jerusalem."<sup>525</sup> The Church is "the court and domain of Almighty God."<sup>526</sup> It is the "Church of the First-born," with "God the Judge of all" and "Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant."<sup>527</sup> Newman's

---

<sup>522</sup> Ibid.

<sup>523</sup> Ibid.

<sup>524</sup> Ibid, 257.

<sup>525</sup> Ibid.

<sup>526</sup> Ibid., 256.

<sup>527</sup> Ibid., 257.



ecclesiology is built upon a Trinitarian foundation: the Church of the Almighty God the Father is redeemed and purified by the “pouring out of Christ’s blood in it,” sanctified and glorified by the “gracious dispensation” of the Holy Spirit. It is the Church of glory, the “glorious Church,”<sup>528</sup> “a heaven upon earth, in fulfilment of Jacob’s vision.”<sup>529</sup> It is “the Kingdom of God” and “Christ [is] the centre of it, His glory the light of it, the Just made perfect His companions, and the Apostles His witnesses to their brethren.”<sup>530</sup>

Newman was building a Trinitarian theology of glorification. He saw the passion of Christ as the moment of the Son’s willing obedience in which He gave humanity the glory that He had received from the Father before the foundation of the world (cf. Jn. 17, 22),<sup>531</sup> so that “all be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us” [John xvii. 21].<sup>532</sup> It is the “Father of glory,” who draws all humankind into himself, by disclosing “a present entrance [i.e., the Church] into the next world, opened upon our souls through participation of the Word Incarnate, ministered to us by the Holy Ghost.”<sup>533</sup>

Later in 1838, in his book *Lectures on Justification*, Newman asserted that “glory” is “the inherent perfection of Almighty God from eternity.”<sup>534</sup> Now that “inherent perfection” is “manifested in time,”<sup>535</sup> and is given to us through the Son, by the Holy Spirit, in order to

---

<sup>528</sup> Ibid., 263.

<sup>529</sup> Ibid., 257.

<sup>530</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>531</sup> Ibid., 264.

<sup>532</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>533</sup> Ibid., 263.

<sup>534</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 189.

<sup>535</sup> Ibid.

change us “from glory to glory.”<sup>536</sup> Newman connected “glory” with “righteousness.” Glorification or justification is the “ministration of the Spirit” and “the ministration of *righteousness* exceeding in *glory*.”<sup>537</sup> Also in 1838, Newman published *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*, which considered the passion and the cross of Christ as “His proper glory,” and as the moment when it was true that “now is the Son of man glorified.”<sup>538</sup>

Much later in 1866, in *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on His Recent Eirenicon*, Newman again insisted that “all have sinned and need the glory of God, being justified by his grace and redeemed.”<sup>539</sup> Depicting humanity sharing the glory of God the Trinity, Newman exclaimed: “such is the mysterious state in which Christians stand;”<sup>540</sup> it is the “state of glory.”<sup>541</sup> Believers become partakers of divine glory, “citizen[s] of a heavenly kingdom.”<sup>542</sup> Believers, in terms of the book of Revelation, “are ministers round the throne of their reconciled Father, ‘kings and priests unto God,’ having their robes washed in the Lamb’s blood, and being consecrated as temples of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>543</sup> In Newman’s Trinitarian theology of glorification, the Father is the one who reconciled all humankind to him, through the redeeming blood of the Son incarnate, by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, so that all

---

<sup>536</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>537</sup> Ibid.

<sup>538</sup> JHN, *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril*, 145.

<sup>539</sup> JHN, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on His Recent Eirenicon* (London: Lawrence Kehoe, 1866), 74.

<sup>540</sup> *PPS* 3: 263.

<sup>541</sup> Ibid., 259.

<sup>542</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>543</sup> Ibid., 264.

may share the glory of the Triune God, so that all “may be one in Us.” Accordingly, glory, in Newman’s sense, is seen as communion and communion as glory. The mystery of the Holy Trinity is the glory of all humanity and all have been drawn into oneness with that glory. This “mystery of the new birth,”<sup>544</sup> enables us to view “by faith His glory without and within us.”<sup>545</sup> Moreover, we are called to live in “our obedience,”<sup>546</sup> for “the highest glory is obedience.”<sup>547</sup>

While emphasizing the glory of the passion of Christ, Newman did not forget the sacrificial perspective of his death: “the doctrine of the Son of God dying on the Cross for us.”<sup>548</sup> In 1836, Newman, in his sermon on “The Incarnate Son, a Sufferer and Sacrifice,” developed his point of view on Christ, Son of God, “the Eternal Priest and His one ever-enduring Sacrifice.”<sup>549</sup> For Newman, it is the “Sacrifice which, though completed once for all on Calvary, yet ever abideth, and, in its power and its grace, is ever present among us, and is at all times gratefully and awfully to be commemorated.”<sup>550</sup> Christ “has redeemed us one and all,” so that we are “being drawn one and all to Him.”<sup>551</sup> To redeem is to “draw us to Him,” and that happened when He “was lifted up.”<sup>552</sup> Nonetheless, the death of Christ was not a martyrdom.

---

<sup>544</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>545</sup> Ibid., 269.

<sup>546</sup> Ibid.

<sup>547</sup> JHN, “The State of Grace,” *PPS* 4: 133-149, at 142.

<sup>548</sup> JHN, “The Incarnate Son, a Sufferer and Sacrifice,” *PPS* 6: 69-82, at 71.

<sup>549</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>550</sup> *PPS* 6: 70.

<sup>551</sup> Ibid.

<sup>552</sup> Ibid.

A martyr is one who dies for the Church, who is put to death for preaching and maintaining the truth. Christ, indeed, was put to death for preaching the Gospel; yet He was not a Martyr, but He was much more than a Martyr. Had He been a mere man, He would have been rightly called a Martyr, but as He was not a mere man, so He was not a mere Martyr. Man dies as a Martyr, but the Son of God dies as an Atoning Sacrifice.<sup>553</sup>

“Atoning Sacrifice” describes the salvific perspective of the death of Christ.

“Atoning” indicates “a virtue in His death,” which makes his death different from all others, “for He was God,” “God becoming incarnate and dying on the Cross.”<sup>554</sup> The term “Atoning Sacrifice” could have been inspired by Augustine<sup>555</sup>, who stated in his *Against the Manicheans*:<sup>556</sup>

We have the prophetic intimations of one most true sacrifice to be offered for the sins of all believers, as in the sacrifices enjoined by God on our fathers; along with which there was also the symbolical anointing typical of Christ, as the name Christ itself means anointed.... the true sacrifice, which is due only to one true God, and which Christ alone offered on His altar.<sup>557</sup>

As Augustine linked Christ with his sacrifice—he is the “High Priest” and at the same the “sacrificial Victim,” for the sacrifice he offered to God was none other than Himself<sup>558</sup>—Newman linked the “Eternal Priest” with his “Atoning Sacrifice.”<sup>559</sup> The “Atoning Sacrifice”

---

<sup>553</sup> Ibid., 70-71.

<sup>554</sup> Ibid., 71.

<sup>555</sup> Cf. *Via Media*, 1: 97, note 9.

<sup>556</sup> Cf. Newman’s writing on the life of St. Augustine in JHN, *Historical Sketches*, vol. II (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906), 127-162.

<sup>557</sup> Augustine, *Reply to Faustus the Manicheans*, 20:18, Philip Schaff, eds., *St. Augustine the Writings Against the Manicheans and Against the Donatists*, Part 4 (New York: Kessinger Publishing, 2004): 260-261. See Newman’s references to the Fathers on “the Priesthood of Christ” in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 245-6.

<sup>558</sup> Michael Keenan Jones, *Toward a Christology of Christ the High Priest* (Roma: Università Gregoriana, 2006), 98.

<sup>559</sup> Pusey also emphasized this point in his *First Letter to Newman*, 422.

is Christ himself, who is our Redemption. These two terms highlight the divine nature and salvific mission of the Son of God. It was the “Lord of glory” who was being “killed”<sup>560</sup>: “God the Son was the Sufferer.”<sup>561</sup> For Newman, if Christ were a mere man, he could not save the world; the sufferings and death of Christ were those of the Word incarnate, of the Only-begotten Son of God; thus, his sufferings and death “could not pass away like a dream; they could not be a mere martyrdom, or a mere display or figure of something else.”<sup>562</sup> Newman reminded his audience that it was “the sufferings and death of the Word Incarnate,”<sup>563</sup> “the death of the Son of God Incarnate,”<sup>564</sup> that brought “our reconciliation to God, the expiation of our sins, and our new creation in holiness.”<sup>565</sup>

Newman emphasized the divinity of Christ in his passion and death: “when He suffered, it was God suffering.”<sup>566</sup> Lest his statement sound like Patripassianism, Newman immediately explained that

Not that the Divine Nature itself could suffer, any more than our soul can see or hear; but, as the soul sees and hears through the organs of the body, so God the Son suffered *in* that human nature which He had taken to Himself and made His own.<sup>567</sup>

The divine nature cannot be touched by sufferings; in his human nature, however, the Son of God “did truly suffer.” Yet, there was no division in the person of the Son: “as truly as He framed the worlds through His Almighty power, so through His human nature did He suffer;

---

<sup>560</sup> *PPS* 6: 72.

<sup>561</sup> *Ibid.*, 73.

<sup>562</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

<sup>563</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>564</sup> *Ibid.*, 77.

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

<sup>566</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>567</sup> *Ibid.*

for when He came on earth, His manhood became as truly and personally His, as His Almighty power had been from everlasting.”<sup>568</sup> In virtue of the “hypostatic union,” one may say “Almighty God Himself, God the Son, was the Sufferer.”<sup>569</sup> The term “Almighty God” here points directly to “God the Son”; speaking of the Son as “Almighty” was exceptional, since Newman usually reserved the term for the Father. Perhaps Newman used “Almighty” here in order to emphasize that the Son as God is also as “Almighty” as God the Father; thus, the “Almighty” did suffer and die for the redemption of all people.

### **3 A Defense of the Humanity and Divinity of Christ**

As in his sermon on “Incarnation and Atonement” in 1835, Newman described the human nature of Christ as an “instrument”; in 1836, with the intention of defending the humanity and divinity of Christ he repeated this term and added a new term, “perfect tabernacle,”<sup>570</sup> which is taken from the Letter to the Hebrews (9: 11) in reference to Christ the High Priest:

But it must not be supposed, because it was an instrument, or because in the text it is called a tabernacle, that therefore it was not intimately one with Him, or that it was merely like what is commonly meant by a tabernacle, which a man dwells in, and may come in and out of; or like an instrument, which a man takes up and lays down. Far from it; though His Divine Nature was sovereign and supreme when He became incarnate, yet the manhood which He assumed was not kept at a distance from Him (if I may so speak) as a mere instrument, or put on as a mere garment, or entered as a mere tabernacle, but it was really taken into the closest and most ineffable union with Him. He received it into His Divine Essence (if we may dare so to speak) almost as a new attribute of His Person; of course I speak by way of analogy, but I mean as simply and indissolubly.<sup>571</sup>

---

<sup>568</sup> Ibid., 72-73.

<sup>569</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>570</sup> JHN, “Christ the Son of God made Man,” *PPS* 6: 53-68, at 61.

<sup>571</sup> Ibid., 64-65.

In regard to the union of the divine nature and human nature in the person of the Son of God, Newman was concerned, on the one hand, to highlight the divinity of the Son of God; on the other hand, he emphasized that the Son of God truly suffered and died for humankind. Newman depicted the second divine person, who is truly God, as sharing the same full divinity with the Father and the Holy Spirit; but simultaneously He is truly man, yet without sin. Newman used the analogies “instrument” and “perfect tabernacle” to safeguard the divinity and humanity of Christ. For Christ’s humanity, Newman saw the term “perfect tabernacle” signifying His “pure and sinless flesh, which was miraculously formed of the substance of the Blessed Virgin.”<sup>572</sup> “[G]reater than any thing earthly,” Christ’s flesh was not like our sinful flesh, for He “had no earthly father.”<sup>573</sup> “It was a new creation by which He was formed, even by the descent of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>574</sup> “He was man because He had our human nature wholly and perfectly.”<sup>575</sup> As Newman insisted, “He was not man in exactly the same sense in which any one of us is a man,” for “His Person is not human like ours, but divine.”<sup>576</sup> “He who was from eternity, continued one and the same, but with an addition. His Incarnation was a ‘taking of the manhood into God.’”<sup>577</sup> “He was not a man made God, but God made man.”<sup>578</sup>

---

<sup>572</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>573</sup> Ibid., 62.

<sup>574</sup> Ibid., 61

<sup>575</sup> Ibid., 62.

<sup>576</sup> Ibid.

<sup>577</sup> Ibid.

<sup>578</sup> Ibid.

Newman was also concerned about the divinity of Christ. Newman asserted this that the Son of God entered into this “new and perfect tabernacle; entered, but not to be confined, not to be circumscribed by it.”<sup>579</sup> Newman explained that “still He did not cease to be what He was, because He became man, but was still the Infinite God, manifested in, not altered by the flesh.”<sup>580</sup> Newman wanted his audience to keep in mind that the Son of God incarnate never ceased to be God in his divinity:

His manhood remained human, and His Godhead remained divine. God became man, yet was still God, having His manhood as an adjunct, perfect in its kind, but dependent upon His Godhead.<sup>581</sup>

Newman attempted to present a perfect picture of Christ, truly God and truly man. Believers have to hold firmly the “Catholic tenet, that the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in One Person, never to be divided.”<sup>582</sup>

Although Newman attempted to analyze the divine nature and human nature of Christ and to emphasize the hypostatic union, he preferred to focus on the divinity of Christ. For instance, when Christ prayed to the Father, it was not “the prayer of a man supplicating God, but of the Eternal Son of God who had ever shared the glory of the Father.”<sup>583</sup> Newman, however, noted that such prayer was different from when He “was in the bosom of the Father”; He now prayed in “a new way”; He prayed “in the economy of redemption, and in a

---

<sup>579</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>580</sup> Ibid.

<sup>581</sup> Ibid.

<sup>582</sup> Ibid., 65.

<sup>583</sup> Ibid.



lower world, viz. through the feelings and thoughts of human nature.”<sup>584</sup> Similarly, when Christ wept at the grave of Lazarus, or was in anger, or had compassion on the people, “He manifested the tender mercy, the compassion, the long-suffering, the fearful wrath of Almighty God, yet not in Himself, as from eternity, but as if indirectly through the outlets of that manhood with which He had clothed Himself.”<sup>585</sup> Also, when Christ poured out his blood on the cross, “it was not a man’s blood, though it belonged to His manhood, but blood full of power and virtue, instinct with life and grace, as issuing most mysteriously from Him who was the Creator of the world.”<sup>586</sup> For Newman, Christ “shows us that He was not an individual man, like any of us, but God acting through human nature as His assumed instrument.”<sup>587</sup>

Should this be seen as a weak point or as a particular one of Newman’s Christology? In Newman’s language, the divinity of Christ seems to be more emphasized than the humanity. Newman, in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, rarely used the term “Jesus.” One might say that Newman preferred Christology from above to Christology from below. Although Newman clarified his views about “instrument” and “tabernacle” and insisted on the hypostatic union, his expressions sometimes—if taken out of context—could be misunderstood. The divinity of Christ indeed is the chief concern of Newman and his fellow Tractarians. In *Tract 85* (published 1838), in discussing the revelation in the New Testament, Newman listed “the divinity of Christ” first, then “the unity of God, and the supremacy of

---

<sup>584</sup> Ibid.

<sup>585</sup> Ibid., 63.

<sup>586</sup> Ibid.

<sup>587</sup> Ibid.

divine grace,” and other doctrines later.<sup>588</sup> Newman spent much time in analyzing and defending the fullness of the divinity of Christ probably because of the threat of Dissenters—notably the Latitudinarians, Socinians, Unitarians, Congregationalists, Quakers.<sup>589</sup> These Dissenters “rejected the Church’s Thirty-nine Articles of Faith” as well as the liturgy and rites of the Church of England. Moreover, their religious beliefs tended “toward Arianism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism, denying the essential divinity of Christ altogether.”<sup>590</sup> Newman’s sermon, “The Incarnate Son, Sufferer and Sacrifice,” spoke of “men now-a-days,” whose “hearts are set on schemes of this world.”<sup>591</sup> For them, the Gospel was “strange, extravagant, incredible”; they could not accept “the Son of God taking human flesh.”<sup>592</sup>

“How can these things be?” God Himself suffering on the Cross, the Almighty Everlasting God in the form of a servant, with human flesh and blood, wounded, insulted, dying? And all this as an Expiation for human sin? Why (they would ask) was an Expiation necessary? Why could not the All-merciful Father pardon without one? Why is human sin to be accounted so great an evil? We see no necessity for so marvellous a remedy; we refuse to admit a course of doctrine so utterly unlike any thing which the face of this world tells us of.<sup>593</sup>

Newman saw this sort of “reason of the new age” as really a threat to the Anglican Church in particular and to Christianity in general. As he wrote to Hamden in 1834, he felt that “as they do, in my opinion, altogether to make shipwreck of Christian faith.”<sup>594</sup> This

---

<sup>588</sup> JHN, “Tract 85,” Members of the University of Oxford, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. 5 for 1838-40 (London: J. G. & J. Rivington, 1840), 12.

<sup>589</sup> Gerald Newman, Leslie Ellen Brown, *Britain in the Hanoverian Age, 1714-1837* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1997), 193.

<sup>590</sup> Ibid.

<sup>591</sup> *PPS* 6: 80.

<sup>592</sup> Ibid., 81.

<sup>593</sup> Ibid.

<sup>594</sup> JHN to Renn Dickson Hampden (28 November 1834), *LD* 4: 371.

issue remained a significant concern for Newman. As a Roman Catholic, in his *Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations*, he remarked: “They speak in a dreamy, shadowy way of Christ’s divinity; but, when their meaning is sifted, you will find them very slow to commit themselves to any statement sufficient to express the Catholic dogma.”<sup>595</sup> Ian Ker has commented that Newman’s Christology “so emphasized the divinity of Christ as to risk downgrading his humanity, partly because of the influence of the Alexandrian Fathers, especially St. Athanasius, and partly because he was extremely anxious to rebut any diminution of Christ’s divinity by the liberal theologians of the day.”<sup>596</sup> Similarly, Geoffrey W. Bromiley has observed that in the nineteenth century, there was “a major defense of orthodoxy” and Newman was a theologian who defended orthodoxy by insisting that “Christ should be thought of as man, rather than as *a* man.”<sup>597</sup>

Given the theological Liberalism of the Dissenters, one can understand why Newman so stressed the divinity of Christ. Newman wanted to protect orthodox Christology from “men now-a-days.” He wanted believers to hold the Catholic faith inherited from the Fathers of the early Church. Emphasizing the divinity of Christ had been a great concern of Athanasius in his struggles against Arianism. Newman, in contending against the Dissenters

---

<sup>595</sup> JHN, *Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906), 345.

<sup>596</sup> Ian Ker, *Newman on Being a Christian* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 40. Also see Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 134.

<sup>597</sup> C. Brown, “The Person of Christ,” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. III: K-P, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1994), 781-801, at 784.

of his day, insisted that “Christ is God: from eternity He was the Living and True God.”<sup>598</sup> Newman’s belief reflects the assertion of Athanasius: “Christ is God and the Son of God.”<sup>599</sup> As Wilfrid Ward said, “Dogmatic history in the early centuries is the protection of the primary beliefs that God is one; that Christ is God and man; that man is sinful and dependent on God; against Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians.”<sup>600</sup> Newman brought these beliefs of the early Church to the nineteenth century where he saw the orthodox teachings of the Church again threatened by new forms of heresy.<sup>601</sup>

#### 4. The Economic Trinity is the Immanent Trinity

Besides his assertion that Christ is God, one of the significant points of Newman in 1836 was that he again returned to the Trinitarian formula that he had enunciated in 1831, but this time he employed the title “Christ”:

The Father is God . . . , and so is the Holy Ghost; . . . *Christ* is God and Lord, most fully, completely, and entirely, in all attributes as perfect and as adorable, as if nothing had been told us of Father or of Holy Ghost . . . while our Lord is God He is also the Son of God, or rather, . . . He is God because He is the Son of God.<sup>602</sup>

In 1831, when Newman discussed the divinity of the Holy Trinity, he spoke of the second person, as the “Son of God,” “Eternal Word,” “Only begotten Son.” The title “Christ” was not mentioned. In 1836, Newman again asserted the Godhead of the Trinity. This time,

---

<sup>598</sup> *PPS* 6: 55.

<sup>599</sup> JHN, trans., *Historical Tracts of S. Athanasius* (London: J. Rivington, 1843), 84. Also see Newman’s explanation of the term *Kurios* in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 422-23.

<sup>600</sup> Wilfrid Ward, *Problems and Persons* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), xlvii.

<sup>601</sup> This aspect will be analyzed further in chapter V which treats the context of Newman’s sermons.

<sup>602</sup> *PPS* 6: 56-7.

he placed the title “Christ” in the midst of the discussion, insisting “Christ is God,” thereby linking “Christ” with the “Son of God.” This change does not mean that in 1831 Newman did not believe that Christ is God, but it shows a change in focus. In 1836, his concern focused more on the “Economy of Redemption” and “Christ” is the “economic title.” Newman seemingly placed the title “Christ” in the Trinitarian discussion in order to emphasize that the economy is the work of the Holy Trinity. The new title does not change the immanent life of the Triune God, yet shows the unique work of the Son of God in the economy as well as in immanence:

From eternity He had been the Only-begotten in the bosom of the Father; and when He came on earth, this essential relation to the Father remained unaltered; still, He was a Son, when in the form of a servant,—still performing the will of the Father, as His Father’s Word and Wisdom, manifesting His Father’s glory and accomplishing His Father’s purposes.<sup>603</sup>

The Son, for Newman, *still* was the Son whether he was in heaven or on earth, in the immanent life or in the economic mission. There was no change in his relationship with the Father. The Incarnation did not make him “a second Son,” though it might be said that “the Son of God became the Son a second time ... by becoming man.” However, “He was a Son both before His Incarnation, and, by a second mystery, after it.”<sup>604</sup> This assertion safeguards the divinity of Christ, while showing that the economic Trinity *is* the immanent Trinity. The Incarnation did not change the immanent Trinity, for the One “who came on earth, was the very Same who had been from everlasting.”<sup>605</sup> “Although He be God and Man, yet is not two

---

<sup>603</sup> Ibid., 58-59.

<sup>604</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>605</sup> Ibid., 67.

but one Christ,” “the Eternal Word, the Son of God, the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity.”<sup>606</sup> “He was as entirely man as if He had ceased to be God, as fully God as if He had never become man, as fully both at once as He was in being at all.”<sup>607</sup> For Newman, this was “by unity of Person,” “not by unity of nature.”<sup>608</sup> For Newman, “by unity of Person” avoids the notion of “the Divine Nature and the human becoming some one new nature.” It is “not by confusion of substance.”<sup>609</sup> For Newman, there is no division between the immanent Trinity and the economic Trinity, since God in himself is identical to the God who reveals himself in the economy of salvation. The relationships between the divine persons are *always the same* whether in the Incarnation or passion or death or resurrection. Nothing changed in the Godhead and in the Trinitarian relationships. The difference is that what was hidden is now revealed. What was in the immanent life now is disclosed in the economy. As Newman stated in his sermon, “The Mysteriousness of Our Present Being,” on Trinity Sunday in 1836,

He is revealed to us as One God, the Father, One indivisible Spirit; yet there is said to exist in Him from everlasting His Only-begotten Son, the same as He is, and yet distinct, and from and in Them both, from everlasting and indivisibly, exists the Co-equal Spirit.<sup>610</sup>

Newman reasoned that “we have never been in heaven; God, as He is in Himself, is hid from us.” How can we know him? We know him because “we are informed concerning him” by “One who ‘knoweth the Father,’ His Co-eternal Son Himself, when He came on

---

<sup>606</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>607</sup> Ibid.

<sup>608</sup> Ibid. 67.

<sup>609</sup> Ibid.

<sup>610</sup> JHN, “The Mysteriousness of Our Present Being,” *PPS* 4: 282-294, at 286-287.

earth.”<sup>611</sup> The Son incarnate is the key for us to perceive the mystery of the Trinity. He is the revelation of the Triune God. What is in the immanent life of God is what is revealed here on earth in the economy. Newman, nevertheless, clarified that “the doctrine, as a whole, is unintelligible to us (which we grant); that the words we use have very little meaning (which is not true, though we may not see the full meaning).”<sup>612</sup> Newman acknowledged the limitations of human language in expressing the mystery of the Trinity: “If we have mysteries even about ourselves, which we cannot even put into words accurately, much more may we suppose, even were we not told it, that there are mysteries in the nature of Almighty God.”<sup>613</sup> Therefore, if the “profane minds” say that “we are using words without meaning. We answer, no, not without meaning in themselves, but without meaning which we fully apprehend.”<sup>614</sup> Newman recognized that the immanent Trinity is revealed to us in the economy, and the experience of the economic Trinity is the basis for positing distinctions within the Godhead, though human language is very limited in its expression of the mystery, yet “God understands His own words, though human.”<sup>615</sup> This doctrine is God-given; it is God himself who

put it into words, and the doctrine, as we word it, is the doctrine as the Apostles worded it; it is conveyed to us with the same degree of meaning in it, intelligible to us, with which the Apostles received it; so that it is no reason for giving it up that in part it is not intelligible.”<sup>616</sup>

---

<sup>611</sup> Ibid., 286.

<sup>612</sup> *PPS* 4: 290.

<sup>613</sup> Ibid.

<sup>614</sup> Ibid.

<sup>615</sup> Ibid.

<sup>616</sup> Ibid.

Isaac Augustine Dorner (1809-1884),<sup>617</sup> a German theologian, who lived at the same period as Newman, had a similar vision. For Dorner, “the economic Trinity . . . leads back to immanent distinctions in God himself, all the more so because in the world of revelation we have to do not merely with a teaching of truths, but with the true *being* of God in the world, with God’s actions, indeed with his self-communication.”<sup>618</sup> Dorner, in his book *A System of Christian Doctrine*, treated particularly the doctrine of God. Dorner was first concerned about the “doctrine of the Godhead,” then “the doctrine of God as the essentially Triune,” namely “the Internal Self-Revelation of God,” then the “doctrine of God as the Revealer of Himself in the world,” or the “doctrine of the Economic Trinity.”<sup>619</sup> In treating the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, similarly as Newman in the *Arians of the Fourth Century*, first Dorner did his study of the doctrine in Scriptures, which he called “Biblical Doctrine.” Then he focused on “Ecclesiastical Development of the Doctrine of the Trinity,” in which he particularly discussed the Athanasian Creed.<sup>620</sup> According to Dorner, the “Trinity of revelation” would be “a misrepresentation, if there is not behind it a Trinity of nature.”<sup>621</sup> This emphasis is obvious in regard to the Holy Spirit: “The Holy Spirit performs only the same office in the economic Trinity that he performs in the immanent Trinity, where he is equally the distinguishing and

---

<sup>617</sup> Newman, in speaking of the development of doctrine, mentioned Dorner and his work: “Dorner’s great work on our Lord’s Person.” *LD* 25: 279.

<sup>618</sup> Gareth Jones, *The Blackwell Companion to Modern Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 195.

<sup>619</sup> I. A. Dorner, *A System of Christian Doctrine*, vol. I, Alfred Cave, trans. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1888), vii-viii.

<sup>620</sup> *Ibid.*, 344-397.

<sup>621</sup> Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology*, vol. I (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907), 328.



the unifying principle.”<sup>622</sup> Similarly, Julius Kaftan (1848-1926) insisted that “the economic and the immanent Trinity differ only in form, but in content they are congruent.”<sup>623</sup> J. C. K. Hofman (1810-1877) also attempted to combine the economic and the immanent Trinity: “the relation of the Father and the Son is intra-divine, though comprehensible to man only in its historical self-evidence on the basis of the Bible.”<sup>624</sup>

These German theologians, who were contemporaries of Newman, indicate that Trinitarian theology was one of the main theological concerns of Newman’s time. Dorner had another great work, entitled *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. This work was indeed a profound study on the history and theology of the doctrine of Christ. It was published in five volumes, going from the Scriptures, the Fathers of the Church and medieval times, to the 1800s. In the second volume, Dorner particularly treated concrete issues such as meaning of *hypostasis*, Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, Arian denial of the human soul of Christ, Athanasius’ doctrine of the divine and human natures in Christ, etc.<sup>625</sup> Dorner and Newman seemingly shared the same primary concern about the doctrine of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ. In addition, they both took the early church Fathers as the

---

<sup>622</sup> Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002), 570. Also see Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Logic—III: The Spirit of Truth* (New York: Ignatius, 2005), 307.

<sup>623</sup> O. Kim, “The Doctrine of the Trinity,” *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. XII, Samuel Macauley Jackson, ed. (London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1912), 18-22, at 22.

<sup>624</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>625</sup> See “Analysis of the Five Volumes,” in I. A. Dorner, *History of the Development of the Person of Christ*, Division Second, vol. III (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869), v-xxviii. Dorner divided his work into two parts: Division First (volumes I, II), Division Second (volumes I, II, III). Division First was published in 1835, two years after the publication of Newman’s *Arians of the Fourth Century*.

main source of their discussions. Thus both the works of Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, and of Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, were often quoted together by authors at that time.<sup>626</sup>

### 5. The Eucharist – The Sacrament of Glory

Newman's concern about the divinity of Christ and his vision of the passion as glory led him to "the first sacrament of the Church": the Eucharist.<sup>627</sup> In his sermon, "The State of Grace," in November 1836, he considered the Eucharist as the sacrament of glory, so that Christians "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory," because of "Christ's Presence in that mysterious Ordinance."<sup>628</sup> Newman called the Eucharist: "Heavenly Communion" and the "Presence of the Lord Incarnate."<sup>629</sup> Newman strongly expressed his faith in the Eucharist:

We have, we trust, more faith than to need to see the heavens open, or the Holy Ghost descend in bodily shape,—more faith than to attempt, in default of sight, to indulge our reason, and to confine our notion of the Sacrament to some clear assemblage of words of our own framing. We have faith and love enough, in St. Paul's words, to "*discern* the Lord's Body." He who is at the right hand of God, manifests Himself in that Holy Sacrament as *really* and *fully* as if He were visibly there. We are allowed to draw near, to "give, take, and eat" His sacred Body and Blood, as truly as though like Thomas we could touch His hands and thrust our hand into His side.<sup>630</sup>

---

<sup>626</sup> Cf. S. Cheetham, *A History of the Christian Church During the First Six Centuries* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1905), 459; Joseph Pohle, *The Divine Trinity* (London: B. Herder, 1911), 130; James C. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. I (London: John Murray, 1874), 282; William Bright, *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898), 130; Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. III (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), 617.

<sup>627</sup> JHN, "The State of Grace," *PPS* 4: 133-149, at 147.

<sup>628</sup> *Ibid.*, 147.

<sup>629</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>630</sup> *Ibid.*, 147-148.

Newman had no doubt about the Real Presence of the Lord in the Eucharist; as he later wrote to his friend, Henry Wilberforce: “When I was at the early Eucharistic Service at St. Mary’s (I thus specify it, because I am appealing to my memory distinctly) I had an absolute and overpowering sense of the Real Presence.”<sup>631</sup> Two months before he wrote this sermon, in September 1836, Newman informed Pusey that he believed in the Sacrifice of the Mass, which was taught by the Council of Trent: “As to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine Decree.”<sup>632</sup> At this time when he wrote Pusey, Newman was “incidentally anticipating the principles of Tract 90.”<sup>633</sup> However, when Newman said that he believed in the Real Presence and could not find fault with the Tridentine Decrees, this did not mean that he fully accepted the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Two years later in 1838, in his sermon “The Eucharistic Presence,” Newman made clear:

That belief, which goes beyond ours, shows how great the gift is really. I allude to the doctrine of what is called transubstantiation, which we do not admit; or that the bread and wine cease to be, and that Christ’s sacred Body and Blood are directly seen, touched, and handled, under the *appearances* of Bread and Wine. This our Church considers there is no ground for saying, and our Lord’s own words contain marvel enough, even without adding any thing to them by way of explanation. Let us, then, now consider them in themselves, apart from additions which came afterwards.<sup>634</sup>

---

<sup>631</sup> JHN to Henry Wilberforce (27 January 1846), *LD* 11, Charles Stephen Dessain, ed. (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1961): 101.

<sup>632</sup> Henry Parry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. II (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893), 33.

<sup>633</sup> Walter Walsh, *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1899), 269.

<sup>634</sup> JHN, “The Eucharistic Presence,” *PPS* 6: 136-152, at 141.

Newman and his fellow Tractarians admitted that the doctrine of transubstantiation had “no ground” in Scripture. In *Tract 38*, Pusey asserted that “the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man’s devising, is profane and impious.”<sup>635</sup> In his work on Baptism, Pusey said that “the error of transubstantiation has so modified other true doctrine, as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered upon the Cross.”<sup>636</sup> In his *Tract 81*, once again Pusey said, “the doctrine of the Sacrifice cannot be the same where transubstantiation is held, and where it is not.”<sup>637</sup> Newman in his *Via Media* agreed with Pusey on this issue: “This, I suppose, was my own view also.”<sup>638</sup> For Newman and Pusey, the problem was that if “there was no Transubstantiation, there was no real and literal offering of Christ.”<sup>639</sup> Newman explained what the Tractarians believed:

The Eucharist is “the Very Body and Blood of the Redeemer, and His Personal Presence; but from first to last there was no real offering up of Christ, because there was no Tran-substantiation. He was really present but as our spiritual food, and as the Lamb that had been offered once, but not as then being offered; not as the Lambs of the Mass.”<sup>640</sup>

The Tractarian understanding of the Eucharist appeared in the *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*:

---

<sup>635</sup> Pusey, “Tract 38,” Members of the University of Oxford, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. I., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Charles Henry, 1839), 281.

<sup>636</sup> E. B. Pusey, “Extracts from the Tracts for the Times,” 13; in Appendix, E. B. Pusey, *A Letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford on the Tendency to Romanism* (New York: J. S. Redfield, Clinton Hall, 1843).

<sup>637</sup> Pusey, “Tract 81,” Members of the University of Oxford, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. IV., for 1836-1837, new ed. (London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1840), 47.

<sup>638</sup> JHN, *The Via Media*, vol. 2 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), 353.

<sup>639</sup> Ibid.

<sup>640</sup> Ibid.

The Church of England clearly intended to deny any *gross corporal* presence, such as is implied in the coarse questions frequently debated in connexion with Transubstantiation. In short, she affirms a *spiritual* Presence, and the Author affirms the presence of a spiritual Body.<sup>641</sup>

Indeed, it took a while for Newman to accept transubstantiation: “Froude would not believe that I was in earnest, *as I was*, in shrinking from the views which he boldly followed out. I was against Transubstantiation.”<sup>642</sup> Newman also confessed in his *Apologia*:

People say that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is difficult to believe; I did not believe the doctrine till I was a Catholic. I had no difficulty in believing it, as soon as I believed that the Catholic Roman Church was the oracle of God, and that she had declared this doctrine to be part of the original revelation.<sup>643</sup>

Newman reasoned that for Thomas More, the doctrine of transubstantiation is “a kind of proof charge. A faith which stands that test, will stand any test.” But for Newman, “I cannot indeed prove it, I cannot tell *how* it is; but I say, ‘Why should it not be? What’s to hinder it? What do I know of substance or matter?’”<sup>644</sup> Newman saw faith as beyond proof and demonstration. Speaking of the transubstantiation is like talking about the essence of God. We are dealing “with what no one on earth knows anything about.”

What do I know of the Essence of the Divine Being? I know that my abstract idea of three is simply incompatible with my idea of one; but when I come to the question of concrete fact, I have no means of proving that there is not a sense in which one and three can equally be predicated of the Incommunicable God.<sup>645</sup>

---

<sup>641</sup> Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, vol. I (Derby: Henry Mozley and Sons, 1839), 62. Also see William Simcox Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops upon Tractarian Theology* (Oxford: J. Vencent, 1845), 409.

<sup>642</sup> Note 1 in a letter to Newman from Richard Hurrell Froude (January 1835), *LD* 5: 18.

<sup>643</sup> *Apologia*, DeLaura, ed., 184-185.

<sup>644</sup> *Ibid.*, 185.

<sup>645</sup> *Ibid.*

Pusey said that the doctrine of transubstantiation was “probably a dispute about words.”<sup>646</sup> In *Tract 90* in 1841, however, Newman unhesitatingly defended “transubstantiation” in its scholastic sense as appropriate for Anglicans.<sup>647</sup> Pusey in May, 1843, in his sermon “The Holy Eucharist, a Comforter to the Penitent,” implicitly accepted the doctrine of transubstantiation; however, it needs to be explained so that “the doctrine of the true presence itself is conveyed.”<sup>648</sup>

Although Newman, at this time, was struggling with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, his faith in the Eucharist as the Real Presence of the Lord was strong and steadfast. He understood the “Real Presence” to mean that “Christ, who died and rose again for us, is in it spiritually present, in the fulness of His death and of His resurrection.”<sup>649</sup> Newman explained “spiritually” or “spiritual” here “not as if ‘spiritual’ were but a name or mode of speech, and He were really absent, *but* by way of expressing that He who is present there can neither be seen nor heard; that He cannot be approached or ascertained by any of the senses; that He is not present in place, that He is not present carnally, though He is really present.”<sup>650</sup> Newman used the term “spiritual presence” to avoid the “*gross corporal*

---

<sup>646</sup> George Park Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910), 630.

<sup>647</sup> JHN, *Tracts for the Times*, no. 90 (New York: J. A. Sparks, 1841), 49-59. Also see William Palmer, John Henry Newman, *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the Years 1840, 1841* (London: Gilbert and Rivington, 1882), 145-155.

<sup>648</sup> Rev. E. B. Pusey, “The Holy Eucharist, a Comforter to the Penitent,” *A Sermon Preached before the University* (New York: James A. Sparks, 1843), 71.

<sup>649</sup> *PPS* 6: 136.

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

presence” that the Tractarians denied. Newman believed that the Eucharist is the “Real Presence” of the Lord in his fullness, but

how this is, of course is a mystery. All that we know or need know is that He *is* given to us, and that in the Sacrament of Holy Communion.<sup>651</sup>

In order to emphasize the given-ness of the Lord in the Eucharist, Newman asserted that the sacrament is not “God’s mercy, or favour, or imputation,” or “a state of grace, or the promise of eternal life, or the privileges of the Gospel, or the new covenant;” but it is “the gift of His own precious Body and Blood, really given, taken, and eaten.”<sup>652</sup> Newman indeed did not mean to deny the state of grace or the promise of eternal life or God’s mercy that the believers can receive through the sacrament. Newman wanted to emphasize that the Eucharist is more than all privileges or anything else. It is the very God himself who is given to us. It is the *gift* that can be taken and eaten *now* “at a certain particular time, and a certain particular spot . . . when and where the Holy Communion is celebrated.”<sup>653</sup>

Newman also saw the Eucharist as an eschatological sacrament, the sacrament of glory. He compared the glory of the Lord on the Mount of Tabor when “His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light” (Matt. xvii. 2) with the “glorious presence” of the Lord in the “Holy Communion, though every thing looks as usual to the natural man.”<sup>654</sup> The Eucharist is our very “present source of rejoicing” with which “we have and [which] we may glory in, the present power and grace of God in us and over us, and the means thereby

---

<sup>651</sup> Ibid.

<sup>652</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>653</sup> Ibid.

<sup>654</sup> *PPS* 4: 148.

given us of victory in the end.”<sup>655</sup> In this “Heavenly Sacrament,” the “Highest” gives believers “His own gracious self.”<sup>656</sup> In this sacrament, believers receive the Lord of glory himself and share his eternal glory. These beliefs, for Newman, will “fill the heart with joy,” for “there is nothing to hinder our rejoicing in them while we have them.”<sup>657</sup> In spite of “all recollections of the past or fear for the future,” or “whatever comes, weal or woe” in the Last Day, we all stand and “need not be ashamed before Him,” for His glory is in us, “His Spirit is in us,”<sup>658</sup> for the Eucharist that we receive is “in very form an anticipation of His coming, a near presence of Him in earnest of it.”<sup>659</sup> By receiving the Eucharist, “we be His,” and we have

the inward support of His Spirit too, carrying us on towards Him, and “witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God.” God is mysteriously threefold; and while He remains in the highest heaven, He comes to judge the world;—and while He judges the world, He is in us also, bearing us up and going forth in us to meet Himself. God the Son is without, but God the Spirit is within,—and when the Son asks, the Spirit will answer.<sup>660</sup>

“Shrinking from Christ’s Coming” was Newman’s last *Parochial and Plain* sermon in 1836. Newman drew an eschatological picture in which the Triune God is the judge and simultaneously the answerer, and the Eucharist is the means through which we already

---

<sup>655</sup> Ibid.

<sup>656</sup> Ibid.

<sup>657</sup> Ibid., 149.

<sup>658</sup> JHN, “Shrinking from Christ’s Coming,” *PPS* 5: 46-57, at 55.

<sup>659</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>660</sup> Ibid., 57.



participate in “the future day of Christ.”<sup>661</sup> It is already now but not yet. We are journeying and experiencing what is “most joyful and also most painful.”

Joy and grief, triumph and humiliation, are not strangely mingled, yet both really preserved. The joy does not change the grief, nor the grief the joy, into some third feeling; they are incommunicable with each other, both remain, both affect us.<sup>662</sup>

For Newman, this was “a paradox”—“sorrowful yet always rejoicing, and dying yet living, and having nothing yet possessing all things.”<sup>663</sup> Indeed, the whole humankind is already and not yet in its “Last Day,” in which God himself is drawing “up our thoughts and wills to heavenly things, and becomes one with us,” and “He will assuredly be still in us and give us confidence at the Day of Judgment. He will be with us, and strengthen us.”<sup>664</sup> In the Eucharist, believers live the “already” and “not yet” of “the future day of Christ.” The mystery of “when the Son asks, the Spirit will answer” is taking place at the “Lord’s table.” Thus, “we must pray for His coming,” so that “His elect will stand before Him when He comes.”<sup>665</sup>

## II. From 1837 to 1838

### 1. “*His Spirit*” in the Church – Communion and Governing Soul

Newman continued to consider the theology of the Triune God in the mystery of the glorification of humankind in 1837 and 1838. In his sermon “Christ Manifested in Remembrance” in 1837, Newman took the biblical statement “He shall glorify Me” (Jn 16:14)

---

<sup>661</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>662</sup> Ibid.

<sup>663</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>664</sup> Ibid., 57.

<sup>665</sup> Ibid.

as the starting point for his Pneumatological ecclesiology. Newman asserted that Christ “is with us in the Spirit.”<sup>666</sup> With “the Ever-blessed Spirit of God,” “the Presence of the Eternal Son, ten times more glorious, more powerful than when He trod the earth in our flesh, is with us.”<sup>667</sup> It was the Holy Spirit who gave glory to the Son of God: “The special way in which God the Holy Ghost gave glory to God the Son, seems to have been His revealing Him as the Only-begotten Son of the Father, who had appeared as the Son of man.”<sup>668</sup> Only in receiving the Holy Spirit, the Apostles, after the ascension of Jesus Christ, understood who had been with them, and thus professed Jesus Christ as their Lord and God.<sup>669</sup> Now “the risen and glorified Saviour is more powerful than when He was in the form of a servant.”<sup>670</sup> Now “we are under the awful ministration of the Spirit.”<sup>671</sup> The Holy Spirit, “who glorified Christ, imparts Him thus glorified to us.”<sup>672</sup>

The glorification of Christ in the Holy Spirit not only helps us to recognize and profess Christ as our Lord, Savior and God, but leads us to the fullness of communion with God and with one another. Newman in his sermon “The Communion of Saints” in 1837 stated:

There must indeed be a union between all creatures and their Almighty Creator even for their very existence; for it is said, “In Him we live, and move, and have our being.”...

He who came for ever, came as a Spirit, and, so coming, did for His own that which the visible flesh and blood of the Son of man, from its very nature, could not do, viz.,

---

<sup>666</sup> JHN, “Christ Manifested in Remembrance,” *PPS* 6: 253-266, at 265.

<sup>667</sup> Ibid.

<sup>668</sup> Ibid., 254.

<sup>669</sup> Ibid., 256.

<sup>670</sup> Ibid., 265-266.

<sup>671</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>672</sup> Ibid., 266.

He came into the souls of all who believe, and taking possession of them, He, being One, knit them all together into one.<sup>673</sup>

Newman was very clear that Christ during his time on earth had limitations. By coming in the flesh, Christ “provided an external or apparent unity, such as had been under the Law. He formed His Apostles into a visible society.”<sup>674</sup> However, it was not yet complete. Christ “came again in the person of His Spirit,” in order to make “them all in a real sense one.”<sup>675</sup> The Apostles “were parts and organs of one unseen power; they really depended upon, and were offshoots of that which was One; their separate persons were taken into a mysterious union with things unseen, were grafted upon and assimilated to the spiritual body of Christ, which is One.”<sup>676</sup> In other words, this unity is not simply an external form, but a deep and mysterious communion rooted in the risen Christ, by the power of his Spirit.

“By the Holy Ghost, in whom Christ has come again” is the key to Newman’s thought on communion and the Church. There is, for Newman, no Christ without the Holy Spirit. Newman asserted that “Christ came in the person of His Spirit.”<sup>677</sup> The term “person” here appears not simply as a reminder of the Holy Spirit as person, but as an emphasis on the oneness of Christ and His Spirit. Although the person of Christ is distinct from the person of the Holy Spirit, Christ cannot be separated from His Spirit. Newman did not say that “Christ came in the person of the Holy Spirit,” but he said, “Christ came in the person of *His* Spirit.” This shows a belonging to each other, an inseparableness between Christ and his Spirit. Just

---

<sup>673</sup> JHN, “The Communion of Saints,” *PPS* 4: 168-184, at 168-9.

<sup>674</sup> *Ibid.*, 169.

<sup>675</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>676</sup> *Ibid.*, 169-70.

<sup>677</sup> *Ibid.*, 169.

as Newman stretched his Pneumatology from the mystery of the Incarnation to the Eucharist, his ecclesiology includes the position and role of the Holy Spirit. Christ-Holy Spirit-Church is a link or a dwelling-within-one-another which cannot be divided or separated. For Newman, Christ came in the flesh “not to make us one, but to die for us;” then “the Spirit came to make us one in Him [Christ] who had died and was alive, that is, to form the Church.”<sup>678</sup> This is “the special glory of the Christian Church,”<sup>679</sup> insofar as the Church was born in the glory, the Spirit of the risen Lord. This “special glory” implies that all members of the Church “do not depend merely on what is visible,” or are “mere stones of a building, piled one on another, and bound together from without, but they are one and all the births and manifestations of one and the same unseen spiritual principle or power, “living stones,” internally connected, as branches from a tree, not as the parts of a heap.”<sup>680</sup> Because of this “special glory,” all are now “members of the Body of Christ... through the gracious ministration of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>681</sup> This is, for Newman, “a principle of life, a secret origin of existence to all who believe.”<sup>682</sup>

Newman considered the Holy Spirit the “invisible, governing Soul” of the Church.<sup>683</sup> The theme of the Holy Spirit as the soul of Church is found in the writing of Augustine. In a sermon on Pentecost Sunday, Augustine said, “What the soul is to the body of man, the Holy Ghost is to the Body of Christ: which the Church is. What the soul does in all the members of

---

<sup>678</sup> Ibid., 170.

<sup>679</sup> Ibid.

<sup>680</sup> Ibid.

<sup>681</sup> Ibid.

<sup>682</sup> Ibid.

<sup>683</sup> Ibid.

one body, this the Holy Spirit does throughout the Church.”<sup>684</sup> Newman, in his sermon “The Church Visible and Invisible” in 1835, also asserted: “When the soul leaves the body it ceases to be a body, it becomes a corpse. So the Church would cease to be the Church, did the Holy Spirit leave it; and it does not exist at all except in the Spirit.”<sup>685</sup> Two years later, in his sermon “The Communion of Saints,” he observed that before the coming of the Holy Spirit, “God’s servants were as the dry bones of the Prophet’s vision, connected by profession, not by inward principle;” but since the time they received the “invisible, governing Soul,” “they are all the organs . . . the hands, or the tongues, or the feet, or the eyes of one and the same directing Mind, the types, tokens, beginnings, and glimpses of the Eternal Son of God.”<sup>686</sup>

Newman went on to assert:

From the day of Pentecost to this hour there has been in the Church but One Holy One, the King of kings, and Lord of lords Himself, who is in all believers, and through whom they are what they are; their separate persons being but as separate developments, vessels, instruments, and works of Him who is invisible.<sup>687</sup>

Newman then took the images of the Church as “the fruitful Vine, and the rich Olive tree upon and out of which all Saints, though wild and barren by nature, grow, that they may bring forth fruit unto God.”<sup>688</sup> This statement is reminiscent of Irenaeus: “Where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and

---

<sup>684</sup> Augustine, *Sermo CCXLVII*, iv, 4, in M. F. Toal, *The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers* (New York: Ignatius Press, 2000), 27.

<sup>685</sup> JHN, “The Church Visible and Invisible,” *PPS* 3: 220-235, at 224.

<sup>686</sup> *PPS* 4: 170-171.

<sup>687</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>688</sup> *Ibid.*

every kind of grace.”<sup>689</sup> The Church brings forth fruit, for “the Living *Spirit* of God came down upon it at Pentecost, and made it *one*, by giving it *life*.”<sup>690</sup> Newman highlighted the three words “Spirit,” “one” and “life” in order to point out that the life and oneness or communion of the Church are the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, the Church is “a living body, and one.”<sup>691</sup>

## 2. The Visible and Invisible Church and the Salvation of the World

In Newman’s ecclesiology, the term “Church,” is not only the *visible* Church of “persons *now* living in this world, it is of course a visible company.”<sup>692</sup> Nevertheless, “in its nobler and truer character it is a body invisible,” for it consists of “the many, who sleep in the Lord.”<sup>693</sup> The Church is “called invisible”

because the greater number of her true children have been perfected and removed, and because those who are still on earth cannot be ascertained by mortal eye; and had God so willed, she might have had no visible tokens at all of her existence, and been as entirely and absolutely hidden from us as the Holy Ghost is, her Lord and Governor.<sup>694</sup>

In 1835, Newman spoke of the Church both as journeying on earth, and as triumphant—“unseen” or “invisible” “in the sense of the Church in glory, or the Church in rest.”<sup>695</sup> For Newman, in 1837, the term “invisible Church” did not simply mean her “perfected and removed” members, but also indicated the greatness of the Church that we

---

<sup>689</sup> Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III, 24, 1. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I “The Apostolic Fathers – Justin Martyr – Irenaeus” (New York: Charles Scribner’s sons, 1903): 458.

<sup>690</sup> *PPS* 4: 171.

<sup>691</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>692</sup> *Ibid.*, 172.

<sup>693</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>694</sup> *Ibid.*, 172-173.

<sup>695</sup> *PPS* 3: 223. Also see “The Gift of the Spirit,” *PPS* 3: 257.

cannot fully see: the Holy Spirit is her “Lord and Governor.” Newman asserted that the Holy Spirit “is invisible, so is His work,” and thus “the Church is invisible.”<sup>696</sup> Newman, while speaking of “visible Church” and “invisible Church,” did not mean two churches. “Scripture does not speak of two bodies, one visible, the other invisible, each with its own complement of members.”<sup>697</sup> Newman said, this is only “a common notion at present; and it is an erroneous and (I will add) a dangerous notion.”<sup>698</sup> Nonetheless, “it is allowable to speak of the Visible and of the Invisible Church, as two sides of one and the same thing, separated by our minds only, not in reality.”<sup>699</sup>

The term, the “invisible Church,” was not unfamiliar in the Anglican Church at that time. In *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Edward Harold Browne pointed out that while the Articles said nothing of the “invisible Church,” the term implies “a contradistinction to something visible.”<sup>700</sup> Browne also clearly stated that the “invisible Church” is not a Scriptural term, but it has two aspects. The first is of “the saints departed, who, in Paradise or the unseen place (Hades), are no longer militant and visible, but form part of the true Church of God.”<sup>701</sup> The second is of “a body of true saints, persons . . . really sanctified in heart, who not only now partook of Church-privileges, but would forever reign with Christ.”<sup>702</sup>

---

<sup>696</sup> *PPS* 4: 173.

<sup>697</sup> *PPS* 3: 221.

<sup>698</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>699</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>700</sup> Edward Harold Browne, *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal* (New York: H. B. Durand, 1865), 462. This is the first American edition, from the fifth English edition.

<sup>701</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>702</sup> *Ibid.*

Browne's interpretations resonated with the discussion of Newman, who went further than the saints or the sanctified members of the Church, and insisted on the presence and work of the risen Lord and his Holy Spirit. Christ and his Holy Spirit is the key to say the Church is invisible.

The terms "visible Church" and "invisible Church" seemingly come from Augustine's refutation of the Donatists. In discussing grace, Augustine considered it entirely a matter of God's free gift. Those who are baptized are members of the visible Church; however, the Church on earth could not be expected to be completely pure. The Church on earth always includes sinners; in contrast, the "heavenly Church" or "invisible Church" is composed of the elect whom only God knows; they would remain pure, even though they are outside the visible unity, yet they belong to the invisible church.<sup>703</sup>

John Calvin developed these notions of Augustine. For Calvin, the "invisible Church" is "the society of all the saints, which spread over the whole world, and existing in all ages, yet bound together by the doctrine and the one Spirit of Christ, cultivates and observes unity of faith and brotherly concord."<sup>704</sup> The "visible Church" is now journeying in history, including all those who profess their faith in Christ as Savior and Lord.<sup>705</sup> Later, probably

---

<sup>703</sup> Cf. Jeffrey Thomas VanderWilt, *A Church Without Borders: The Eucharist and the Church in Ecumenical Perspective* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 40; Stanley James Grenz, William Carl Placher, *Essentials of Christian Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 224; Daniel L. Akin, David P. Nelson, Peter R. Schemm, *A Theology for the Church* (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2007), 817.

<sup>704</sup> J. K. S. Reid, ed., *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (London: The Westminster Press, 2000), 321.

<sup>705</sup> W. Stanford Reid, "The Ecumenism of John Calvin," *Westminster Theological Journal* 11/1 (November 1948): 32.



under the influence of Augustine and Calvin, the Evangelicals came to distinguish between real Christians and nominal Christians. “Real Christians” are God’s elect, who belong to “the invisible Church of Christ by the grace of conversion and the energizing action of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>706</sup> They are pure and holy, so the invisible Church is the true Church. “Nominal Christians” who have not yet been converted belong only to the visible Church through baptism.<sup>707</sup> This visible Church includes bad men, but “bad men cannot be members of the true Church.”<sup>708</sup> Accordingly, the Evangelicals concluded, “there is a true Church distinct from the visible Church.”<sup>709</sup>

Newman disagreed with the Evangelicals at this point. First, for Newman, there is only one Church. There is no difficulty about “the distinction of the Church into Visible and Invisible,” if “we view it as, on the whole, but one in different aspects.”<sup>710</sup> Second, it cannot be said, “Bad men cannot be members of the true Church”; rather, one should say: “Bad men cannot be *true* members of the Church.”<sup>711</sup> Newman did not want to exclude anyone from the Church. All Christians are called to be true members of the Church of Christ. Newman considered the Church of Christ

as Visible, because consisting (for instance) of clergy and laity—as Invisible, because resting for its life and strength upon unseen influences and gifts from Heaven. This is not really to divide into two, any more than to discriminate (as they say) between

---

<sup>706</sup> JHN, *The Church of the Fathers*, Francis McGrath, ed. (Notre Dame: Gracewing Publishing, 2002), lii.

<sup>707</sup> Ibid.

<sup>708</sup> *PPS* 3: 227.

<sup>709</sup> Ibid.

<sup>710</sup> Ibid., 222.

<sup>711</sup> Ibid., 227.

concave and convex, is to divide a curve line; which looked at outwardly is convex, but looked at inwardly, concave.<sup>712</sup>

Perhaps influenced by Augustine's view of the invisible Church—that through God's grace, all are being called to be in the Church of Christ—Newman came to the conclusion:

“Out of the Church is no salvation”:

I mean to say out of that great invisible company, who are one and all incorporate in the one mystical body of Christ, and quickened by one Spirit: now, by adhering to the visible Ministry which the Apostles left behind them, we approach unto what we see not, to Mount Zion, to the heavenly Jerusalem, to the spirits of the just, to the first born elected to salvation, to Angels innumerable, to Jesus the One Mediator, and to God.<sup>713</sup>

Later as a Roman Catholic, in his *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, Newman wrote that this doctrine came from Ignatius, Irenaeus, Cyprian and Augustine.

The main sense is, that there is no other communion or so called Church, but the Catholic, in which are stored the promises, the sacraments, and other means of salvation; the other and derived sense is, that no one can be saved who is not *in* that one and only Church.<sup>714</sup>

However, Newman immediately added that

But it does not follow, because there is no Church but one, which has the Evangelical gifts and privileges to bestow, that therefore no one can be saved without the intervention of that one Church.<sup>715</sup>

Newman was very clear that there is only One Church, the Church of Christ, in which we surely will receive the fullness of salvation of God. Nevertheless, the salvation of God still reaches to those who are outside of the “visible Church.” For Newman, the Augustinian

---

<sup>712</sup> Ibid., 222.

<sup>713</sup> PPS 4: 174.

<sup>714</sup> JHN, *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*, vol. II (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891), 335; hereafter cited JHN, *Difficulties*.

<sup>715</sup> Ibid.

notion of the “invisible Church” is the safeguard for the universal aspect of salvation. No one is excluded from “that great invisible company.” Anglicans, at that time, believed that on the one hand they will be saved in the very visible Church of Christ in which they professed their faith, while on the other hand they also “speak of and hold the doctrine of the ‘uncovenanted mercies of God.’”<sup>716</sup>

The term “uncovenanted mercies” came from the Jewish temple, which was divided into the Holy of Holies, the Court of the Priests, the more perfect, with whom an express covenant was made and the Court of the Gentiles, the more imperfect, with whom an implied covenant was made.<sup>717</sup>

The former were the chosen people. The latter may be said to have been left to the uncovenanted mercies of God. They worshipped according to their knowledge. They were friends of Israel.<sup>718</sup>

Thus, Newman applied the phrase “uncovenanted mercies of God” to “those who are living under the sound of the Gospel.”<sup>719</sup> Such persons are not the members of the covenant of grace by baptism; however, the “mercies of God” are still bestowed upon them “for Christ’s sake.”<sup>720</sup> Thus Newman distinguished two kinds of divine mercy: one is “covenanted mercy,” which is promised by Jesus Christ to those who believe in Him; the other is “uncovenanted

---

<sup>716</sup> Ibid.

<sup>717</sup> John Foxe, Stephen Reed Cattley, George Townsend, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, vol. I (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1841), 23.

<sup>718</sup> Ibid. Also see Ian Turnbull Ker, Terrence Merrigan, eds., *Newman and Faith* (Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 2004), 161.

<sup>719</sup> Members of the Established Church, “The Uncovenanted Mercies of God,” *The Christian Observer* (London: J. Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly, 1840), 271-272, at 271.

<sup>720</sup> Ibid., 272. Also see Robert W. Prichard, *The Nature of Salvation: Theological Consensus in the Episcopal Church, 1801-73* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 86-87.

mercy,” which God bestows on all people although no covenant has been made.<sup>721</sup>

“Covenanted mercy is matter of absolute certainty, the fulfillment of the promise of the Almighty; uncovenanted mercy is speculation of what may happen upon a human idea of the Divine attributes.”<sup>722</sup>

The notion of the “uncovenanted mercies of God,” as Newman later wrote, became the “doctrine of invincible ignorance.” This doctrine maintains that it is “possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body.”<sup>723</sup> The doctrine of invincible ignorance “renders the seemingly rigorous doctrine of the Church, that communion with the See of Peter is by God’s ordinance necessary to salvation, compatible with the confident hope that many who are outside all visible communion with the Roman Catholic Church will enter heaven.”<sup>724</sup> Newman quoted the statement of Pope Pius IX in his Encyclical to the bishops of Italy (10 August 1863):

*We and you know*, that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most Holy Religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts, which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.<sup>725</sup>

---

<sup>721</sup> Victor Shea, *Essays and Reviews: The 1860 Text and Its Reading* (Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2000), 317.

<sup>722</sup> Ibid.

<sup>723</sup> JHN, *Difficulties*, 2: 335.

<sup>724</sup> G. H. Joyce, “Invincible Ignorance,” *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 7, James Hastings, ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), 403-404, at 404.

<sup>725</sup> JHN, *Difficulties*, 2: 335-336.

For Newman, the doctrine of “out of the Church is no salvation” clearly did not apply to people in “invincible ignorance.”<sup>726</sup> As Newman noted in his *Via Media*, “those who die in invincible ignorance are not in the place of lost souls; those who are not lost, are either in purgatory or in heaven.”<sup>727</sup> Nevertheless, in a letter to Pusey in 1837, he observed that “we can as little decide absolutely that a man *is* in invincible ignorance, as that he *is not*. No one has a right to be sure that he is in invincible ignorance.”<sup>728</sup> The salvation of God, for Newman, is for everyone; all people are called to be within the “invisible body,” which is the “true Church,” for “it changes not, though it is ever increasing”<sup>729</sup>:

What it has, it keeps and never loses; but what is visible is fleeting and transitory, and continually passes off into the invisible. The visible is ever dying for the increase of the invisible company, and is ever reproduced from out the mass of human corruption, by the virtue of the Spirit lodged in the invisible, and acting upon the world. Generation after generation is born, tried, sifted, strengthened, and perfected.<sup>730</sup>

The Holy Spirit is the key for reproducing or regenerating the whole world. It is the Holy Spirit, who is making the whole creation into the Body of Christ, giving birth, strengthening and perfecting all in the “heavenly Jerusalem,” which is the “true Church.” Newman, therefore, asserted: “The Church is not in time or place, but in the region of spirits; it is in the Holy Ghost.”<sup>731</sup> Newman described the presence of the “heavenly Jerusalem”:

---

<sup>726</sup> Ian Turnbull Ker, *The Achievement of John Henry Newman* (London: Continuum, 1991), 138.

<sup>727</sup> *Via Media*, 2: 110, note 6.

<sup>728</sup> A Letter from J. H. Newman to E. B. Pusey, 27 April 1837, in Henry Parry Liddon, Robert James Wilson, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. IV (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897), 257.

<sup>729</sup> *PPS* 4: 175.

<sup>730</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>731</sup> *Ibid.*

As the soul of man is in every part of his body, yet in no part, not here nor there, yet every where; not so in any one part, head or heart, hands or feet, as not to be in every other; so also the heavenly Jerusalem, the mother of our new birth, is in all lands at once, fully and entirely as a spirit; in the East and in the West, in the North and in the South,—that is, wherever her outward instruments are to be found.<sup>732</sup>

In his *Tract 74*, published in 1836, Newman described the “heavenly Jerusalem”: “It is ... called the Heavenly Jerusalem, because it is of a heavenly nature; and it is called the Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and is the mother of us all.”<sup>733</sup> In his sermon “The Invisible Word” (1837), Newman added: “It is not above the sky, it is not beyond the grave; it is now and here; the kingdom of God is among us.”<sup>734</sup> No one would doubt Newman’s faith in the possibility of universal salvation for all. The Heavenly Jerusalem “is in all lands at once.” And the visible Church here on earth, for Newman, is “a principle of life and increase, till He comes again.”<sup>735</sup> Through the “visible Church” we have the “Ministry and Sacraments, the bodily presence of Bishop and people,” as “keys and spells” for us “by which we bring ourselves into the presence of the great company of Saints,” entrancing into the Heavenly Jerusalem, which is “indivisible and one.”<sup>736</sup>

Along with “Invisible Church” or “Heavenly Jerusalem,” Newman also used the term “Holy Church Catholic” with the same meaning: “Such is the City of God, the Holy Church Catholic throughout the world, manifested in and acting through what is called in each

---

<sup>732</sup> Ibid., 176.

<sup>733</sup> JHN, “Tract 74,” *Members of the Oxford Movement, Tracts for the Times*, vol. III (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1839), 50.

<sup>734</sup> JHN, “The Invisible World,” *PPS* 4: 200-213, at 207. Also see Michael Wheeler, *Heaven, Hell and the Victorians* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 134.

<sup>735</sup> *PPS* 4: 175.

<sup>736</sup> Ibid., 176.

country the Church visible; which visible Church really depends solely on it, on the invisible.”<sup>737</sup> With these terms, Newman was attempting to highlight the universal aspect of God’s salvation for all humankind. However, the salvific plan of God cannot stand alone by itself. It needs human cooperation. As we shall see in the next discussion, Newman analyzed the significance of human participation in the economy of God. He proposed an economic anthropology, in which a human person has to journey from the “state of nature” to the “state of salvation.”

### **3. Economic Anthropology – From “State of Nature” to “State of Salvation”**

In his sermon “The Strictness of the Law of Christ” (1837), Newman acknowledged that we humans are in the state of nature, and nature is attached tightly to flesh and sin. We are “by nature slaves to sin and Satan.”<sup>738</sup> Thus, “we are free to make our situation worse,” but “we are not free to be without service or post of any kind.”<sup>739</sup> The human person is created for his Creator. His being is from and for God. Therefore, “it is not in man’s nature to be out of all service and to be self-dependent.”<sup>740</sup> He “cannot be without a master, such is the law of our nature.”<sup>741</sup> Nature cannot stand by itself. It needs to be guided and to be subject to a master. Thus, we have to “choose our master, but God or mammon we must serve. We cannot possibly be in a neutral or intermediate state. Such a state does not

---

<sup>737</sup> Ibid., 177-8.

<sup>738</sup> JHN, “The Strictness of the Law of Christ,” *PPS* 4: 1-17, at 1.

<sup>739</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>740</sup> Ibid., 3

<sup>741</sup> Ibid.

exist.”<sup>742</sup> By choosing God to be our Master, we will be sanctified and reborn in the Holy Spirit. However, regeneration is not something outside of us to be later bestowed by God. Its seed is already in our nature. “We have a seed of truth and holiness planted within us, a new law introduced into our nature.”<sup>743</sup> However, the “old nature” is still there, namely “the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts” (Eph. 4, 22). Hence, “we have a work, a conflict all through life.”<sup>744</sup> In this regard, Newman was probably influenced by Bishop Joseph Butler (1692-1752), as we shall see.

For Butler, the state of nature standing by itself “is a state of lust and rapine.”<sup>745</sup> However, in his sermons *Upon Human Nature*, Butler averred, “The image of God . . . was originally stamped upon it [human nature], the traces of which . . . are plainly discernible upon the mind of man.”<sup>746</sup> In addition, “the seeds of it [benevolence] are implanted in our nature by God.”<sup>747</sup> Butler then concluded that since the traces of God are already there, “man by his nature is a law to himself.”<sup>748</sup> That is, “*from his make, constitution, or nature, he is in the strictest and most proper sense a law to himself*. He hath the rule of right within: what is wanting is only that he honestly attend to it.”<sup>749</sup> Butler explained that conscience as “a

---

<sup>742</sup> Ibid.

<sup>743</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>744</sup> Ibid.

<sup>745</sup> John Hunt, “Bishop Butler as a Writer on Evidences,” *Contemporary View*, 22 (June-November, 1873): 903-920, at 911.

<sup>746</sup> Joseph Butler, *Three Sermons upon Human Nature: with a Dissertation on the Nature of Virtue* (London: J. & J. J. Deighton and T. Stevenson, 1835), 29; hereafter cited: Butler, *Three Sermons*.

<sup>747</sup> Ibid., 30.

<sup>748</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>749</sup> Ibid., 57.



superior principle” will preside over “a number of instincts and principles of action” of human nature.<sup>750</sup> “Conscience does not only offer itself to show us the way we should walk in, but it likewise carries its own authority with it, that it is our natural guide; the guide assigned us by the Author of our nature.”<sup>751</sup> Thus, Butler unhesitatingly called our nature “the voice of God within us.”<sup>752</sup> In other words, for Butler, human nature is hierarchical and at the summit is conscience, which is “a person’s God-given guide” and controls human nature.<sup>753</sup>

Newman was influenced by the thought of Butler. He did not deny the arguments of Butler on the relationship of human nature and conscience. Newman, in a letter to R. H. Froude, in April 1832, admitted that, “I go somewhat beyond Butler.”<sup>754</sup> Newman saw that it is not simply benevolence, but the *truth and holiness* of God that have been implanted in human nature. In a sermon, “Rising with Christ” (1837), Newman asserted, “The great gift of God which is lodged deep within” us is “the gift of election and regeneration.”<sup>755</sup> In addition, the “new law, the law of the Spirit of Christ” has been introduced to us.<sup>756</sup> That means that there already is in human nature the whole plan of sanctification and regeneration. The seeds are there and waiting to blossom. The believer, hence, is called to believe and obey,

---

<sup>750</sup> Matthew Arnold, “Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist,” *Living Age*, fifth series, vol. XIV (Boston: Littell and Gay, April, May, June, 1876), 67-78, at 76; hereafter cited: Arnold, “Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist”.

<sup>751</sup> Butler, *Three Sermons*, 58.

<sup>752</sup> Arnold, “Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist,” 76.

<sup>753</sup> Jon Mayled, *Religious Ethics for AS and A2* (London: Routledge, 2007), 190.

<sup>754</sup> Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 1: 226.

<sup>755</sup> JHN, “Rising with Christ,” *PPS* 6: 208-220, at 219.

<sup>756</sup> *PPS* 4: 16.

following not the law of himself but the law of the Holy Spirit. This will lead him to the “state of salvation.”

In 1838, Newman preached the sermon “The State of Salvation.” He emphasized the “new state”; “Christ came to bring” “all whom He had chosen out of the world.”<sup>757</sup> In this “new state,” the human being will be made into a “new creature in righteousness and true holiness.”<sup>758</sup> He will be “fully formed and perfected by the habitual indwelling of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>759</sup> It is Christ, in other words, who brings all into the “state of salvation” “by coming to us through His Spirit.”<sup>760</sup> The “state of salvation” is also the “state of grace,” for grace is gift of the Holy Spirit. Living in the “state of salvation” or the “state of grace” is living in Christ and in His Holy Spirit, and “as His Spirit is holy, we are holy.”<sup>761</sup> Nevertheless, we cannot just wait passively for the salvation of God to come to us. We have to work out our salvation from “beginning, continuing, and at last perfecting,” and all is “a course of obedience.”<sup>762</sup> As Newman asserted, “Faith gained him pardon; but works gain him a reward.”<sup>763</sup> Newman did not accept the position that “faith is all in all.”<sup>764</sup> Some may think that “faith, if they have it, blots out their sins as fast as they commit them.”<sup>765</sup> “They think that the only business of a Christian is, not to be holy, but to have faith, and to think and speak

---

<sup>757</sup> JHN, “The State of Salvation,” *PPS* 5: 178-194, at 179.

<sup>758</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>759</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>760</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>761</sup> *Ibid.*, 181

<sup>762</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>763</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>764</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>765</sup> *Ibid.*

of Christ,” even thought they are “really living, whether by habit or by act, in extortion, avarice, envy, rebellious pride, self-indulgence, or worldliness, and neither know nor care to know it.”<sup>766</sup> Newman strongly opposed this position. Faith and obedience, salvation and holiness, for Newman, cannot be separated. He insisted:

Our state of grace is a state of holiness; not one in which we may be *pardoned*, but in which we are *obedient*. He who acts unworthily of it, is not sheltered by it, but forfeits it. It is a state in which power is given us to act rightly, and therefore punishment falls on us if we act wrongly.<sup>767</sup>

Newman’s arguments here seemed to refer to the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Though Newman did not mention this doctrine by name, in this same year (1838), he wrote the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, arguing against the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith without recourse to the sacraments and works.<sup>768</sup> According to Luther, a Christian only needs “a simple imputation of Christ’s justice; the necessary condition for this imputation is faith: faith alone is necessary, faith alone is sufficient.”<sup>769</sup> Newman, on the contrary, insisted that “Justification comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith; *consists* in God’s inward presence; and *lives* in obedience.”<sup>770</sup> For

---

<sup>766</sup> Ibid., 183.

<sup>767</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>768</sup> Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 267-271.

<sup>769</sup> Antoon Vandavelde, ed., *Gifts and Interests* (Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 2000), 151. Luther stated, “Faith alone is counted for righteousness . . . . These three things, faith, Christ, acceptance, or imputation, must be joined together. Faith taketh hold of Christ, and hath him present, and holdeth him inclosed, as the ring doth the precious stone. And whoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ, apprehended in the heart, him will God account for righteous. . . . God doth accept or account us as righteous, only for our faith in Christ.” Martin Luther, *A Commentary of Saint Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Classics, 1979), 71. Read more specially pages 124-133.

<sup>770</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 318.

Newman, “Sacraments are the means of justification,”<sup>771</sup> for Christ “came to us through Sacraments.”<sup>772</sup> Newman also raised questions about the biblical arguments of Paul and James on faith and works. According to Newman, the term “works” in the case of James means “good and acceptable works”: “we are justified, not by faith only, but by good works,” which are the “fruits of faith.”<sup>773</sup> For Paul, the term “works” means “works done in the flesh.” Thus, when Paul said “without works,” he does not mean without “good works.”<sup>774</sup> Newman concluded that Paul “does not deny what St. James affirms, that we are justified in good works.”<sup>775</sup>

Although Newman did not analyze the arguments of Paul and James in the sermon, “The State of Salvation,” he expressed his reservations about the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Newman reminded his audiences that there is no faith without good works. Newman believed that the one who has “doubtless faith to begin the work, has faith also strong enough to perfect it.”<sup>776</sup> We have to work out our salvation. Let us look at our fathers of faith and hear of their “glorying in tribulations,” their being “alive from the dead,” their “joy and peace in believing,” their being “fruitful in every good work,” their “increasing in the knowledge of God,” their “work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope.”<sup>777</sup>

---

<sup>771</sup> Ibid., 323.

<sup>772</sup> Ibid., 327.

<sup>773</sup> Ibid., 331.

<sup>774</sup> Ibid.

<sup>775</sup> Ibid., 333.

<sup>776</sup> *PPS* 5: 185.

<sup>777</sup> Ibid., 187.

God invites human co-operation in his salvific plan. God is the one who has initiated and wants to finish his plan. To believe in God, is to believe in “the Ever-blessed Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whose mercy has planned, accomplished, and wrought in us ‘life and immortality.’”<sup>778</sup> However, our faith in God cannot be a dead faith; it has to bear “fruit to perfection.”<sup>779</sup> In other words, “what a Christian has to do is represented as a *work*, a process which has a beginning, middle, and end; a consistent course of obedience, not a state in which we have done nothing more at the end of our lives than at the beginning, except sin the oftener, according to its length.”<sup>780</sup> Newman was concerned that the doctrine of justification by faith alone meant that, “original sin is the very essence of human nature.”<sup>781</sup> Accordingly, human nature would be hopeless. The doctrine of justification by faith alone implied that “human nature, even when regenerate, is not, and cannot be, really holy;” that “it is idle to suppose that, even with the aid of the Holy Spirit, it can do any thing really good in any degree; that our best actions are sins; and that we are always sinning, ... that it is vain to try to be holy and righteous, or, rather, that it is presumptuous.”<sup>782</sup> Newman considered this argument totally wrong, for it negated the grace and work of the Holy Spirit, the mystery of the “Word made flesh,” the passion and glorification of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the mystery of the Holy Trinity in the economy of salvation. Newman’s discussions in his *Parochial and*

---

<sup>778</sup> JHN, “Faith without Demonstration,” *PPS* 6: 327-342, at 327.

<sup>779</sup> *PPS* 5: 185.

<sup>780</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>781</sup> Albert Henry Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, vol. II (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1903), 309. Also see Eric W. Gritsch, *A History of Lutheranism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002), 83-84.

<sup>782</sup> *PPS* 5: 181-2.

*Plain Sermons* from 1835 to 1838, indicated that he believed: “Without an Almighty Son we are not redeemed,—without an Ever-present Spirit we are not justified and sanctified.”<sup>783</sup>

“The doctrine of the Holy Trinity must be held in order to salvation.”<sup>784</sup> Faith, for Newman, is not something that we can learn or possess by human effort nor it is imposed by anyone, but God’s gift:

There is a voice within us, which assures us that there is something higher than earth. We cannot analyze, define, contemplate what it is that thus whispers to us. It has no shape or material form. There is that in our hearts which prompts us to religion, and which condemns and chastises sin. And this yearning of our nature is met and sustained, it finds an object to rest upon, when it hears of the existence of an All-powerful, All-gracious Creator. It incites us to a noble faith in what we cannot see.<sup>785</sup>

This “inward voice” is really the voice of God. As Newman remarked in his sermon “Faith and Love” (1838), this voice is “the Spirit whispering warnings” while the world is tempting us.<sup>786</sup> Moreover, the Holy Spirit speaks “not only in our hearts, but through the sensible world; and this Voice we call revelation.”<sup>787</sup> Newman, therefore, distinguished two voices in the external world: “The voice of the tempter calling us to fall down and worship him, and he will give us all; and the voice of God, speaking in aid of the voice in our hearts.”<sup>788</sup> It is love, which will help us to hear “the voice within us,” and faith to hear the voice of God without us.<sup>789</sup> God, in other words, speaks to us from within and without us.

---

<sup>783</sup> *PPS* 6: 328.

<sup>784</sup> *Ibid.*, 332.

<sup>785</sup> *Ibid.*, 339-340.

<sup>786</sup> JHN, “Faith and Love,” *PPS* 4: 307-317, at 314.

<sup>787</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>788</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>789</sup> *Ibid.*

Love and faith are the gifts of the Holy Spirit to help us to listen to God's voice and enter into the mystery of salvation.

For Newman, love is not something outside of us: "It is our nature, because God the Holy Ghost has made it our nature. Love is the immediate fruit and the evidence of regeneration."<sup>790</sup> It is "heavenly." "It is always the sign of the regenerate."<sup>791</sup> It is "the seed of holiness, and grows into all excellences," making us who we are.<sup>792</sup> "Love is the true ruling principle of the regenerate soul, and faith ministers to it. Love is the end, faith the means." "By faith we give up this world, but by love we reach into the next world."<sup>793</sup> This love, for Newman, is surely not earthly love; it has a name called "charity." And most of all, this love or charity is

but another name for the Comforter. It is eternal Charity which is the bond of all things in heaven and earth; it is Charity wherein the Father and the Son are one in the unity of the Spirit; by which the Angels in heaven are one, by which all Saints are one with God, by which the Church is one upon earth.<sup>794</sup>

In his sermon, "The Indwelling Spirit" (1834), Newman called the Holy Spirit "Eternal Love whereby the Father and the Son have dwelt in each other." In this sermon, the Holy Spirit is characterized as "Eternal Charity," "wherein the Father and the Son are one," by whom heaven is one, by whom the Church is one. The theme of the Holy Spirit as love or charity or unity of the Father and the Son in the immanent life of the Trinity, for Newman, is very significant, because it is the key that opens the unity of the Church and the mystery of

---

<sup>790</sup> Ibid., 310.

<sup>791</sup> Ibid.

<sup>792</sup> Ibid., 311.

<sup>793</sup> Ibid., 315.

<sup>794</sup> Ibid., 317.

salvation for all humankind. The Holy Spirit, through the Incarnation, passion and glorification, the Church and sacraments, has made “Christ present with us,” and also made “us present with Christ.”<sup>795</sup> Christ is present

with us, not only as He is in the unity of the Father and the Son, not in the Omnipresence of the Divine Nature, but personally, as the Christ, as God and man; not present with us locally and sensibly, but still really, in our hearts and to our faith. And it is by the Holy Ghost that this gracious communion is effected.<sup>796</sup>

To receive salvation, for Newman, is to participate fully and gloriously in the “gracious communion” with God; indeed, we may experience this communion right now on earth in the Church, by the power of the Holy Spirit. In the Church, the Holy Spirit “causes” and faith “welcomes” “the indwelling of Christ in the heart” of each believer.<sup>797</sup> Newman reminded his audience that the Spirit never takes “the place of Christ in the soul, but secures that place to Christ.”<sup>798</sup> The “presence of Christ” is “in those who have His Spirit.”<sup>799</sup> The Spirit “comes that Christ may come in His coming.” And only “through the Holy Ghost we have communion with Father and Son.”<sup>800</sup>

---

<sup>795</sup> JHN, “Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Church,” *PPS* 6: 120-135, at 127.

<sup>796</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>797</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>798</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>799</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>800</sup> *Ibid.*



### **Conclusion**

In the second period, 1835 to 1838, Newman sketched a portrait of the Holy Trinity through the mystery of the Incarnation, passion and glorification, as well as through Pneumatological ecclesiology and economic anthropology. Seemingly each year, Newman focused on a different theological point. The first two years, 1835 and 1836, can be seen as the years of Incarnation, passion and glorification, in which Newman depicted a Pneumatological Christology. There is no Christ without the Holy Spirit. From the moment of the Incarnation to the passion and then glorification, there is no separation of Christ the Son and His Spirit. The “gracious economy” of salvation, for Newman, is the work of God the Trinity, in which the Son and the Holy Spirit carried out the Father’s “business.” Through terms such as “assume,” “instrument,” and “perfect tabernacle,” Newman analyzed the hypostatic union of the human nature and divine nature of Jesus Christ, in order to assert that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man, who came to carry out the “gracious economy” of God the Father, whose summit is the passion. In discussing the atonement, Newman rejected the theory of satisfaction, for it denied the “economic Mercy” of God and the voluntary “active obedience” of the Son. In the Incarnation and passion, Newman showed an intimate relationship of the Father and the Son, in which the Holy Spirit is the key of communion and glorification. The passion, for Newman, is the mystery of glorification in which the Son glorified the Father, the Father glorified the Son, and the glory is the Holy Spirit himself. Moreover, that glorification is given to all humanity, so that all would be transformed into the “glorious image of Christ” by the “gracious dispensation” and the “ministration of the Holy

Spirit.” The “gracious economy” is then seen as a mystery of glorification—the glorification in the immanent life of the Triune God is now flowing out into the economy, sanctifying all from “glory to glory.” This is the special work of the Holy Spirit, who is glory as communion and communion as glory. Only in the Spirit do the Father and the Son glorify each other in communion; and only in the Son is humanity glorified and in communion with God. From this point of communion and glory, Newman discussed the Eucharist as the “Sacrament of glory,” along with the questions of “Real Presence” and “Transubstantiation.” Newman also introduced the perspective of the Last Day, in which the Eucharist is the sacrament of eschatology, insofar as we receive “in very form an anticipation of the Lord’s coming.”

During 1837 and 1838, Newman maintained his theology of glorification, but broadened it to include ecclesiology and anthropology. Newman’s ecclesiology is pneumatological, insofar as there is no Church of Christ without his Spirit. The Church of Christ is the “glorious Church,” the “Church of glory.” Newman discussed the Holy Spirit as the “invisible, governing Soul” of the Church; “visible Church” and “invisible Church;” “out of the Church is no salvation;” “uncovenanted mercies” of God and the doctrine of “invincible ignorance.” Thus, Newman presented a universal aspect of salvation. No one is denied God’s salvation, for God’s “gracious mercy” embraces all; and all are welcomed into his “true Church.” Newman strongly asserted that already there is in human nature the seed of regeneration, which is truth and holiness. He thus proposed an “economic anthropology” in which there is no human, who is self-independent, who has no need of grace and salvation of God. In every human, “the Voice of God” is always present; the seed of holiness and truth

has been planted. The “gracious economy” is ready for all, requiring a journey from the “state of nature” to the “state of salvation.” What the human needs to do is to work out salvation, cooperating with God by faith and obedience. Newman carefully treated the issue of justification by faith alone, in order to highlight the significant role of the Church and sacraments, of love and good works.

During this period, there are three issues which Newman might well have discussed further. The first is the “wrath of God”: Newman did not accept the theology of substitution, but could not explain how the “wrath of God” was taken away; in many sermons, the “wrath of God” appeared but without further explanation. The second issue is the resurrection: while Newman mentioned the risen Lord, the Holy Spirit, the glorious Church, he did not discuss the event of resurrection itself; he was seemingly concerned only about the “fruits of Resurrection”: grace, justification, glorification, that the risen Lord and his Spirit are ever present, dwelling and activating within the Church and in each believer. The third issue is the state of a human before the fall: Newman’s discussions concerned the weakness of human nature and the regeneration of Holy Spirit, but seemed to neglect the human state before the fall.

For Newman, the years 1835 to 1838 could be called a “golden age,” for this was the time when he wrote most of his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. It was the time when he developed his theology of the economic Trinity, through theological discussions on Incarnation, atonement, passion, glorification, Eucharist, ecclesiology, anthropology. Through all the discussions, Newman depicted the work of the Trinity as a “gracious

economy,” in which the Father is ever the foundation, the will, the source, the plan for the whole work; in which the Son and the Holy Spirit as distinct persons, play different roles, but are always one, inseparable, indivisible in carrying out and completing salvation. This time frame was also a time of “glory,” which was a key term running like a “red thread” through all that Newman treated. In particular, the mystery of the Holy Trinity is the mystery of immanent glorification. The economy of salvation is the work of God’s glorification within each believer, the Church, and the whole world. These years were a time of glory, not only in terms of the successful works that Newman accomplished, but in his development of Trinitarian theology.

Although Newman analyzed that the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity, for the immanent life of the Triune God is now revealed in the economy, he still asserted that “the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity is mysterious.”<sup>801</sup> He simply reasoned, “It would be strange, indeed, as has often been urged in argument, if any doctrine concerning God’s infinite and eternal Nature were not mysterious.”<sup>802</sup> It is beyond human language and imagination. Newman then concluded: “The highest reason is not to reason on system, or by rules of argument, but in a natural way; not with formal intent to draw out proofs, but trusting to God’s blessing that you may gain a right impression from what you read.”<sup>803</sup> In 1835, Newman asserted that the mystery of the Trinity is “quite beyond our reason;”<sup>804</sup> but thanks to the Incarnation, we can perceive the “truths relating to the incommunicable and infinite

---

<sup>801</sup> *PPS* 6: 333.

<sup>802</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>803</sup> *Ibid.*, 341.

<sup>804</sup> *PPS* 3: 156.

essence of Almighty God.”<sup>805</sup> In 1838, after extensive reflection, Newman called his audience to “the highest reason” but “not to reason,” rather to “walk by faith.”<sup>806</sup>

---

<sup>805</sup> Ibid.

<sup>806</sup> *PPS* 6: 339.

**CHAPTER IV:**  
**THE THIRD PERIOD: 1839 - 1843**  
**A TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY OF “REST AND PEACE”**

**I. From 1839 to 1840**

**1. Incarnation and Sanctification – A Theology of Within-ness**

The Holy Trinity in the economy of salvation continued as the main concern of Newman in 1839 and 1840. If Newman, in the second period (1835-1838), had characterized human salvation as “glorification,” in this third period, he preferred the term “sanctification.” Newman believed that God “calls us again and again, in order to justify us again and again,—and again and again, and more and more, to sanctify and glorify us.”<sup>807</sup> Justification, glorification and sanctification are the three key terms of Newman in describing the salvific work of the Holy Trinity. Yet Newman did not consider justification as the work of the Father, glorification as the work of the Son, and sanctification the work of the Holy Spirit. Newman always viewed the economy as the whole and undivided work of the Triune God. In particular, the works of the Son and the Holy Spirit, for Newman, are absolutely inseparable, though they are distinct persons, inasmuch as Newman often applied the same terms or titles of the Holy Spirit to the Son. Newman, in his sermon “the Mystery of Godliness,” unhesitatingly called the Son “Sanctifier.”

---

<sup>807</sup> JHN, “Divine Calls,” *PPS* 8: 17-32, at 24.

As He was born, so are we born also; and since He was born, therefore we too are born. As He is the Son of God by nature, so are we sons of God by grace; and it is He who has made us such . . . He is the “Sanctifier,” we the “sanctified.”<sup>808</sup>

Newman reasoned that God the Creator sanctifies his angels, but He and they “are not of one”; however, “the Son of God and we are of one,” for “He has become ‘the firstborn of every creature;’ He has taken our nature, and in and through it He sanctifies us.”<sup>809</sup> By his Incarnation, “He is our Brother.”<sup>810</sup> This was apparently the first time in *The Parochial and Plain Sermons* that Newman used the title “Brother” for the Son. Similarly, also in 1839, in the sermon “Christian Sympathy,” Newman called Christ “Our Brother.”

He could not have become our brother, unless we were all brethren already; He could not have made us His brethren, unless by becoming our Brother; so that our brotherhood in the first man is the means towards our brotherhood in the second.<sup>811</sup>

Sanctification, for Newman, is not simply a grace of God coming from outside and then transforming humanity. Sanctification is the very participation of God “in flesh,” in human nature. Sanctification then comes to us from our “blood relationship,” our “brotherhood” with the Son of God, “forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.”<sup>812</sup>

The Son of God indeed became man. He took our nature and “sanctified our nature in Himself,” and then “He communicates it to us.”<sup>813</sup> Newman observed: “He first sanctified it in Himself, made it righteous, made it acceptable to God, submitted it to an expiatory passion,

---

<sup>808</sup> JHN, “The Mystery of Godliness,” *PPS* 5: 86-97, at 86.

<sup>809</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

<sup>810</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>811</sup> JHN, “Christian Sympathy,” *PPS* 5: 116-127, at 116.

<sup>812</sup> *Ibid.*, 117.

<sup>813</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

and then He imparted it to us. He took it, consecrated it, broke it, and said, ‘Take, and divide it among yourselves.’”<sup>814</sup> “Our old nature is common to us all, and so is our new nature. And because our old nature is one and the same, therefore is it that our new nature is one and the same.”<sup>815</sup> In other words, “by God’s becoming man, men, through brotherhood with Him, might in the end become as gods.”<sup>816</sup> This Newman called “the wonderful economy of grace, or mystery of godliness.”<sup>817</sup>

Newman, in fact, had already said much about the mystery of the Incarnation, analyzing and emphasizing the hypostatic union of the human nature and divine nature of Christ. He also insisted on the oneness of the Son of God with humanity in the Incarnation. Newman, however, at this time, looked at the Incarnation through another lens: our brotherhood with the divine Son, through which we are “one nature with the Lord from heaven.”<sup>818</sup> By the Incarnation of the Son of God, our old nature was sanctified. He took on him the “thoughts, affections, and infirmities of man, thereby, through the fulness of His Divine Nature, to raise those thoughts and affections, and destroy those infirmities.”<sup>819</sup> In other words,

He who is all purity came to an impure race to raise them to His purity. He, the brightness of God’s glory, came in a body of flesh, which was pure and holy as Himself, “without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish;” and this He did for our sake, “that we might be partakers of His holiness.”<sup>820</sup>

---

<sup>814</sup> Ibid., 117-118.

<sup>815</sup> Ibid., 116.

<sup>816</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>817</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>818</sup> Ibid. 119.

<sup>819</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>820</sup> Ibid., 92.



For Newman, sanctification also has another name, which is “deification.” For Newman, the “sanctification or rather deification of the nature of man is one main subject of St. Athanasius’ theology.”<sup>821</sup> The incarnate Son is the “principle of sanctification, or rather of deification.”<sup>822</sup> Deification, as Newman commented, was the doctrine that Athanasius insisted “again and again” in his writings.<sup>823</sup> Newman quoted Athanasius’ statements such as “The Word of God was made man in order to sanctify the flesh”<sup>824</sup>, or “If the works of the Word’s Godhead had not taken place through the body, man had not been made god.”<sup>825</sup> Newman seemingly followed the thought of Athanasius. The doctrine of deification was “central to his theology.”<sup>826</sup>

The theme of deification was also central to Pusey’s theology and spirituality.<sup>827</sup> Newman, as a leader of the Oxford Movement, tried to develop this theme in his sermons, which seemed a good way to make the orthodox teachings of the Church Fathers once again part of the mainstream of the Anglican Church. For example, Newman summarized the theme “sanctification or rather deification” as follows:

---

<sup>821</sup> JHN, *Essay on Development*, 140.

<sup>822</sup> *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 130.

<sup>823</sup> *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 88.

<sup>824</sup> Athanasius, Orat. ii. § 10, *ibid.*, 2: 130.

<sup>825</sup> Athanasius, Orat. iii. 33, *ibid.*, 131.

<sup>826</sup> Geoffrey Rowell, Owen Higgs, *In This Sign Conquer* (London: Continuum, 2006),

4.

<sup>827</sup> Cf. Geoffrey Rowell, “Pusey, Edward Bouverie,” *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, Gordon S. Wakefield, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983): 326-327, at 326. For the Tractarians, the Incarnation is “the mysterious foundation of redemption,” in which the “sanctifying or deifying of our fallen human nature” take place. James C. Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. I, *The Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 179.

He came in that very nature of Adam, in order to communicate to us that nature as it is in His Person, that “our sinful bodies might be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood;” to make us partakers of the Divine nature; to sow the seed of eternal life in our hearts; and to raise us from “the corruption that is in the world through lust,” to that immaculate purity and that fulness of grace which is in Him. He who is the first principle and pattern of all things, came to be the beginning and pattern of human kind, the firstborn of the whole creation. He, who is the everlasting Light, became the Light of men; He, who is the Life from eternity, became the Life of a race dead in sin; He, who is the Word of God, came to be a spiritual Word, “dwelling richly in our hearts,” an “engrafted Word, which is able to save our souls;” He, who is the co-equal Son of the Father, came to be the Son of God in our flesh, that He might raise us also to the adoption of sons, and might be first among many brethren.<sup>828</sup>

This paragraph summarizes the whole work of the economy in two terms: “Mercy is the beginning, and sanctity the end.”<sup>829</sup> The economy surely comes from the mercy of God, and its purpose is none other than to sanctify humanity. The “chief principle” to carry out this plan is “the Immaculate Lamb of God.”<sup>830</sup> For Newman, this title reminded us the Son’s “voluntary sufferings” in carrying out the “Father’s will” to be “the sacrifice for [our] sin” and become our “Sanctifier.”<sup>831</sup> Therefore, “let us come to the Sanctifier to be sanctified.”<sup>832</sup>

Moreover, Newman also linked the Incarnation with righteousness. Newman, in his sermon “Righteousness not of Us, but in Us” (1840), saw “the object of Christ’s coming” as “making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness.”<sup>833</sup> God, in His Son incarnate, has indeed “not merely nominally given to us and imputed to us”

---

<sup>828</sup> *PPS* 5: 92-93.

<sup>829</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>830</sup> *Ibid.*, 91; also see *PPS* 5: 121.

<sup>831</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>832</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>833</sup> JHN, “The Law of Spirit,” *PPS* 5: 143-163, at 150.

righteousness, but “really implanted [it] in us,” “by the operation of the Blessed Spirit.”<sup>834</sup> Newman was very clear that truth and righteousness “are not of us,” but “in us.”<sup>835</sup> Newman, in 1838, had already started his economic anthropology with the vision that God has implanted within us “a seed of truth and holiness” and “a new law [has been] introduced into our nature,”<sup>836</sup> that the Son of God came in order to transform us into “new creature in righteousness and true holiness.”<sup>837</sup> Newman, in 1840, asserted that the “saving truth, life, light, and holiness [namely righteousness] are not of us, though they must be in us.”<sup>838</sup> That means it is from God, “not from ourselves,” that we receive “righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, which is in us,—from whom is the washing away of our inward guilt, and the implanting in us of a new nature.”<sup>839</sup>

Newman emphasized “righteousness, sanctification, and redemption” are “in us,” or “must be in us,” because the Son of God became flesh, taking the whole of humanity within him. It is in him that we are justified, sanctified and glorified. He is the principle of our “righteousness, sanctification and redemption.” He is now in us, and thus “righteousness, sanctification and redemption” are “in us.” From this point of view, Newman likened those in a “state of salvation” to the incarnate Son himself.

He was born of the Spirit, and we too are born of the Spirit. He was justified by the Spirit, and so are we. He was pronounced the well-beloved Son, when the Holy Ghost descended on Him; and we too cry Abba, Father, through the Spirit sent into our

---

<sup>834</sup> JHN, “Righteousness not of Us, but in Us,” *PPS* 5: 128-142, at 136.

<sup>835</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>836</sup> *PPS* 4: 4.

<sup>837</sup> *PPS* 5: 179.

<sup>838</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>839</sup> *Ibid.*, 135.

hearts. He was led into the wilderness by the Spirit; He did great works by the Spirit; He offered Himself to death by the Eternal Spirit; He was raised from the dead by the Spirit; He was declared to be the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness on His resurrection: we too are led by the same Spirit into and through this world's temptations; we, too, do our works of obedience by the Spirit; we die from sin, we rise again unto righteousness through the Spirit; and we are declared to be God's sons,—declared, pronounced, dealt with as righteous,—through our resurrection unto holiness in the Spirit.<sup>840</sup>

Indeed, what happened to the Son now is happening to us who are in him and in his Spirit. What God did for his Only-begotten Son, God is now doing to us and for us, because the Son is the “firstborn of all creation,” our Brother, and we are his brethren. He is the Eternal Son by divine nature; we are children of God by adoption. The salvation of humanity took place first in the Son, and through him is now taking place in each one of us. However, what is happening in us now is not outside of Christ the Son. It is happening in us, who are within Christ: “Christ Himself vouchsafes to repeat in each of us in figure and mystery all that He did and suffered in the flesh.”<sup>841</sup>

He is formed in us, born in us, suffers in us, rises again in us, lives in us; and this not by a succession of events, but all at once: for He comes to us as a Spirit, all dying, all rising again, all living. We are ever receiving our birth, our justification, our renewal, ever dying to sin, ever rising to righteousness. His whole economy in all its parts is ever in us all at once; and this divine presence constitutes the title of each of us to heaven; this is what He will acknowledge and accept at the last day.<sup>842</sup>

This was what Newman meant by saying that “righteousness, sanctification and redemption” are “not of us” but “in us.” For Newman, the economy of salvation is not outside of us, not something outward attached or applied to us. It “is ever in us all at once.”

---

<sup>840</sup> Ibid., 139.

<sup>841</sup> Ibid.

<sup>842</sup> Ibid., 139-40.

With the Incarnation of the Son, the whole economy is within us, so that “God is in us for righteousness, for sanctification, for redemption, through the Spirit of His Son.”<sup>843</sup> This is a particular aspect of Newman’s soteriology. The preposition *in* or *within* for Newman is crucially significant, because in the immanent life of God, it expresses the *coinherence* of the Trinity,<sup>844</sup> and in the economy it describes the mystery of salvation from the moment of the Word becoming flesh to the fulfillment on the Last Day. Accordingly, within-ness is a cardinal point of Newman’s theology.

Newman started his Trinitarian theology by analyzing the within-ness of the immanent life of God, namely, the relationships of the divine persons.<sup>845</sup> Then Newman analyzed the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation. Newman envisioned the Incarnation as the main doctrine that dominates the whole salvific plan, in which within-ness is once again the chief aspect of the mystery. In 1835, Newman began to deepen and develop his theology of salvation by means of the Incarnation, but he had focused on the hypostatic union. Although Newman had emphasized the salvific aspect of the participation of human nature in the divine nature through the Incarnation, he had not yet analyzed the role of human beings. Newman, then in 1838, started to show concern for human nature by emphasizing the “seed of truth and holiness planted within us.”<sup>846</sup> However, by 1840, Newman created a distinct point of his theology of salvation by asserting the within-ness of salvation in human beings. What Newman saw in the within-ness of God is *life*. Now through the Incarnation this “gift of life is

---

<sup>843</sup> Ibid., 131.

<sup>844</sup> Cf. *supra*, 90-91.

<sup>845</sup> Cf. *supra*, 52-64.

<sup>846</sup> PPS 4: 4; cf. *supra*, 166.

in us, as truly as it is not of us; it is not only from Him but it is unto us.”<sup>847</sup> This gift of life is none other than eternal life, the life within the Holy Trinity, which is “not of us,” yet now it is “unto us” through the Son incarnate. In fact, Newman, in his analysis, went from the within-ness of God to the within-ness of human beings, in which the life of God dwells in us.

Newman’s theology of the Trinity is the theology of God’s self-giving in God’s immanent life as well as in the economy. What happens in the life of God *in se* is now expressed in the economy *pro nobis*, in which human beings and all creatures are drawn into a participation in the inward divine life. Newman, nonetheless, carefully noted that the life of God within us and the salvation of each one of us have not yet fully reached its completion. “It could not be done all at once; it could not be done forthwith to individuals.” God the Father “did not once for all restore the whole race, and change the condition of the world in His sight immediately on Christ’s death.”<sup>848</sup>

Newman, on the one hand, asserted that the “whole economy in all its parts is ever in us all at once”; on the other hand, he said that “it could not be done all at once.” Newman was not contradicting himself: the whole economy indeed is ever in us at once; Christ, the Son incarnate and risen Lord and his Spirit are ever in us. However, the salvation in us is not yet complete, for Christ and his Spirit are active and working in the world and in each individual in order to bring all to the fullness of salvation. Christ now in his Spirit “is formed in us, born in us, suffers in us, rises again in us, lives in us.”<sup>849</sup> Therefore, “we are ever receiving our

---

<sup>847</sup> *PPS* 5: 137.

<sup>848</sup> *Ibid.*, 136-137.

<sup>849</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

birth, our justification, our renewal, ever dying to sin, ever rising to righteousness.”<sup>850</sup> For Newman, God is all *in* us and acting *in* us; God is “ever in us at once,” but “not done at once.”

Newman, besides highlighting the within-ness of God’s salvation, also emphasized human cooperation in the work of salvation. In 1838, Newman saw human cooperation as faith and obedience<sup>851</sup>; in 1840, he moved one step further by emphasizing “a depth of power and strength lodged in us,”<sup>852</sup> which is God’s “great gift” that helps us “to do what we are commanded to do,”<sup>853</sup> namely to become co-workers with God for our salvation. Newman believed that this “gift within us may be drawn out till it fills eternity.”<sup>854</sup> Newman called this gift “a special hidden mysterious power, which makes us its instruments,”<sup>855</sup> or “a spiritual principle in us,” which is

so great, so wondrous, that all the powers in the visible world, all the conceivable forces and appetites of matter, all the physical miracles which are at this day in process of discovery, almost superseding time and space, dispensing with numbers, and rivalling mind, all these powers of nature are nothing to this gift within us.<sup>856</sup>

Newman stated that we do not need “Scripture to tell us of our divinely imparted power [or “this gift within us”]; that our own consciousness was sufficient.”<sup>857</sup> This power within us, by our consciousness and experience, “goes beyond *us*, . . . *we* have never fathomed it, . . . *we* have drawn from it, and never emptied it; . . . *we* have evidence that there

---

<sup>850</sup> Ibid., 139.

<sup>851</sup> See *PPS* 5: 184-186; JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 318.

<sup>852</sup> JHN, “the Power of the Will,” *PPS* 5: 341-356, at 343.

<sup>853</sup> Ibid., 348.

<sup>854</sup> Ibid., 344.

<sup>855</sup> Ibid.

<sup>856</sup> Ibid., 345.

<sup>857</sup> Ibid., 346.

is *a* power with us, how great we know not, which does for us what we cannot do for ourselves, and is always equal to all our needs.”<sup>858</sup> In other words, “we have the power of His might; nor only so, but the strength of the power of His might who is Almighty.”<sup>859</sup> And the object of this “divine power” or “gift” is to make us to be “partakers of the divine nature.”<sup>860</sup>

Newman, on the one hand, asserted the whole economy is “ever in us at once,” on the other hand, he emphasized the “divine power within us,” which helps us to participate in God’s salvific plan. It is God, who set his plan and carries it out by himself; it is God, who helps us to join his plan. God is active from both sides, divine and human. Speaking precisely, the whole economy happens in Jesus Christ, the Son incarnate, who is divine and human. It is in him that God works out his plan from both sides. God set his economy within us, and we by his power within us cooperate with God in the “state of salvation.” In 1845, in his *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, Newman went further and pointed out that the economy is not simply a plan or a work of God. It is Christ himself, the Son of God, who is “the Economy.”<sup>861</sup> Newman capitalized the term “Economy” to signify Christ the Son. Newman seemingly wanted to assert that the “Economy” is the second divine person himself, who is ever in the immanent life of the Trinity, and who “became flesh and made his dwelling among us.” In other words, the *immanent* person became the *economic* person. “God *in se*” became “God *pro nobis*.” In addition, Newman, in *Select Treatises of St.*

---

<sup>858</sup> Ibid., 347.

<sup>859</sup> Ibid., 346.

<sup>860</sup> Ibid., 352.

<sup>861</sup> JHN, *Essay on Development*, 137.



*Athanasius*, also characterized the “whole Economy” as the “Incarnation.”<sup>862</sup> In a word, the *Economy* is the *Son incarnate*. Christ and his Spirit are ever in us at once, the economy and God’s power are ever in us at once. The salvation of God is happening now within us and we become true “instruments”<sup>863</sup> through which God sanctifies the whole creation.

## 2. Deification – Partakers of God’s Rest and Peace

Newman’s third period of Trinitarian theology emphasized within-ness. He focused his theology more inwardly than outwardly, more to deepening mysteries than to satisfying reasons, more to rest and peace than to external action. This new focus is evident in his Trinitarian thought in his last years as an Anglican. In his sermon “Peace in Believing” (Trinity Sunday, 1839), he asserted that “peace” is God’s “everlasting state,” and “rest” “His eternal state.”<sup>864</sup>

Certainly the whole economy of redemption is a series of great and continued works; but still they all tend to rest and peace, as at the first. They began out of rest, and they end in rest. They end in that eternal state out of which they began.<sup>865</sup>

With this statement, Newman summarized his theology of salvation. The economy indeed is “a series of great and continued works” of God the Father who “sent His Only-Begotten Son into the world, and that most Gracious and All-Pitiful Son, our Lord, condescended to come to us, both He and His Father wrought with a mighty hand; and They vouchsafed the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, and He also wrought wonderfully, and works

---

<sup>862</sup> *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 161.

<sup>863</sup> *PPS* 5: 344.

<sup>864</sup> JHN, “Peace in Believing,” *PPS* 6: 362-371, at 363.

<sup>865</sup> *Ibid.*, 364.

hitherto.”<sup>866</sup> God the Holy Trinity as distinct divine persons in unity is unceasingly carrying out the economy both in human history and within each human being. That economy is not only seen as a series of the salvific works of the Triune God, but also, more importantly, it tends to “rest and peace, as at the first.” The economy is rooted ever more deeply in the innerness or within-ness of God, out of which it began and in which it ends. Newman, in the first and second periods, often emphasized the economy as the “business” of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in unity. From 1839, he went one step further by insisting that the economy is the “Dispensation of active providences” that God “in order to our redemption, has superinduced upon His eternal and infinite repose.”<sup>867</sup>

God’s “eternal and infinite repose” or “rest and peace,” for Newman, is God himself: “God is the God of peace, and in giving us peace He does but give Himself, He does but manifest Himself to us; for his presence is peace.”<sup>868</sup> In 1831, Newman asserted that “God is Himself, and nothing short of Himself; His attributes are He. Has He wisdom? This does but mean that He is wisdom. Has He love? that is, God is love, as St. John speaks.”<sup>869</sup> Thus, God’s “peace and rest” or “eternal and infinite repose” is God’s own self. The salvific works “began out of rest, and they end in rest,” which means that they began out of God himself and end in God himself. God’s economy is God’s own self. God’s carrying out the economy is none other than to give us himself and make us to be partakers of himself:

---

<sup>866</sup> Ibid., 363-364.

<sup>867</sup> Ibid., 367.

<sup>868</sup> Ibid., 363.

<sup>869</sup> JHN, “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” *PPS* 6: 349.

[God] did not bring into being peace and love as part of His creation, but He was Himself peace and love from eternity, and He blesses us by making us partakers of Himself, through the Son, by the Spirit, and He so works in His temporal dispensations that He may bring us to that which is eternal.<sup>870</sup>

Newman quoted this phrase many times from St. Peter's first letter: "partakers of the divine nature." Deification, for Newman as for Athanasius, meant being "partakers of the divine nature." In 1839, however, Newman used another phrase: "partakers of Himself"—which seems to indicate that deification is none other than being one with God. This "being one" is carried out by the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit. Newman used both of these phrases to indicate deification.

Those who are deified, for Newman, might also be called "partakers of God's Rest and Peace." That means "we enter into our Rest, by entering in with Him who, having wrought and suffered, has opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers."<sup>871</sup> Newman was careful to note that the economy "took place in time."<sup>872</sup> However, "all God's providences, all God's dealings with us, all His judgments, mercies, warnings, deliverances, tend to peace and repose as their ultimate issue."<sup>873</sup> In sum, all are destined to God himself. Even "all our troubles and pleasures here, all our anxieties, fears, doubts, difficulties, hopes, encouragements, afflictions, losses, attainments, *tend this one way*."<sup>874</sup> Deification is available to all. Human beings finally *tend* to God's rest and peace: God himself. The Holy Trinity, for Newman, is the ultimate destination to which all are drawn. At length all come to

---

<sup>870</sup> PPS 6: 368.

<sup>871</sup> Ibid., 369.

<sup>872</sup> Ibid.

<sup>873</sup> Ibid.

<sup>874</sup> Ibid.

that “rest which remaineth unto the people of God.” At length all come to the “White Throne of God” and the “Beatific Vision.”<sup>875</sup>

God indeed wanted to embrace and gather all human beings into Himself. God may be called their *Alpha Point* out of which they came, and the *Omega Point* in which they end. In addition, God is also the *Within Point*, which dwells in the believers, so that “they have a well of peace springing up within them unfathomable.”<sup>876</sup> Christians do not need to wait until the end of their lives in order to obtain God’s “peace and rest.” They may have it here and now on earth, for Christ and his Spirit are always within them. They, however, are still journeying. They are longing for God, yearning for “the sight of the Blessed Three, the Holy One; the Three that bear witness in heaven; in *light* unapproachable; in *glory* without spot or blemish; in *power* without variableness, or shadow of turning.”<sup>877</sup>

Newman used three terms—“light,” “glory” and “power”—in order to indicate the character of each divine person of the Holy Trinity, respectively. The Father is “light unapproachable”,<sup>878</sup> in another sermon, Newman mentioned “the incomprehensible infinite God.”<sup>879</sup> The Son is seen as “glory without spot or blemish.”<sup>880</sup> In other sermons, Newman described the Son as “the Lord of glory,”<sup>881</sup> “the brightness of His [the Father’s] glory, and the express image of His person,” “Light from Light,” “the Alpha and Omega, the beginning

---

<sup>875</sup> Ibid.

<sup>876</sup> JHN, “Equanimity,” *PPS* 5: 58-71, at 69.

<sup>877</sup> *PPS* 6: 370.

<sup>878</sup> Ibid.

<sup>879</sup> *PPS* 4: 291.

<sup>880</sup> Ibid., 6: 370; also see *PPS* 5: 92.

<sup>881</sup> Ibid., 6: 72.

and the ending,”<sup>882</sup> the “Immaculate Lamb of God.”<sup>883</sup> And the Holy Spirit is “power without variableness, or shadow of turning.”<sup>884</sup> In another place, Newman called the Spirit “the Strength of man and beast, the Guide of faith, the Witness against sin,” “the Soul of universal nature,” “the Grace abiding in the Christian soul, and the Lord and Ruler of the Church.”<sup>885</sup> “Light,” “glory” and “power” may be regarded as the cardinal terms in Newman’s descriptions of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. Newman, nonetheless, did not limit a particular term to a single person; for example, the terms “light” and “glory” are often used for all three divine persons; however, the term “power” is reserved for the Holy Spirit.

### 3. God and the Soul

In addition to emphasizing the deification of human beings, Newman, in 1839, began discussing the inner relationship of God and the soul. Six years earlier (1833), Newman wrote a sermon on “The Immortality of the Soul,” in which he mentioned that “we have souls,”<sup>886</sup> and they are immortal;<sup>887</sup> and that this world is “no more than a show.”<sup>888</sup> Newman concluded: “There are but two beings in the whole universe, our own soul, and the God who made it.”<sup>889</sup> In 1839, the theme of the soul re-appeared in his sermon “The Thought of God,

---

<sup>882</sup> Ibid., 2: 28.

<sup>883</sup> Ibid., 5: 91.

<sup>884</sup> Ibid., 6: 370.

<sup>885</sup> Ibid., 2: 218.

<sup>886</sup> JHN, “The Immortality of the Soul,” *PPS* 1: 15-26, at 17.

<sup>887</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>888</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>889</sup> Ibid.

the Stay of the Soul,” where he stated: “God alone is the happiness of our souls.”<sup>890</sup> Newman asserted,

The soul of man is made for the contemplation of its Maker; and . . . nothing short of that high contemplation is its happiness; . . . whatever it may possess besides, it is unsatisfied till it is vouchsafed God’s presence, and lives in the light of it.<sup>891</sup>

“God and the soul” is one of the themes of mysticism. The above passage might be seen as an “introduction” to “the beginning of the end” of the Oxford Movement, when the Tractarians, in the last years, tended to the theme of mysticism.<sup>892</sup> John Henry Overton has commented: “The first symptom was the appearance of John Keble’s *Tract 89*, “On the Mysticism Attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church.”<sup>893</sup> Newman’s sermon “The Thought of God, the Stay of the Soul” was another example of the Tractarian tendency of mysticism. Newman described the indispensable relationship of God and the soul by means of a comparison:

As the body is not complete in itself, but requires the soul to give it a meaning, so again the soul till God is present with it and manifested in it, has faculties and affections without a ruling principle, object, or purpose.”<sup>894</sup>

Newman had already used the image of “body and soul” describe the relationship of the Church and the Holy Spirit<sup>895</sup>; here he used it for the inner bond of God and the soul.

---

<sup>890</sup> JHN, “The Thought of God, the Stay of the Soul,” *PPS* 5: 313-326, at 317-318.

<sup>891</sup> *Ibid.*, 315.

<sup>892</sup> John Henry Overton, *The Anglican Revival* (Chicago and New York: Herbert S. Stone & Company, 1889), 96.

<sup>893</sup> *Ibid.* Also see Elisabeth Jay, ed., *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 131; *Tract 89*, in fact, was published in 1840, but Newman, 19 March 1838, had already mentioned that “there was to come Keble’s Papers on Mysticism... No. 89 of the Tracts.” Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 2: 225.

<sup>894</sup> *PPS* 5: 314.

Without God, the soul has no reason and purpose to survive. God is the happiness of the soul, which is created for God and God alone. Thus the soul needs God's presence and light to be itself. The soul is only truly itself when it is in God and God is in it. It will never be satisfied until it is "vouchsafed God's presence, and lives in the light of it."<sup>896</sup>

The happiness of the soul consists in the exercise of the affections; not in sensual pleasures, not in activity, not in excitement, not in self esteem, not in the consciousness of power, not in knowledge; in none of these things lies our happiness, but in our affections being elicited, employed, supplied.<sup>897</sup>

The term "exercise" suggests the "training of the soul." Newman, in examining the contemporary tendencies of religious faith practice, commented: "The Spirit of Luther is dead; but Hildebrand and Loyola are still alive."<sup>898</sup> The "exercise of the affections" was one of the significant steps in the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola: "We should exercise our affections more than our reasoning faculties."<sup>899</sup> Newman regarded the exercise of affections as "essential to the existence of true religion."<sup>900</sup> The affections are the "springs of action," so that even "with the highest perceptions of truth and religion," we cannot be active without them. The affections influence the common concerns of life; yet more

<sup>895</sup> Cf. *supra*, 154-155.

<sup>896</sup> *PPS* 5: 315.

<sup>897</sup> *Ibid.*, 315-316.

<sup>898</sup> *Apologia*, Kingsley, ed., 194. Hildebrand (1020-1085) was a Benedictine monk and became Pope Gregory VII in 1073. He restored the spirit of the Rule of St. Benedict and enforced the monastic ideal of celibacy on the secular clergy. He also affirmed the primacy of the papal authority and aimed to free the Church from the secular state. Cf. Elizabeth Abbott, *A History of Celibacy* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2001), 104-105.

<sup>899</sup> Aloysius Belloc, *Spiritual Exercises according to the Method of Saint Ignatius of Loyola* (London: Burns and Oates, 1883), 19.

<sup>900</sup> Charles Buck, ed., *A Theological Dictionary Containing Definitions of All Religious Terms* (Philadelphia: Joseph J. Woodward, 1831), 15.

significantly they “relate to the Divine Being, the immortality of the soul, and the happiness or misery of a future state.”<sup>901</sup>

The saints have always exercised “holy affections”; in particular, “Jesus Christ himself affords us an example of the most lively and vigorous affections; and we have every reason to believe that the enjoyment of heaven consists in the exercise of them.”<sup>902</sup> Newman indeed followed this line of thought:

As hunger and thirst, as taste, sound, and smell, are the channels through which this bodily frame receives pleasure, so the affections are the instruments by which the soul has pleasure. When they are exercised duly, it is happy; when they are undeveloped, restrained, or thwarted, it is not happy. This is our real and true bliss, not to know, or to affect, or to pursue; but to love, to hope, to joy, to admire, to revere, to adore. Our real and true bliss lies in the possession of those objects on which our hearts may rest and be satisfied.<sup>903</sup>

Newman firmly believed that “God alone is the happiness of our souls”<sup>904</sup> and that “He alone is sufficient for the heart who made it.”<sup>905</sup> The contemplation of God is nothing else but “fully to open and relieve the mind, to unlock, occupy, and fix our affections.”<sup>906</sup> The love of God would invade and permeate our affections; otherwise, the affections are just like “a stream running in a narrow channel, impetuous, vehement, turbid.” Without God’s love, “the heart runs out, as it were, only at one door; it is not an expanding of the whole man.”<sup>907</sup>

Newman was very clear that “created natures cannot open us, or elicit the ten thousand mental

---

<sup>901</sup> Ibid.

<sup>902</sup> Ibid.

<sup>903</sup> *PPS* 5: 316.

<sup>904</sup> Ibid., 317-318.

<sup>905</sup> Ibid., 316.

<sup>906</sup> Ibid., 318.

<sup>907</sup> Ibid.



senses which belong to us, and through which we really live.”<sup>908</sup> Only God our Maker himself and his presence “can enter us; for to none besides can the whole heart in all its thoughts and feelings be unlocked and subjected.”<sup>909</sup> Even our nearest friends can only enter into us “partially.” Only God and his “perfect and enduring Presence, and it alone, keeps the heart open.”<sup>910</sup> Without him, “the heart is straitened and distressed.” Only God who is infinite can be the measure of the heart; and “He alone can answer to the mysterious assemblage of feelings and thoughts which it has within it.”<sup>911</sup>

In his discussion, Newman emphasized that “God in His great mercy . . . has revealed to us that there is a *Mediator* between the sinful soul and Himself.”<sup>912</sup> It is only “in and through Christ” that the believer “can bear to submit and open his heart to God, and to wish it open.”<sup>913</sup> It is only “in and through Christ” that the believer, “though he be a sinner,” will “wish to be allowed to make Him the one Object of his heart.”<sup>914</sup> Newman also emphasized “the witness of the Spirit,” for the “Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God”; for God has “sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts” (Rom. viii. 16. 2 Cor. i. 22).<sup>915</sup> In the Holy Spirit, the soul experiences “satisfaction and rest” and is “able to surrender itself wholly to God, and to have no desire, no aim, but to please

---

<sup>908</sup> Ibid.

<sup>909</sup> Ibid.

<sup>910</sup> Ibid.

<sup>911</sup> Ibid., 319.

<sup>912</sup> Ibid.

<sup>913</sup> Ibid., 319-320.

<sup>914</sup> Ibid., 320.

<sup>915</sup> Ibid., 321.

Him.”<sup>916</sup> Newman never omitted to place his discussion into a Trinitarian context. The theme “God and the soul” cannot be completed without the “in-and-through Christ” and the “witness of the Spirit.” Newman was picturing a relationship of the soul with God the Father, in and through Christ, with the witness of the Holy Spirit. It is a relation of the soul with the Triune God. This could be seen as a distinguishing and particular point of Newman. In his discussions, Newman attempted to view everything in a Trinitarian light.

#### 4. Was Newman a Mystic?

Given Newman’s theology of “within-ness” and his discussion on “God and the soul,” should he be considered a mystic? There have been many different opinions in this regard. In his own day, Newman was indeed called a “logician, poet, mystic, with a spirit as devout as it was inquiring and critical.”<sup>917</sup> Yet Newman was more complex than one or two titles. He “exhibits a rare combination of the mystic with the logician.”<sup>918</sup> People often saw him as “one of the medieval schoolmen”; however, “unlike them, he is master of a style, in writing, that is almost unmatched for pellucid clearness, as well as for trenchant force.”<sup>919</sup>

Among the authors of Newman’s own time who described him was Justin McCarthy, an Irish politician, journalist, and historian (1830-1912), who stated:

The abilities of Dr. Newman were hardly surpassed by any contemporary in any department of thought. His position and influence in Oxford were almost unique. There was in his intellectual temperament a curious combination of the mystic and the

---

<sup>916</sup> Ibid.

<sup>917</sup> J. M. Dale, “The Ritual of the English Church,” *The Quarterly Review*, vol. 137, William Gifford, John Taylor Coleridge, eds. (1874): 542-586, at 544.

<sup>918</sup> Justin Almerin Smith, *Studies in Modern Church History* (New Haven, Conn.: James P. Cadman, 1887), 249

<sup>919</sup> Ibid., 250.

logical. He was at once a poetic dreamer and a sophist—in the true and not the corrupt and ungenerous sense of the latter word.<sup>920</sup>

In addition, Vida Dutton Scudder, a writer and educator (1861-1954), analyzed the medieval aspect of Newman, and linked this to mysticism:

Newman is no child of his own age, though he was one of its leaders. He belongs to the Middle Ages, not by his imagination, but by his very personality. If Scott is all chivalry, Newman is all asceticism. Pure mystic speaks in him, the mystic who has not even seen the warrior. His longest poem, the “Dream of Gerontius,” is a study of the experience of the Catholic soul after death. No one who has felt the keen touch of that poem upon the hidden spirit could venture to call it archaic. Only by accident does the nineteenth rather than the thirteenth century give it birth. Cardinal Newman is in one sense apart even from the medieval revival: he is simply a true son of the past.<sup>921</sup>

Reginald John Campbell (1867-1956), a well known preacher and minister of the City Temple, London, in discussing saints and sermons in his sermon “the Crystal Sea,” unhesitatingly mentioned Newman’s personal mystical experience of “only two luminous self-evident realities over against each other, God and his own soul.”<sup>922</sup>

Wilfrid Philip Ward (1856-1916), an English essayist and Newman biographer, exclaimed: “ ‘Mystic!’ Yes.” Newman did talk about “God and the soul,” “the unseen world,” “the mysterious teachings of conscience,” “the shadow of God’s presence in the human heart,

---

<sup>920</sup> Justin McCarthy, *A Short History of Our Own Times from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of 1880*, sixth edition (London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly, 1886), 33.

<sup>921</sup> Vida Dutton Scudder, *The Life of the Spirit in the Modern English Poets* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1895), 176.

<sup>922</sup> R. J. Campbell, *Thursday Mornings at the City Temple* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), 259. Newman mentioned this experience in his sermon, “The Immortality of the Soul,” in 1833.

and of God's wrath in the world at large."<sup>923</sup> However, Newman was not like the "typical mystic [who] lives in the clouds":

He [Newman] loved to talk on current topics of the day. He was interested . . . in everything which was going on in science, in politics, in literature. He could throw himself into spheres of action far removed from his own . . . . His senses were keenly alive to the small things of earth . . . . Ascetic though he was, he chose the wines for his college cellar at Oriel. Vivid and real was the world of religious mystery to him, he could give the closest attention to matters of secular detail. He could, in a moment, pass from the greatest matters to the smallest . . . . Newman would leave the atmosphere of religious thought and meditation and betake himself to his violin . . . . He delighted in Miss Austen and Anthony Trollope. He enjoyed a good story from *Pickwick*. All this limits very much the application to him of the popular idea of a "mystic"; and yet all this is true of a man whose sense of religious mystery was surpassed by few.<sup>924</sup>

Charles Franklin Thwing, an American clergyman and educator (1853-1937)

compared Newman to various other historical figures:

To some, Newman is a religious philosopher like Pascal, to others, a mystic like Fenelon. To one, like Lord Morley, he is simply a master of English style and not to be considered as a thinker. To some, like certain German critics, he is an ecclesiastic and theologian, a writer concerned with theory and development in dogma; and to others, like Dean Stanley, he belongs to the literature of all time. He himself illustrates what his biographer has said: "That the same object may be seen by different onlookers under aspects so various and partial as to make their views from their inadequacy, appear occasionally even contradictory."<sup>925</sup>

Should we speak of Newman as a mystic or a logician, as a theologian or a writer?

Wilfrid Ward acknowledged that there was in him (Newman) something of the mystic. He was full of power in controversy. His mind had been absorbed in patristic theology. His life

---

<sup>923</sup> Wilfrid Philip Ward, *Witnesses to the Unseen, and Other Essays* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1893), 99; hereafter cited: Ward, *Witnesses to the Unseen*.

<sup>924</sup> Ibid., 99-100.

<sup>925</sup> Charles Franklin Thwing, *Education According to Some Modern Masters* (New York: Platt & Peck Co., 1916), 222.

was one of seclusion. Yet these epithets, singly or collectively, quite fail to give any idea of him, or of the nature of his influence.<sup>926</sup> Newman “was not a theologian, not a mystic, not a controversialist. Newman was *Newman*.”<sup>927</sup> In Newman, people could find their own model or image. Newman had a “mystic personality” from which his various aspects originated and were manifested. “What would the Oxford Movement have amounted to without the mystic personality of John Henry Newman.”<sup>928</sup> His mystic personality was a great contribution to the Movement, the Church and the world. Newman’s name and works have been mentioned in different areas such as philosophy, theology, education, history, sociology, poetry, spirituality, and recent works on mysticism.<sup>929</sup>

Although Newman indeed had various talents, the conclusion is that “Newman is *Newman*.” It must be recognized that in this third period of Newman’s leadership of the Oxford Movement (1839-43), his mystical personality blossomed. Perhaps it is this mystical element that helped Newman to accept *peacefully* what happened to him in the wake of the publication of *Tract 90*. Horace James Bridges, an American writer and lecturer (1880-1955), in his book about the journey of faith, hope and despair from “Origen and Tertullian down to Jonathan Edwards.... and John Henry Newman,” gave a profound definition of a mystic, which seems to fit Newman perfectly:

---

<sup>926</sup> Ward, *Witnesses to the Unseen*, 98-99.

<sup>927</sup> Ibid. Also see Wilfrid Ward, “Some Aspects of Newman’s Influence,” *The Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review* 28 (July–December 1890): 563-574, at 563-564.

<sup>928</sup> William Philip Downes, “Mysticism,” *The Biblical World*, vol. LIV (Chicago: University of Chicago Press., 1920), 619-624, at 619.

<sup>929</sup> Cf. Mark Allen McIntosh, *Mystical Theology: The Integrity of Spirituality and Theology* (Wiley-Blackwell, 1998), 196-197; Emily Herman, *The Meaning and Value of Mysticism* (New York: Ayer Publishing, 1971), 30-31.

The mystic is the man whose sense of peace in life is so real, whose acceptance of the high privilege of being is so glad and so spontaneous, that he willingly embraces it, with all its unresolved discords, all its insoluble riddles.<sup>930</sup>

This definition seems to reflect Newman in this third period of his life: his theology of “within-ness” and the theme of “Rest and Peace” continued to follow Newman in his last three years of membership of the Oxford Movement.

## II. From 1841 to 1843

In 1840, the year after his Trinity sermon on “Peace in Believing” (1839), Newman did not write a sermon on the Trinity. In 1841, he chose to reuse this earlier sermon;<sup>931</sup> perhaps because the year 1841 was a year of crisis for Newman because of *Tract 90*. Subsequently, Newman did not write any more sermons on the Trinity until after his entrance into the Roman Catholic Church. Thus, “Peace in Believing” was his last Anglican sermon on the Holy Trinity and could be seen as the summary of Newman’s Trinitarian theology as an Anglican. In the midst of the storm surrounding *Tract 90*, he seems to have found “peace in believing” in the Holy Trinity.

Why was this theme of “peace” important for Newman? On 27 February, 1841, *Tract 90* was published.<sup>932</sup> At the end of March, Bishop Bagot of Oxford asked Newman, “for the

---

<sup>930</sup> Horace James Bridges, *Criticisms of Life: Studies in Faith, Hope and Despair* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915), 52-53.

<sup>931</sup> Cf. Placid Murray, ed., *John Henry Newman Sermons 1824-1843*, vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 370-371.

<sup>932</sup> The Birmingham Oratory, ed., *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others . . . 1839-1845* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1917), 70.

sake of peace, to suppress the Tract,”<sup>933</sup> because “Tract No. 90 was objectionable, and might tend to disturb the peace and tranquility of the Church.”<sup>934</sup> One solution was that all the “*Tracts* should be discontinued, without any recantation on the part of Newman, or censure on that of the Bishop.”<sup>935</sup> Central to the dispute about *Tract 90* was the role of the Thirty-nine Articles in the Anglican communion. The Articles, for Anglicans, did not have the same sense as the Council of Trent for Roman Catholics. Charles Chapman Grafton (1830-1912), the second Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Fond du Lac and a supporter of the Oxford Movement, explained:

The Articles do not set forth our Faith as the Council of Trent does for Roman Catholics. Our Faith is to be found embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. The Articles were established in the interests of peace. They do not set forth our Faith, but for peace’s sake, the clergy in their teaching may not deny any doctrine therein explicitly stated. This was the contention of Dr. Newman, in his *Tract 90*; of Bishop Forbes, in his *Thirty-nine Articles*, and of Santa Clara, or Fr. Davenport, a Roman Catholic, who wrote a treatise showing that the Articles, properly construed, did not contradict Trent.<sup>936</sup>

Newman, in his letter to the Rev. R.W. Jelf, also quoted the statement of Edward Stillingfleet (1635-1699), a British theologian, that “the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith.” Rather, the Articles are the “inferior Truths” which the Church of England “expects

---

<sup>933</sup> Thomas Leach, *A Short Sketch of the Tractarian Upheaval* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1887), 153.

<sup>934</sup> John William Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, vol. II (London: John Murray, 1889), 51.

<sup>935</sup> Alfred Rayney Waller, G. H. S. Barrow, *John Henry Cardinal Newman* (Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1901), 89.

<sup>936</sup> Charles Chapman Grafton, *The Roman Question: A Collection of Publications with Respect to that Question* (Milwaukee: Young Churchman, 1909), 76-77.

a submission to, *in order to her Peace and Tranquility*.<sup>937</sup> Archbishop John Bramhall, Primate of Ireland, also stated that “neither doth the Church of England define any of these questions, as necessary to be believed, either necessitate medii, *or* necessitate præcepti, which is much less; *but only bindeth her sons for peace sake, not to oppose them*.”<sup>938</sup> Newman, in his letter to John Keble, on 14 March 1843, unhesitatingly called the Thirty-nine Articles “Articles of Peace.”<sup>939</sup>

In comparing the Thirty-nine Articles with the teaching of the Council of Trent, Newman presumably wanted to keep his followers within the Church of England and did not intend to “disturb the peace and tranquility” of the Church of England.<sup>940</sup> Newman, certainly not a “wonton disturber of the peace, merely unsettling people’s mind,”<sup>941</sup> promised Bishop Bagot not to publish any more tracts. However, the Heads of the Houses condemned *Tract 90*; subsequently, bishop after bishop also condemned it, and so the “storm of indignation” quickly spread “throughout the country.”<sup>942</sup> Two decades later in his *Apologia*, Newman described the situation:

---

<sup>937</sup> JHN, *A Letter Addressed to the Rev. R.W. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church: In Explanation of No. 90 in the Series Called the Tracts for the Times* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841), 21.

<sup>938</sup> *Ibid.*, 21-22.

<sup>939</sup> JHN to John Keble (Littlemore, 14 March 1843), *LD 9*, Francis J. McGrath and Gerard Tracy, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006): 279-281, at 280.

<sup>940</sup> Cf. *supra*, 35-38.

<sup>941</sup> The Birmingham Oratory, ed., *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble*, 71.

<sup>942</sup> M. G. Brock, M. C. Curthoys, eds., *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. VI, “Nineteenth-century Oxford,” part I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 240-243. Also see Connolly, *John Henry Newman*, 4-5.



My place in the movement was lost; public confidence was at an end; my occupation was gone. It was simply an impossibility that I could say anything henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the Marshall on the buttery-hatch of every College of my University, after the manner of discomfited pastry-cooks, and when in every part of the country and every class of society through every organ and opportunity of opinion, in newspapers, in periodicals, at meetings, in pulpits, at dinner tables, in coffee-rooms, in railway carriages, I was denounced as a traitor who had laid his train and was detected in the very act of firing it against the time-honoured establishment.<sup>943</sup>

At this time, Newman stopped the publication of the Tracts and also resigned as editor of the *British Critic*. He left St. Mary's and remained at Littlemore in peace and quiet in order to write his book *An Essay on the Development*.<sup>944</sup> "Rest and peace" had been Newman's theme in 1839, and once again his choice for 1841. Seemingly Newman found that his true "rest and peace" was with God: "In giving us peace He does but give Himself, He does but manifest Himself to us, for his presence is peace;" and "rest" is God's "everlasting state."<sup>945</sup> By being in union with God, "we enter into our Rest."<sup>946</sup> "All God's providences, all God's dealings with us, all His judgments, mercies," or in a word, the whole of God's economy "tend to peace and repose."<sup>947</sup> All are gathered and brought back to God, our "Peace and Rest." Yet when Newman preached this sermon on the Trinity Sunday in 1839, he could hardly have foreseen the quite different circumstances in which he re-preached the sermon in 1841.

---

<sup>943</sup> *Apologia*, Kingsley ed., 132. Also see Thomas Leach, *A Short Sketch*, 153.

<sup>944</sup> *Ibid.*, 280. Newman took five years to complete this book (1841-1845).

<sup>945</sup> *PPS* 6: 363; cf. *supra*, 191-195.

<sup>946</sup> *Ibid.*, 369.

<sup>947</sup> *Ibid.*

The period 1839-1840 was the time when Newman developed his theology of “within-ness”: the economy is already implanted within human beings; the economy began out of God’s own self and would end in God’s own self; the relationship of God and the soul. Thanks to this spirituality, Newman, though in the midst of a storm, still found rest; although carrying the cross, he still had peace in his soul.

### **The Cross – Peace and Love**

About forty days after the publication of *Tract 90*, Newman gave a sermon on “The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World” (9 April 1841), which maintained that the “doctrine of the Cross of Christ does but anticipate for us our experience of the world.”<sup>948</sup>

The world is sweet to the lips, but bitter to the taste. It pleases at first, but not at last. It looks gay on the outside, but evil and misery lie concealed within. When a man has passed a certain number of years in it, he cries out with the Preacher, “Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.” Nay, if he has not religion for his guide, he will be forced to go further, and say, “All is vanity and vexation of spirit;” all is disappointment; all is sorrow; all is pain.<sup>949</sup>

The clamor surrounding *Tract 90* might well have made Newman feel that “all is sorrow; all is pain.” Yet in the midnight of pain and darkness, he found “peace and comfort” in the cross of Christ: “It [the Gospel] bids us to *begin* with the Cross of Christ, and in that Cross we shall at first find sorrow, but in a while peace and comfort will rise out of that sorrow.”<sup>950</sup> For Newman, the cross of Christ is the “measure of the world,” the “heart of religion.”<sup>951</sup> The function of the heart is “the seat of life;” “the principle of motion, heat, and activity.” From

---

<sup>948</sup> JHN, “The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World,” *PPS* 6: 83-93, at 87.

<sup>949</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>950</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>951</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

it, “the blood goes to and fro to the extreme parts of the body.”<sup>952</sup> Without it, all powers and faculties of the human beings cannot function. Newman saw in the cross of Christ and His Atoning Sacrifice “the vital principle on which the Christian lives, and without which Christianity is not.”<sup>953</sup>

Without it no other doctrine is held profitably; to believe in Christ’s divinity, or in His manhood, or in the Holy Trinity, or in a judgment to come, or in the resurrection of the dead, is an untrue belief, not Christian faith, unless we receive also the doctrine of Christ’s sacrifice . . . . It involves the belief in Christ’s true divinity, in His true Incarnation, and in man’s sinful state by nature; and it prepares the way to belief in the sacred Eucharistic feast, in which He who was once crucified is ever given to our souls and bodies, verily and indeed, in His Body and in His Blood.<sup>954</sup>

Newman, in earlier years, had taken the doctrine of the cross and Christ’s Atoning Sacrifice as significant in the economy of salvation; for example, he said in 1830: “Christ was not only a martyr, He was an Atoning Sacrifice”;<sup>955</sup> and in 1836: “Man dies as a Martyr, but the Son of God dies as an Atoning Sacrifice.”<sup>956</sup> Newman also asserted the significance of this doctrine in his *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, in 1838:

Christ is God from everlasting; He became man under Cæsar Augustus; He was an Atonement for the world on the Cross; but He became a Saviour on his resurrection. He was then “exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour;” to come to us in the power of the Spirit, as God, as Man, and as Atoning Sacrifice.<sup>957</sup>

However in 1841, Newman re-emphasized the significance of this doctrine, and widened its indispensable role in a network of relationships with other doctrines such as the

---

<sup>952</sup> Ibid.

<sup>953</sup> Ibid.

<sup>954</sup> Ibid.

<sup>955</sup> *PPS* 2: 42; cf. *supra*, 129-130.

<sup>956</sup> *PPS* 6: 70.

<sup>957</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 222.

Trinity, Christ's divinity and manhood, Incarnation, death and resurrection, and the Eucharist.<sup>958</sup> Newman seemingly wanted to place the cross and Christ's atoning sacrifice as the central point of Christian life and doctrines, for the redemption of the world took place at the cross of Christ, in the very person of the Son of God, who is our "Atoning Sacrifice." In 1841, Newman observed: "We shall sorrow with Christ's sufferings; but all this sorrow will only issue, nay, will be undergone in a happiness far greater than the enjoyment which the world gives."<sup>959</sup> This happiness was the joy and triumph of the resurrection; however, even in the midst of suffering, we still may experience this happiness deep down in our souls, which is the peace that the Lord said "I leave with you; My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you" [John xvi. 22; xiv. 27.]<sup>960</sup> For Newman, in receiving this peace, we receive God Himself, for God is Peace.<sup>961</sup>

In the aftermath of *Tract 90*, Newman seems to have found consolation in the experience of the cross, which provides peace and happiness "far greater" than what the world can give. He knew that as a true disciple, he had to suffer with Christ in order to share His glory. Newman then closed his sermon, "The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World," with the statement that Christ "could not enter into His glory before He had first suffered."<sup>962</sup> Newman pointed out that the cross is "God's usual mode of dealing with us."<sup>963</sup> Every believer is called to suffer with Christ first, only then sharing his joy and the triumph of

---

<sup>958</sup> *PPS* 6: 89.

<sup>959</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>960</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>961</sup> *PPS* 6: 363.

<sup>962</sup> *PPS* 6: 92.

<sup>963</sup> *Ibid.*

resurrection. In other words, God, in his mercy, will “send the shadow before the substance.” It is “a shadow,” but “raising hope because the substance is to follow.”<sup>964</sup> Newman, as a result of *Tract 90*, was experiencing the “shadow” before the coming of the “substance.”

In 1842, Newman wrote only one sermon that was published in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*: “The Crucifixion,” in which he admonished his audience: “Think then, my brethren, of your feelings at cruelty practised upon brute animals, and you will gain one sort of feeling which the history of Christ’s Cross and Passion ought to excite within you.”<sup>965</sup> For Newman, it is impossible that “any one can have attained to the love of Christ, who feels no distress, no misery, at the thought of His bitter pains.”<sup>966</sup> As was seen earlier, in 1841, Newman looked at the cross of Christ with the lens of *peace*; in 1842, Newman treated the cross of Christ with the lens of *love*. Not only cannot one say that he loves Christ if he does not *feel* his sufferings, Newman insisted that “it is not enough merely to feel and nothing more; that to feel grief for Christ’s sufferings, and yet not to go on to *obey* him, is not true love, but a mockery.”<sup>967</sup> In other words, there is no true love without obedience.

Obedience, for Newman, is the outward expression of love. Love without obedience is like a body without a soul. A person’s love for God is not genuine if he does not show his obedience to God. Our “Example of love,” Jesus Christ the Son, so loved the Father that he obeyed the Father even to suffering death on the cross. Newman then saw obedience as the best and perfect way to express our love for God. He seemingly saw the trials surrounding

---

<sup>964</sup> Ibid; cf. *supra*, 16.

<sup>965</sup> JHN, “The Crucifixion,” *PPS* 7: 133-145, at 138.

<sup>966</sup> Ibid., 133-134.

<sup>967</sup> Ibid., 134.

*Tract 90* as a great opportunity of deepening his love for God. John Morley (1838-1923), a British writer and newspaper editor, summarized what was happening to Newman at this time of his life:

Newman, the great enchanter, in obedience to his bishop had dropped the issue of the Tracts; had withdrawn from all public discussion of ecclesiastical politics; had given up his work in Oxford; and had retired with a neophyte or two to Littlemore, a hamlet on the outskirts of the ever venerable city, there to pursue his theological studies, to prepare translations of Athanasius.<sup>968</sup>

Although he was misunderstood, Newman maintained his pledge of “absolute obedience” to the authority of the Church.<sup>969</sup> In a letter to Richard Bagot, the bishop of Oxford, Newman insisted that “matters would not have gone better for the Church had I never written”; but then he added: “I am most desirous of saying in print anything which I can honestly say to remove false impressions created by the Tract.”<sup>970</sup> Newman, nevertheless, totally withdrew from everything. He did not attempt to defend himself. He retired in silence to a small village. He showed complete obedience to the Church in accord with his axiom: “Obedience comes first, knowledge afterwards.”<sup>971</sup> Newman believed that if we sorrow, it is in the plan of God, for “God alone can rule our feelings; God alone can make us sorrow.”<sup>972</sup>

---

<sup>968</sup> John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (London: Edward Lloyd, Limited, 1908), 229-230. Also see Joyce Sugg, *John Henry Newman: Snapdragon in the Wall* (Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 2001), 85.

<sup>969</sup> Walter H. Conser, Jr., *Church and Confession* (Mercer: Mercer University Press, 1984), 201.

<sup>970</sup> JHN to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford (Oriel College, 20 March 1841) *LD* 8: 101.

<sup>971</sup> Mossie May Waddington, *The Development of British Thought from 1820 to 1890* (Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1919), 64.

<sup>972</sup> *PPS* 7: 142.

We are in God's hand. He calls us by name, and leads us in every way we go. As Newman stated in "The Shepherd of Our Souls," his only sermon in 1843:

Christ is our Guide and Guardian. He is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." [John xiv. 6.] He is a light unto our ways, and a lanthorn [sic] unto our paths. He is our Shepherd, and the sheep know His voice. If we are His sheep, we shall hear it, recognize it, and obey it.<sup>973</sup>

Newman seemed to see peace, love and obedience as a triangle, shaping his life. He was not alone. He had Christ, his Shepherd. In this sermon—one of his last as an Anglican—one can detect Newman's state of mind in the midst of the storm. If we follow Christ and let him be the Shepherd of our souls, we "will come to a perfect end, and to peace at the last."<sup>974</sup> Newman, in a letter to J. R. Hope, in 1843, described this period as "a time of peace."<sup>975</sup> For instance, *The Conservative Journal* spoke a "few dirty words" of him, but Newman still insisted: "I told you I was going to be very quiet."<sup>976</sup> Newman steadfastly believed that even "in the valley of the shadow of death," "we are safe while we keep close to Him, and under His eye."<sup>977</sup>

During these years, 1841-1843, Newman did not discuss his Trinitarian theology, except by reusing his sermon, "Peace in Believing"—his last Anglican presentation on the Trinity. Rather the main theme of his sermons for these three years following the publication of *Tract 90* was the cross, peace and love. Although Newman did not write any sermons on

---

<sup>973</sup> JHN, "The Shepherd of Our Souls," *PPS* 8: 230-243, at. 241-242.

<sup>974</sup> *Ibid.*, 243.

<sup>975</sup> JHN to J. R. Hope (Littlemore: in Fest. Conv. S. Pauli, 1843), Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, 2: 363.

<sup>976</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>977</sup> *PPS* 8: 242-243.

the Trinity during this time, in 1842, he contributed two volumes of *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius* to the Oxford Library of the Fathers. These two volumes were regarded as “ranking among the richest treasures of English Patristic literature” and as “the most important work published since Bishop Bull.”<sup>978</sup> The preparation of the *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius* indeed provided Newman with the opportunity of refining and developing his Trinitarian theology. After the publication of the *Select Treatises*, Newman devoted his attention to another project—a consideration of the development of doctrine, which resulted in his ground-breaking *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* in 1845. Finally, in 1870, he published one of his greatest works, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, whose fifth chapter includes analysis of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.<sup>979</sup>

---

<sup>978</sup> Rickaby, *An Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, 27.

<sup>979</sup> JHN, *Grammar of Assent*, 98-156.



### Conclusion

During the decade (1833-1843) of his active involvement in the Oxford Movement, Newman's Trinitarian thought both developed and deepened. During the first period (1833-34), Newman started building his Trinitarian theology. His focus was the mystery of the Trinity in terms of the *relationship* of the divine persons. Since it is in this relationship that we perceive the mystery of one God in three persons, Newman took the statement of Jesus—"In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. xxviii. 19)—as a Trinitarian revelation: "the Three Sacred Names introduced have a meaning relatively to each other," for "what can be meant by saying, in the Name, not of God, but of Three?"<sup>980</sup> Each name of the divine person evokes an inseparable, undivided and unbreakable relationship with the other two.

Newman, thus, entered into an analysis of the immanent life of the Holy Trinity. He insisted that the Son is a "person," and the Holy Spirit is a "person"; both came from the "person" of the Father. The Father, the Son and the Spirit are distinguished hypostatically. Newman, then, identified the term "one God" with the Father. The Father is the "First Source," "Cause," "Fountain," out of whom and toward whom the Son and the Holy Spirit are reckoned, and by the communication of *His substance* the Father makes the unity of the Trinity. Though the Father is the "Cause" of the Trinitarian unity, Newman also highlighted

---

<sup>980</sup> PPS 6: 344-5.

the “communion” role of the Holy Spirit, for He is *of* the Father and *of* the Son. The Holy Spirit is the “*Eternal Love* whereby the Father and the Son have dwelt in each other.”<sup>981</sup>

Newman also emphasized the “communicated divinity” of the Son to indicate the origin of the Son and his relationship with the Father in the immanent life. For Newman, the titles *Son* and *Word* together express the second divine person “at once *from*, and yet *in*, the Immaterial, Incomprehensible God.”<sup>982</sup> In his accounts of the immanent Trinity, Newman customarily analyzed the prepositions *in* and *of*, for they really play significant roles in the doctrines of *coinherence* and *monarchia*. If the doctrine of *coinherence*, with the preposition *in* as representative, protects the unity of the Trinity “without intrenching on the perfections of the Son and Spirit,” considered “the characteristic of Catholic Trinitarianism,”<sup>983</sup> then the term *of* also indeed plays a prominent role in the doctrine of *monarchia*, manifesting “one Principle or *arche*,” which is the “Almighty Father,” the “Fount of Divinity.”<sup>984</sup> Newman, during the first years of the Oxford Movement, was very much focused on the immanent Trinity—analyzing and interpreting each divine person *in se* and in relationship with the others, emphasizing the unity as well as the distinction of each divine person, which makes “the Trinity in Unity.”

At the end of 1834, however, Newman shifted his attention to the economic Trinity. Beginning with the mystery of the Incarnation, Newman distinguished titles of the Son such as “Only-begotten” as *immanent*, and “First-born” as *economic*. Newman insisted on the

---

<sup>981</sup> *PPS* 2: 229.

<sup>982</sup> *Arians*, 157.

<sup>983</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

<sup>984</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

unity of the Godhead and manhood: there is “no real separation, no dissolution” in the Word incarnate.<sup>985</sup> Newman looked at the Incarnation as the “economic ministry” of the Word, by the power of the Holy Spirit, in doing the Father’s will. During the second period (1835-1838), Newman developed his view of the economic Trinity. Newman, in discussing the mystery of the economy, very rarely used the name “Jesus;” he preferred titles such as “Eternal Son,” “Eternal Word,” and “Son of God” in order to emphasize the divinity of the Word incarnate: the economy of salvation is not a human plan, but God’s plan, and God the Father has carried out the “gracious economy” through the Son and in the Holy Spirit.<sup>986</sup>

Apparently in order to emphasize the “gracious economy” of God, Newman entered into detailed discussions on flesh and instrument, the human soul of Christ and suffering, the wrath of God and the theory of satisfaction, Incarnation and atonement, the passion and glorification. Newman was particularly interested in the terms “glory” and “glorification.” He saw the economy of salvation as God’s plan of glorification of human beings and its summit as the passion of Christ. For Newman, in the immanent life, the Father and the Son glorify each other in the glory which is the Holy Spirit, and so are in communion. The Holy Spirit is glory as communion and communion as glory. Now that immanent glorification, in the Incarnation, through the passion of Christ, is communicated to the world through the Church, so that all might share the glory of the Triune God and be in the “state of glory”<sup>987</sup>—which is called *economic* glorification.

---

<sup>985</sup> *PPS* 2: 34.

<sup>986</sup> *PPS* 3: 159.

<sup>987</sup> *Ibid.*, 262.

Indeed, this second period (1835-1838) could be seen as the time of his theology of *immanent* glorification and *economic* glorification. The first glorification takes place in the immanent life of the Holy Trinity. The second is being carried out in the history of salvation by the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. Newman closely connected glorification and communion. God in his glory or God's self-glorification means God in divine communion *in se*. The glorification of humanity—human beings sharing the glory of God—means living fully in communion with God *pro nobis*. Thus, glorification, in Newman's sense, is communion and communion is glorification. The mystery of the Holy Trinity is the glory of all humanity; all have been drawn into being one with that glory, for God's glory "*without and within us*."<sup>988</sup> In addition, Newman, using the thought of glorification, also looked at the Eucharist as the "sacrament of glory," for the "glorious presence" of the Lord is in the sacrament, within which believers are glorified and in communion with God. It is the sacrament of the present, but simultaneously the sacrament of eschatology, of the glorious future day of Christ.<sup>989</sup>

Reading Newman's sermons in this second period, one becomes aware of several cardinal points that Newman intentionally highlighted. First, he was particularly concerned with the divinity of Christ, the Word incarnate, particularly because of the threat of the Liberals (Dissenters, Socinians, Unitarians), who tended to deny the essential divinity of Christ. But most of all, the divinity of Christ, for Newman, is the safeguard of the unity of the Holy Trinity in the work of salvation. The Son of God, whether in heaven or on earth,

---

<sup>988</sup> Ibid., 269.

<sup>989</sup> *PPS* 5: 56.

whether in the immanent life or in the economic mission, always is one with the Father in the Holy Spirit. The relationship between the divine persons is *always the same* whether in the Incarnation or passion or death or resurrection. There is no change in the Godhead nor in the divine relationship. The difference is that what was hidden is now revealed. God *in se* is identical with God *pro nobis* in the economy of salvation. Therefore, the economic Trinity *is* the immanent Trinity. Although Newman did not state that the immanent Trinity *is* the economic Trinity, in his expressions, the economic Trinity always points to the immanent Trinity, since, while human language is very limited in its expression of mystery, still “God understands His own words, though human.”<sup>990</sup>

In addition, Newman insisted on the unity of Christ and his Spirit and the Church. There is no Christ without the Holy Spirit. There is no Church of Christ without his Holy Spirit dwelling in and acting in it. Christ-Holy Spirit-Church is linked as a dwelling-within-one-another, which cannot be divided or separated. This linking of Christ-Holy Spirit-Church provided Newman with a basis for discussing related topics such as: the Church and its Soul, the Spirit; the visible and invisible Church; uncovenanted mercies of God and invincible ignorance, etc. Newman believed that the salvation of God is within his Church and that “Christ came in the person of His Spirit”<sup>991</sup> in order continuously to carry out the “business” of the Father.

In effect, Newman initiated an economic anthropology, in which he believed that God has planted “a seed of truth and holiness” within us, “a new law introduced into our

---

<sup>990</sup> *PPS* 4: 290.

<sup>991</sup> *Ibid.*, 169.

nature.”<sup>992</sup> Already is there within us “the gift of election and regeneration.”<sup>993</sup> That means within human nature there is the potential for the whole plan of sanctification and regeneration. The seeds are there waiting to blossom. Thus, all human beings are called to journey, through faith and obedience, from the “state of nature” to the “state of salvation.” It is within this context that Newman discussed the doctrine of justification by faith alone. His concern was not the doctrine itself, but human cooperation, through faith and good works, in the salvific plan of God. Newman strongly denied the idea that human nature is hopeless. He believed that there is an “inward voice” of God within human nature and also the voice of God without, which help, together with faith and love (expressed in good works), the faithful to participate in the mystery of salvation.

Thus, this second period could be characterized as the period of Newman’s analysis of the economic Trinity. His Trinitarian theology at this time viewed salvation as glorification within the immanent life of the Triune God being poured out into human history, such that it has glorified and transformed the whole of humanity in the glory of God. It is the work of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, within the Church, through the sacraments as well as in each human being. Therefore, Newman concluded: “The doctrine of the Holy Trinity must be held in order to salvation.”<sup>994</sup>

Newman enhanced his Trinitarian theology in the third period (1839-43) of the Oxford Movement in a way that could be called the way of “Rest and Peace.” In what might be

---

<sup>992</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>993</sup> *PPS* 6: 219.

<sup>994</sup> Ibid., 332.

termed a theology of “within-ness,” Newman focused on the term “sanctification” as another name for glorification. He insisted that sanctification originated from our very “blood relationship” with the Son of God, through “our brotherhood with Him.”<sup>995</sup> Newman then discussed righteousness as “*in us*.” He believed that the Father, in His Son incarnate, has “really implanted” righteousness “*in us*,” by the operation of the Holy Spirit.<sup>996</sup> The righteousness “is in us,” and “must be in us,” for the God incarnate now, with all the aspects of his Incarnation, is living *within* us, and thus the economy is always in us all.<sup>997</sup> For Newman, the economy is not simply a plan, but a person, Jesus Christ, the Word incarnate. Accordingly, Christ, our Economy, is within us, and in his Holy Spirit, by the will of the Father, continuously completing his salvific work within us.

Newman, in this third period (1839-43), presented the Trinitarian economy as taking place not only in the world but also within each individual human being, so that each one is called into a deep relationship with his God. It is in this context that Newman discussed the relationship of God and the soul. For Newman, God is the rest and the peace of the soul, just as the immanent life of the Trinity is one of rest and peace. The economy came from God’s rest and peace and should end within God’s own self, who is Rest and Peace. In giving us peace, God gives us himself. The economy of salvation is none other than assuming all creation into God’s rest and peace, his eternal state and God’s own self. However, during this

---

<sup>995</sup> *PPS* 5: 118.

<sup>996</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>997</sup> *Ibid.*, 139-140.

earthly journey, we may possess God's rest and peace in our souls. This was seemingly Newman's experience in the stormy aftermath of *Tract 90*.

*Tract 90*, in fact, did not divert Newman from God, but gave him a profound sense of his relationship with God, especially through his Trinitarian theology of "Rest and Peace." Thus, the mystery of the Trinity, for Newman, is neither a satisfaction of human reason nor a theological presentation. The doctrine of the Trinity is a divine call into a mysterious relationship of "peace in believing" in God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Trinity invites believers to journey in faith and obedience so that they might come to a steadfast assertion that they were created by and from rest and peace and so are called to live fully within that rest and peace, that is God himself.

If Newman in his first period analyzed the immanent Trinity and in his second period reflected on the economic Trinity, in his third period, he looked at the Trinity through the lens of rest and peace, which expresses the Holy Trinity as the beginning and the fulfillment of the whole economy. The economy of salvation began out of rest and peace and will end in rest and peace, which is God's own self. Thus, God himself is the *Alpha Point* out of which everything came and the *Omega Point* towards which all will end. Moreover, God himself is also the *Within Point*, which dwells in everything and everything in himself, for in the mystery of the Incarnation God indeed became one with his creation and dwelled in it, so that at the fulfillment of salvation God will be all in all.

Newman's Trinitarian theology is very Christological and Pneumatological, immanent and economic. Newman placed Christ the Only-begotten Son and Word incarnate always



within the inner undivided relationship with the Father and within the unbreakable and inseparable operation of the Holy Spirit. The Son incarnate is the central point of Newman's Trinitarian theology. It is in "Him and His Spirit" that the immanent life of God is revealed and the economy is carried out. In other words, it is within the economy of salvation that Newman recognized and analyzed the immanent life of the Triune God. The economic mission of the Son and His Spirit according to the Father's will has revealed the inner relationship of the Holy Trinity. Thus, for Newman, the "within-ness" of God's relationship has manifested itself in the "without-ness" of the economy, which always points to the "within-ness" of God's own self.

Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* were well received during his lifetime. Eric Mackerness noted that Newman did not "waste words on inept recapitulations" nor provide "startling or *recherché*" illustrations; his language was "free from trite and over-worked turns of phrase"; he did not "force out elaborate metaphors of his own devising."<sup>998</sup> H. W. Wilberforce considered Newman's sermons as "some of the most striking and beautiful sermons ever published."<sup>999</sup> And R. W. Church remarked that his sermons can "stand by themselves in modern English literature; it might be said, in English literature generally."<sup>1000</sup> Through these sermons, Newman developed the theology of the Oxford Movement.

---

<sup>998</sup> Quoted in Robert H. Ellison, *The Victorian Pulpit: Spoken and Written Sermons in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Pennsylvania: Susquehanna University Press, 1999), 84.

<sup>999</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1000</sup> R. W. Church, "Newman's Parochial Sermons," *Living Age*, 4<sup>th</sup> series, vol. XIV (Boston: Littell and Gay, 1869): 151-157, at 151.

Reading these sermons today, we are invited not only to understand his words, but to go beneath the surface of his language in order to enter into his magnificent inner world of theological thought, steadfast faith, and an endless yearning for God. Newman chose the term “relationship” as the starting point of his Trinitarian theology, for it expresses first of all his own undivided and unchangeable relationship with God. Newman’s Trinitarian theology is not a theory on paper but an inward profound experience of his soul with the Triune God. His Trinitarian theology could be seen as a movement from “immanent Trinity” to “economic Trinity” and then to “Rest and Peace,” inasmuch as these terms express the very journey of Newman’s own soul during the Oxford Movement.

**CHAPTER V:**  
**THE CONTEXT OF NEWMAN’S TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY**  
**IN *THE PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS*: 1833 – 1843**

In chapters two, three and four, this study tried to answer the question “what” is the *content* of Newman’s Trinitarian theology in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*? This chapter will attempt to answer the question “why” Newman was concerned with these theological issues; how was he led to a particular theological development from a focus on the immanent Trinity to the economic Trinity to a theology of “Rest and Peace”? In other words, this chapter will examine the *context* of Newman’s sermons within the Oxford Movement and the Church of England from 1833 to 1843.

A sermon is a communication between a preacher and his listeners that treats issues ranging from doctrine to spiritual life to the realities of society. A sermon always carries a two-fold purpose: spiritual and practical. It helps people to live their faith in a deep relationship with God, but simultaneously guides them in dealing with issues in their daily lives in order to strengthen their faith, enkindle their hope and nourish their charity, to present the essential teachings of the Church and to help people to live in her communion. Newman’s sermons can be seen as satisfying these conditions and even more than that. Newman was well-known by his audiences for his profound and eloquent sermons. “He antagonized their opinions, he cut across their most cherished convictions, he rebuked them for their worldliness, he exposed their inconsistencies and satirized their frivolities, but he always

retained a certain ascendancy over their imaginations and their hearts.”<sup>1001</sup> Sermons were, for Newman, an effective means to communicate with people and so they played an important part in achieving the purpose of the Oxford Movement to rejuvenate the Church of England by restoring orthodox teachings, protecting fundamental doctrines and fighting against the “Modern Liberalism” of the time, which was exemplified by Dissenters, Socinians, Unitarians, Latitudinarians, et al. Newman, in his sermons and writings, unhesitatingly spoke with a “great and effective engine against Liberalism” in interpreting the Creeds and essential doctrines such as Trinity and Incarnation, in order to awaken people from dangerous thoughts of the “fashion of the age.”<sup>1002</sup>

If the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* have presented the content of Newman’s Trinitarian theology, the *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* will give us the context of his sermons in the Oxford Movement. This chapter will be devoted to an examination of Newman’s *Letters and Diaries* together with other works in order to see what was happening during the three periods of this decade of the Oxford Movement, in order to discover the reason “why” Newman in his sermons developed particular theological points. Newman’s *Letters and Diaries* lead us back to the time when the Church of England was facing a crisis both in doctrinal issues as well as political matters. It was a time when people were living in spiritual and theological confusion. In order to rescue the Church, the Oxford Movement was established; Newman raised his unforgettable voice from the pulpit of St. Mary’s.

---

<sup>1001</sup> Lewis O. Brastow, *Representative Modern Preachers* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), 288.

<sup>1002</sup> Henri Bremond, *The Mystery of Newman*, H. C. Corrance, trans. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907), 348.

### I. The First Period: From 1833 to 1834

Newman's Trinitarian theology of this first period tended to be very dogmatic. He very much focused on the immanent Trinity, describing the relationship of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit in terms of *hypostasis* and *monarchia*.<sup>1003</sup> Seemingly, this emphasis was in reaction against the “religious fashion of the day”—the liberal rationalism of the Dissenters, Nonconformists, Unitarians, Socinians, Latitudinarians, who were opposed to dogma, especially the doctrines of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.<sup>1004</sup> Like Athanasius in the conflict with Arius and Arianism, Newman was battling the Dissenters and Liberalism. Newman's ten years in the Oxford Movement—1833 to 1843—can be seen as an “energetic decade” in fighting against Liberalism, whose ascendancy might be dated to the victory of the 1832 Reform Bill. Indeed one might say that Newman's whole life was concerned with protecting the Church from the spirit of Liberalism. As he acknowledged on the occasion of his elevation to the College of Cardinals on 17 May 1879:

For thirty, forty, fifty years I have resisted to the best of my powers the spirit of Liberalism in religion. Never did the Holy Church need champions against it more sorely than now.<sup>1005</sup>

His years at Oxford were indeed a time when he devoted himself wholeheartedly to protecting the Church from the “dangers of the age”—especially through his Tracts and his sermons in the pulpit of St. Mary's. It was within the context of the Church of England facing the invasion of Liberalism that Newman developed his Trinitarian theology.

---

<sup>1003</sup> Cf. *supra*, 91-94.

<sup>1004</sup> James Bennett, David Bogue, *The History of Dissenters: From the Revolution to the Year 1808*, vol. II (London: Frederick Westley and A. H. Davis, 1833), 177.

<sup>1005</sup> JHN, *Sayings of Cardinal Newman* (London: Burns & Oates, 1890), 18.

## 1. The Birth of the Oxford Movement

The Church of England began to see signs of danger when Lord John Russell's Bill to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts was passed in the spring of 1828: "Dissenters could now legally hold government office."<sup>1006</sup> Then in July 1830, there was a revolution in France, which changed the world; as Newman commented decades later in his *Apologia*: "I believed that it was unchristian for nations to cast off their governors, and, much more, sovereigns who had the divine right of inheritance."<sup>1007</sup> At the time, Newman wrote to his mother: "This Revolution seems to me the triumph of irreligion."<sup>1008</sup> For him, "the effect of this miserable French affair will be great in England."<sup>1009</sup> In fact, in England the "Whigs had come into power,"<sup>1010</sup> and thus "the agitation for the Reform Bill was taking shape."<sup>1011</sup>

The years of 1830 to 1832 saw the fall of a Tory Government—the traditional allies of the clergy and the Church of England—and the accession to power of a Whig Government—the traditional allies of the Dissenters: Congregationalists, Socinians, Unitarians (also called Rational Dissenters), and Nonconformists.<sup>1012</sup> These years were a period when political

---

<sup>1006</sup> Eric J. Evans, *The Great Reform Act of 1832* (London: Routledge, 1983), 40.

<sup>1007</sup> *Apologia*, Kingsley, ed., 93.

<sup>1008</sup> JHN to Mrs Newman (20 August 1830), *LD* 2: 283.

<sup>1009</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1010</sup> *Apologia*, 93.

<sup>1011</sup> Edward Caldwell Moore, *An Outline of the History of Christian Thought since Kant* (Cambridge: C. Seribner's Sons, 1916), 215; hereafter cited: Moore, *History of Christian Thought*.

<sup>1012</sup> Cf. Gerald Parsons, James Richard Moore, John Wolffe, *Religion in Victorian Britain: Traditions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 15; hereafter cited: Gerald Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Nonconformists called themselves Separatists, holding that "it was the duty of all true Christians to separate themselves from the Church and to form congregations apart, and they also denied that the State had any right to interfere with

attention “focused upon the struggle to pass a Parliamentary Reform Act which would much increase the power of the Whig-Dissenting-Nonconformists tradition.”<sup>1013</sup> In 1831, Newman, fearful of what would happen to the Church of England, wrote to his friend, John W. Bowden:

They are Liberals, and in saying this, I conceive I am saying almost bad of them as can be said of any man. What will be the case if things remain as they are? . . . The Whigs have before now designed Parr for a Bishop, we shall have such as him – I would rather have the Church severed from its temporalities and scattered to the four winds than such a desecration of holy things. I dread above all things the pollution of such men as Lord Brougham affecting to lay a friendly hand upon it. This vile Ministry, I cannot speak of them with patience.<sup>1014</sup>

As Newman had feared, the Reform Bill was passed by Earl Grey’s Whig administration on 7 June 1832.<sup>1015</sup> This indeed was “the triumph of reviving Liberalism in England.”<sup>1016</sup> Dissenters now had a major voice and a highly liberal rationalism began to prevail.<sup>1017</sup> From this time on, the Church’s liturgy, articles and status could be altered and “its Bishops would be appointed, at the will of a parliamentary majority which might be non-Anglican or even non-Christian.”<sup>1018</sup> Thomas Arnold in a letter to Rev J. E. Tyler on 10 June

---

a man’s religious opinions.” During the reigns of James I and Charles I, the Separatists increased and became known by two names – “Nonconformists and Dissenters: Nonconformists because they would not conform to the religion of the Established Church, and Dissenters because they dissented from it.” John Sawyer, *The Story of Gloucestershire* (Cheltenham: Norman, Sawyer & Co., 1908), 267.

<sup>1013</sup> Gerald Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*, 15.

<sup>1014</sup> JHN to John William Bowden (Oriel College, 13 March 1831), *LD* 2: 317.

<sup>1015</sup> J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancient Regime* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 546.

<sup>1016</sup> Verlyn Klinkenborg, Herbert Cahoon, *British Literary Manuscripts: 1880-1914* (London: Courier Dover Publications, 1981), 45.

<sup>1017</sup> Gerald Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*, 15.

<sup>1018</sup> Basil Willey, *Nineteenth Century Studies* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1968), 76.

commented: “The Church as it now stands no human power can save.”<sup>1019</sup> Similarly, Newman questioned: “How are we to keep the Church of England from being liberalized?”<sup>1020</sup> Simultaneously, his good friend, Richard Hurrell Froude exclaimed: “Let us tell the truth and shame the devil: let us give up a *national* Church and have a *real* one.”<sup>1021</sup>

Early in 1830, Newman wrote to Simeon Lloyd Pope, to share his concern about the Liberalism of the age:

The tendency of the age is towards *Liberalism* – i.e., a thinking established notions worth nothing – in this system of opinions a disregard of religion is included. No religion will stand if deprived of its forms.

A system of Church government was *actually established* by the Apostles, and is thus the *legitimate* enforcement of Christian truth. The Liberals know this – and are in every possible manner trying to break it up – and I think the B[ible] S[ociety] (unconsciously) is a means of aiding their object . . . . *Hence it is joined by Liberals . . . as a fact*, I do believe IT MAKES CHURCHMEN LIBERALS – it makes them undervalue the guilt of schism – it makes them feel a wish to conciliate Dissenters at the expense of truth. I think it is preparing the downfall of the Church.<sup>1022</sup>

Newman and his friends were worried about the “tendency of the age” because the spirit of the Dissenters was prevailing within the Church of England. The Dissenters in fact differed on many fundamental points from the teachings of the Church of England:

1. That the Church, as by law established, is the mere creature of the State, as much as the army. 2. That many of her offices and dignities are utterly at variance with the simplicity of Apostolic times. 3. That the repetitions in the Liturgy are numberless and vain. 4. That the Apocrypha is read as a part of the public service. 5. That her Creeds

---

<sup>1019</sup> Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D* (London: B. Fellowers, 1852), 253.

<sup>1020</sup> *Apologia*, 94.

<sup>1021</sup> Richard Hurrell Froude, John Henry Newman, John Keble, James Bowling Mozley, *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude* (London: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1839), 274.

<sup>1022</sup> JHN to Simeon Lloyd Pope (15 August 1830), *LD* 2: 264-265.



contain unwarrantable metaphysical representation relative to the doctrine of the Trinity. 6. That every baptized person is considered as regenerated. 7. That the baptismal and confirmation services, etc. have a tendency to deceive and ruin the souls of men. 8. That no distinction is made between the holy and profane, the sacraments being administered without discrimination to all who present themselves.<sup>1023</sup>

The Dissenters, in addition, saw the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* not only as being hierarchical but also as “ecclesiastical obedience with civil subordination.” They asserted that “such education for civil obedience through the Church was erroneous, liberal and not supported by Scriptural evidence.”<sup>1024</sup>

Given these Dissenting points of view, Newman and his friends felt that the Church of England was truly in danger, especially after the victory of the Reform Bill. He wrote to his aunt, in August, 1832: “What a miserable state the Country is in! The ministry now show themselves to be . . . deeply infected with the cold-hearted indifferent spirit of Liberalism.”<sup>1025</sup> In strong reaction to the positions of Dissenters, John Keble preached an Assize Sermon on the *National Apostasy* on 14 July 1833; this sermon “kindled the conflagration which had been long preparing.”<sup>1026</sup> Newman and his friends heard Keble’s sermon as “the battle cry of faith.”<sup>1027</sup> They formed a committee: “a declaration of principles [was] drawn up, and the

---

<sup>1023</sup> John McClintock and James Strong, “Dissenter,” *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, vol. II (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1894), 824.

<sup>1024</sup> Mary Hilton, *Education and Public Doctrine in Britain, 1750-1850* (London: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 90.

<sup>1025</sup> JHN to Elizabeth Newman (Tunbridge Wells, 24 August 1832), *LD* 3: 80-81, at 81.

<sup>1026</sup> Moore, *History of Christian Thought*, 216.

<sup>1027</sup> Lionel Trilling, *Matthew Arnold* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1974), 46.

Oxford Movement was launched.”<sup>1028</sup> For Newman, the purpose of the Movement was to “withstand the Liberalism of the day.”<sup>1029</sup>

Newman later described in detail his role in the Movement: “First was the principle of dogma: my battle was with Liberalism. By Liberalism I mean the anti-dogmatic principle and its development.” Secondly, his aim was the assertion of “the visible Church with sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace” and definite religious teaching on the foundation of dogma; and thirdly, “the assertion of the Anglican Church as opposed to the Church of Rome.”<sup>1030</sup> In other words, the aim of the movement was to emphasize “the antiquity and the authority of the Church,” in order first to assert the Church’s independence of State control, secondly to restore the Church in its Catholic dogma, liturgy, morality and practices.<sup>1031</sup>

Newman and his fellows conceived the *Tracts for the Times* as a means of codifying the theology of the Anglican Church in opposition to the anti-dogmatic tendencies of the time. The *Tracts* were then an attempt to define the nature and beliefs of the Anglican Church through studies of the Church Fathers, Church history, and dogma. In addition to the *Tracts*, Newman’s afternoon *Parochial and Plain Sermons* at St. Mary’s exerted spiritual power. Edward Caldwell Moore, an American theologian, commented that, at St. Mary’s, Newman

---

<sup>1028</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1029</sup> JHN, *Apologia*, 195; cf. *supra*, 47.

<sup>1030</sup> Ibid., 120-125.

<sup>1031</sup> Arthur Lyon Cross, *A History of England and Greater Britain* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914), 1040.

was at his best. All his strength and little of his weakness showed. His insight, his subtility, his pathos, his love of souls, his marvelous play of dramatic as well as of spiritual faculty, were in evidence.<sup>1032</sup>

In a word, Newman's "sermons at St. Mary's, Oxford, as well as his writings were of great influence."<sup>1033</sup>

## 2. The Context of Newman's Trinitarian Theology in the First Period

Newman did not wait until 1833 when the Movement was born in order to act against Liberalism. Already in 1829, he had started protecting orthodox teachings of the Church, particularly the doctrine of the Trinity against the anti-dogmatic spirit of the Dissenters. Newman gave two sermons on Trinity Sunday—"The Christian Mysteries" in 1829 and "The Mystery of the Holy Trinity" in 1831—which were strong and apparent reactions to those Dissenters who rejected the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The Dissenters, indeed, "stuck" on the "'inexplicable mystery' of the doctrine of the Trinity, contained in the Athanasian Creed," it was their "chief stumbling block."<sup>1034</sup> Newman, in these sermons, asserted that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity "*is not proposed in Scripture as a mystery.*"<sup>1035</sup> It is not an "inexplicable mystery" and a "chief stumbling block," inasmuch as only "doctrines imperfectly revealed must be mysterious."<sup>1036</sup> Newman reasoned that

---

<sup>1032</sup> Moore, *History of Christian Thought*, 215-6.

<sup>1033</sup> William Allan Neilson, *A History of English Literature* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920), 345.

<sup>1034</sup> J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 322-323.

<sup>1035</sup> JHN, "The Christian Mysteries," *PPS* 1: 210.

<sup>1036</sup> *PPS* 1: 211.

if there be an eternal mystery in the Godhead, such as we aver, then, from the nature of the case, there could not but be a difficulty in the words in which He [Christ] revealed it. Christ, in that case, makes no mystery for the occasion; He uses the plainest and most exact form of speech which human language admits of.<sup>1037</sup>

The Dissenters, in contrast, maintained that there is not enough proof from Scripture for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The Bible indeed was their “everything evidence.” As John Angell James (1785–1859), an English Nonconformist clergyman, stated: “The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Dissenters.”<sup>1038</sup> Newman certainly knew this position, thus he did not begin his sermon with a statement of the Church Fathers or Councils, but with a biblical statement as the starting point for his Trinitarian theology: “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” (Matt. 28: 19).<sup>1039</sup>

Newman’s sermon on “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity” can be seen as a direct reply to *Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters*, published in 1817, in which the third letter discussed the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.<sup>1040</sup> The discussion took the

---

<sup>1037</sup> JHN, “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” *PPS* 6: 346.

<sup>1038</sup> John Angell James, “The Principles of Dissent, and the Duties of Dissenters,” *Standard Essays on State-Churches* (London: Society for the Liberation of Religion, 1867), 7.

<sup>1039</sup> *PPS* 6: 343.

<sup>1040</sup> A London Merchant, *Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters* (London: R. Hunter and W. Harwood, 1817), 29-47; hereafter cited: *Six Letters*. The author’s name of this book was hidden. However, in the review of the book, *The Monthly* introduced the author: “The ‘London Merchant’ is what this title imports. He is a respectable layman, whose attention has been directed to theology, and whose inquiries led him from the Established Church to the ‘Independent Dissenters’ and, in the end, from them to the Unitarians.” This book in fact raised theological debates on the doctrine of the Trinity and the Athanasian Creed, and *The Monthly* cordially recommended it to readers. Robert Aspland, “Review – Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters,” *The Monthly Repository of Theology*, vol. XII (London: Sherwood, Neely and Jones, 1817): 302-304.

same biblical statement of Mathew 28:19 as its starting point. Although this sermon of Newman was written fourteen years after the publication of the *Six Letters*, the Trinitarian discussion was still a hot topic. The third letter proposed that the formula of Baptism – “In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” – came later than Acts 8: 16. The Dissenters said, “We can hardly imagine that the apostles themselves, as if watching for the departure of the their master, should instantly adopt another practice, and begin to baptize into his name *only*, who had expressly commanded them to use in that rite, the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”<sup>1041</sup> They took Acts 8:16 as their standard: people were “baptized into the name of Jesus” and when hands were laid upon them, they “immediately received the Holy Ghost.”<sup>1042</sup> Moreover, as the Jews were baptized “into the religion of Moses, by passing through the Red Sea (1 Cor., x, 2),” then Christians, “by faith in Christ” are “baptized into Christ (Gal., iii, 26 and 27).”<sup>1043</sup> For the Dissenters,

If that doctrine [of the Holy Trinity] were perfectly developed to the disciples, previously to this farewell injunction, they would undoubtedly understand their Lord as referring to it in this his farewell admonition; but moderns have yet to find the proofs that such a discovery was made to them, either in public or in private; and, without this satisfaction, they can hardly be justified in believing that the three names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are the proper names of the three persons united by a mysterious union into one God.<sup>1044</sup>

The Dissenters admitted that 2 Corinthians 13: 13 “is much more to the point” of the doctrine, but it is not enough to teach about the Trinity. The text–“the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all”–only tells

---

<sup>1041</sup> *Six Letters*, 31.

<sup>1042</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1043</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>1044</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

that “there is one God,” and our Lord Jesus Christ as “a distinct person.”<sup>1045</sup> The text does not prove Christ’s Godhead.<sup>1046</sup> The phrase “communion of the Holy Ghost” also could not strengthen “any presupposed doctrine.” It simply means no other than the “partaking of, or participation in the gifts of God” of which St. Paul often spoke to his churches.<sup>1047</sup>

These erroneous theological positions very much concerned Newman, who expended all his effort to protect the doctrines of the Trinity and divinity of Christ. Newman, in “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” asserted that Matt 18: 19 was truly the revealed teaching of Jesus. There is indeed only one God, as the Dissenters believed. Newman cited many biblical texts from the Old Testament to prove that “God is one” “in the simplest and strictest sense, as all Scripture shows.”<sup>1048</sup> Furthermore, Newman proclaimed that God is “one in Himself,” for “all that He is, is Himself, and nothing short of Himself; His attributes are He.”<sup>1049</sup> From steadfast faith in the oneness of God, Newman went to the teaching of Jesus, in which Newman questioned, “What can be meant by saying, in the Name, not of God, but of Three?”<sup>1050</sup> Newman then went on to discuss the inseparable, indivisible and unbreakable relationships of each divine person to one another, which show that God is a *relational being*. Newman, moreover, in responding to the rationalism of the Dissenters, asserted that the doctrine of the Trinity is not a kind of knowledge to satisfy human reasons. We only perceive it by *knowledge of faith*, “which receives with reverence and love whatever God gives, when

---

<sup>1045</sup> Ibid., 34.

<sup>1046</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1047</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1048</sup> *PPS* 6: 348.

<sup>1049</sup> Ibid., 349; cf. *supra*, 57.

<sup>1050</sup> Ibid., 344.

convinced it is His gift.”<sup>1051</sup> Newman also insisted that human language is very limited and full of apparent contradictions in describing the mystery of God, because “the power of contemplating the Eternal, as He is, is beyond us.”<sup>1052</sup> “We must,” Newman concluded, “be content to take it on faith, without comprehending how it is, or having any clear understanding of our own words.”<sup>1053</sup>

Newman did not answer all the positions of Liberalism in one sermon; rather, he tried to raise and correct one or two errors of Liberalism in every sermon, because, as he remarked to Henry Wilberforce, the “Church [is] in the midst of error.”<sup>1054</sup> Newman’s aim was to build a firm orthodox foundation for the faith of his people. In addition, his sermon on “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity” can be seen as a response to another error of the time—Sabellianism or Modalism—a view espoused by Richard Whately, whose book, *The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature* (1830), gave rise to confusion about Trinitarian belief:

The doctrine of the Trinity is not so much *declared* as a distinct article of faith, as it is *implied* by the whole history recorded, and views every where taken, in Scripture, of God’s threefold manifestation of Himself; which are such as would present to our minds nothing inconsistent with the agency of three Divine Beings acting in concert, were it not that such sedulous care is taken to assure us of the numerical Unity of the God thus manifested to us; - that in the Son “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead,” &c.<sup>1055</sup>

---

<sup>1051</sup> *PPS* 1: 211.

<sup>1052</sup> *PPS* 6: 351.

<sup>1053</sup> *Ibid.*, 356.

<sup>1054</sup> JHN to Henry Wilberforce (Oriel College, 13 May 1831), *LD* 2: 330-332, at 331.

<sup>1055</sup> Richard Whately, *The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature* (London: B. Fellowes, Ludgate Street, 1830), 85.

Whately, moreover, in a “Fragment of a Letter to a Friend on Certain Religious Difficulties” (1833) distinguished two different doctrines, each called the doctrine of the Trinity, but “often confused together”:

The one speculative, concerning the distinctions in the Divine essence; the other practical, concerning the *manifestations* of God to man. They are as different as a certain opinion respecting the *sun*, from an opinion respecting the sunshine.<sup>1056</sup>

Whately also in the sermon “God’s Abode with His People” preached that Scripture helped to guard us carefully against the notion of three Gods, “but what the relations *to each other* of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, it leaves unexplained; dwelling strongly on their relations *to us*, as constituting a threefold manifestation to mankind of the one God.”<sup>1057</sup>

Whately, later on 23 April 1835, in a letter confessed, “Without saying in direct terms that I am a Sabellian, it is yet so implied, as not only to leave no doubt, but even to assume it, and allude to it as a matter quite familiar to both of us.”<sup>1058</sup>

Richard Whately, for Newman, was indeed a Sabellian.<sup>1059</sup> Newman probably had read Whately’s *Errors of Romanism* and took the opportunity on Trinity Sunday 1831 to reject Whately’s errors. Whately’s Sabellianism seems to stem from his understanding of the

---

<sup>1056</sup> Elizabeth Jane Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., Late Archbishop of Dublin* (London: Longmans, Green, 1866), 206; hereafter cited: Elizabeth Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*.

<sup>1057</sup> Richard Whately, *Sermons on Various Subjects*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: John W. Parker, West Strand, 1849), 200.

<sup>1058</sup> Elizabeth Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, 277.

<sup>1059</sup> JHN to Henry Wilberforce (23 March 1835), *LD* 5: 50-51, at 51.



term “person”; Whately, in his book, *Elements of Logic* (1826), explained that the term

“person” in the case of the Trinity, meant not an individual but a “character” or “capacity”:<sup>1060</sup>

There is another notion of the word Person, and in common use too, wherein the same man may be said to sustain divers persons, and those persons to be the same man: that is, the same man as sustaining divers capacities. As was said but now of Tully, *Tres Personas Unus sustineo; meam, adversarii, judicis*. And then it will seem no more harsh to say, The Three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are one God, than to say, God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, are one God . . . it is much the same thing whether of the forms we use.<sup>1061</sup>

Newman, aware of Whately’s position, unhesitatingly asserted in “The Mystery of the Holy Trinity,” that “the Son or Word is a Person”; and “the Holy Ghost also is a Person.”<sup>1062</sup>

Newman clarified that the Son or the Spirit here is to be spoken of as “He,” not “it.”<sup>1063</sup>

Newman emphasized the “He”, for the term “Person” here could not be understood as an “it” of “character” or “capacity.” Newman emphasized that a person is only a person when there is an existence of another person. Each divine person is different not by substance but by way of being who he is, and none of them is subject to confusion with the other two. Newman recognized that “otherness” in God absolutely exists and, therefore, emphasized the personhood of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit: the three divine persons with their own titles, personalities, properties, completely distinct yet unbreakably relational in communion, and

---

<sup>1060</sup> Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 277.

<sup>1061</sup> Richard Whately, *Elements of Logic*, 9<sup>th</sup> edition (London: Longmans, Green, 1913), 214.

<sup>1062</sup> *PPS* 6: 357.

<sup>1063</sup> *Ibid.*

thus called “Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity.” Such was Newman’s response to the Sabellianism of Richard Whately.<sup>1064</sup>

Newman, nonetheless, did not stop at this point. In a letter to Hugh James Rose on 28 March 1831, Newman mentioned that he had planned a *real* work, in which he would study “theology as a science,” systematically and theologically deepening the doctrines of “Trinity, Person, merits of Christ, grace, regeneration, etc.”<sup>1065</sup> Newman, in another letter to Rose on 16 August 1831, thought of the work in three volumes: “1 on the Trinity and Incarnation; 2 on original Sin, grace, works etc; 3 on the Church System.”<sup>1066</sup> However, the book that Newman actually wrote came out in October 1833, as *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. In this book, Newman devoted two complete sections in chapter II to discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. In the first section, Newman discussed the “Scripture doctrine of the Trinity,” as a straight response to the Dissenters, who totally rejected the doctrine for its lack of biblical proofs. In the second section, he discussed the “Ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity,” analyzing the terms “Person,” “Son,” “Word,” “in God” (*coinherence*), and “of God” (*monarchia*), as a perfect answer to the Sabellianism of Richard Whately.<sup>1067</sup> *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, indeed, was a “powerful book.” It was built upon a “trio foundation”—Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers—so that on the one hand it presented the orthodox teachings

---

<sup>1064</sup> See Donald Graham, “Newman’s Sermon on ‘the Mystery of the Holy Trinity’: A Response to Richard Whately?” *Newman Studies Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 63-76, at 69-72.

<sup>1065</sup> JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriel College, 28 March 1831), *LD* 2: 321-322, at 322.

<sup>1066</sup> JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriel College, 24 August 1831), *LD* 2: 352-353, at 353.

<sup>1067</sup> Newman finished the *Arians* on July 31, 1832, about the same time as the publication of Whately’s *Errors*; see *LD* 3: 74.

of the Church on cardinal issues of faith; on the other hand it helped to distance the faithful from the “democratic and rationalistic thought” of Liberalism, laying out “the attitude which Orthodoxy should take to the conflict of Creeds in fourth-century Alexandria and the conflict of Creeds in nineteenth-century England.”<sup>1068</sup>

Newman, at the end of October, in a letter to the editor, enumerated those who had problems with the doctrine of the Trinity, such as Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians, Latitudinarians, and insisted that “the present latitudinarian spirit” has been “introduced into the Church.”<sup>1069</sup> Newman, in a letter to Richard Hurrell Froude in early November, expressed his deep concern about this “spirit” which was disturbing the Church:

At a time, when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments, and the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the Apostolical Doctrine and Polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are Ministers; and deeprooted attachment to that venerable Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the Orthodox and Primitive Faith.<sup>1070</sup>

Socinians, in fact, were brothers of Unitarians, who sometimes called themselves “Rational Dissenters.” They were all Anti-Trinitarians. In the nineteenth century, Socinianism had great influence upon English Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Unitarians. In the United States, it “gained adherents among Quakers.”<sup>1071</sup> Socinianism

---

<sup>1068</sup> Maurice Cowling, *Religion and Public Doctrine in Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) 18.

<sup>1069</sup> JHN to the Editor of the Record (Oxford, 31 October 1833), *LD* 4: 76-78, at 77.

<sup>1070</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriel College, 7 November 1833), *LD* 4: 90-91, at 91.

<sup>1071</sup> Roger R. Nicole, Charles Evan Hill, Frank A. James, *The Glory of the Atonement: Biblical, Historical & Practical Perspectives* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 340.

originated with Faustus Socinus (1539-1604), who denied the doctrine of the Trinity, the pre-existence of Christ and His two natures, and considered the Holy Spirit not a person but as God's power, energy, and influence.<sup>1072</sup> Herman Bavinck, a Dutch Reformed theologian, commented that the thought of Faustus Socinus "was so sharp and complete that later dissenters could do little else than repeat his arguments."<sup>1073</sup> Newman, recognizing the danger of the Socinian attack on the Church, commented: "To tell the truth, we think one special enemy to which the American Church, as well as our own, at present lies open is the influence of a refined and covert Socinianism."<sup>1074</sup>

Latitudinarianism—another great concern confronting Newman—was a tolerant, anti-dogmatic tendency that arose within the Church of England during the seventeenth century.<sup>1075</sup> Latitudinarians attached very little importance to matters of dogmatic truth, ecclesiastical organization, and liturgical practice, and allowed reason to inform theological interpretation and judgment. In other words, for them, all doctrinal and historical claims of the Church should be examined in the light of reason and science.<sup>1076</sup> To be a Latitudinarian, first of all, is to ask questions "which are out of place, refusing to believe certain things unless they can be accounted for."<sup>1077</sup> The typical Rationalist was Nicodemus, who asked, "How can

---

<sup>1072</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1073</sup> Ibid., 341.

<sup>1074</sup> From a note in *LD* 9: 437.

<sup>1075</sup> I. A. Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology*, vol. II, George Robson, trans. (Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1871), 64-65.

<sup>1076</sup> Jeffrey Paul Von Arx, *Progress and Pessimism: Religion, Politics, and History in Late Nineteenth Century Britain* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1985), 70-71.

<sup>1077</sup> John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Gibbings & Co, 1896), 123. The Liberalism in question is rationalism. The first principle of

these things be?”<sup>1078</sup> Newman’s sermon on the Trinity, apparently in response to Latitudinarians, took Nicodemus not as a “typical Rationalist” but as a “true follower of Christ,” who raised questions to Jesus, “How can these things be?” Nicodemus in fact felt the temptation, but then, Newman insisted, he “overcame it.”<sup>1079</sup>

In addition, Newman, in reaction against rationalism, in his sermon “Faith without Sight” (1834), declared that “the true religion is in part altogether above reason.”<sup>1080</sup> Newman then did not reject the role of reason, but emphasized the *priority of faith* with respect to the inquiry of reason. Reason provides “fitting arguments” in order to show the coherence and intelligibility of faith as well as to avoid errors contrary to faith. The problem was that for Latitudinarians “reason is the faculty whereby revelation is to be discerned.”<sup>1081</sup> Faith itself is an act of reason in the sense of “an act of understanding,” for “without knowledge, there can be no devotion in the service of God, no obedience to his laws. Religion begins in the understanding, and from thence descends upon the heart and life.”<sup>1082</sup> In other words, the Latitudinarians required “natural religion” to be the test and standard of

---

rationalism is “the primacy of logical reason.” It supposed that “reason, cold, impartial, unbiased, impersonal – in other words, knowledge of things from outside and at a distance, without personal commitment – is the supreme, even the sole, motive force of life.”

Walgrave, *Newman*, 34.

<sup>1078</sup> Hunt, *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, 123.

<sup>1079</sup> *PPS* 1: 205.

<sup>1080</sup> JHN, “Faith without Sight,” *PPS* 2: 24

<sup>1081</sup> Mary Hilton, *Education and Public Doctrine in Britain, 1750-1850* (London: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 51.

<sup>1082</sup> David S. Katz, *God’s Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 120.

“revealed religion.”<sup>1083</sup> The term “natural” here actually does not have anything to do with nature; it is indeed, as Charles Sarolea said, “highly artificial.”<sup>1084</sup> “Natural religion” therefore is “a system of beliefs and doctrines reached by the mere processes of reason,” and it is “generally synonymous with *rational* religion.”<sup>1085</sup> With such arguments, Latitudinarians opposed “man-made formulas as the Athanasian Creed and the Thirty-Nine Articles.”<sup>1086</sup> They simplified “the articles of faith into a consistent system of *Rational* Religion: indeed, so *very Rational* as to have almost nothing to do with Revelation.”<sup>1087</sup>

Newman, of course, strongly rejected such positions: religion must be “built upon faith, not upon reason.”<sup>1088</sup> For Newman, in response to rationalism, faith is not an act of understanding or knowing or proving like Thomas, but is shown by Jesus’ words: “Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed” (John 20: 27-29).<sup>1089</sup> It is the faith of Abraham.

It goes out not knowing *whither* it goes. It does not crave or bargain to see the end of the journey; it does not argue with St. Thomas, in the days of his ignorance, “we know not whither, and how can we know the way?” it is persuaded that it has quite enough light to walk by, far more than sinful man has a right to expect, if it sees one step in

---

<sup>1083</sup> Martin Ignatius Joseph Griffin, *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 121.

<sup>1084</sup> Charles Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman and His Influence on Religious Life and Thought* (New York: Charles Scribners’ Sons, 1908), 105.

<sup>1085</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1086</sup> B. W. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 21.

<sup>1087</sup> John Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment: Science, Religion and Politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 248.

<sup>1088</sup> *PPS* 2: 17.

<sup>1089</sup> Ibid., 15-16.

advance; and it leaves all knowledge of the country over which it is journeying, to Him who calls it on.<sup>1090</sup>

This is the faith, upon which religion is built. It is the faith, which is “‘the substance,’ or the realizing, ‘of things hoped for,’ ‘the evidence,’ or the making trial of, the acting on, the belief of ‘things not seen’ (Heb. 11: 1).”<sup>1091</sup> With that faith, we enter into the mystery of the Trinity. Newman, in his sermon “The Gospel, a Trust committed to Us”, preached on Trinity Sunday 1834, continued to criticize the rationalists, who wanted to “weigh”, “measure”, “analyze, simplify, refashion,” “reduce”, “arrange”, and “harmonize” doctrinal Truths.<sup>1092</sup>

Newman warned his congregation:

Do not be moved by them; do not alter your Creed for them; for the end of such men is error. They go on disputing and refining, giving new meanings, modifying received ones, still with the idea of the True Faith in their minds as the scope of their inquiries; but at length they “miss” it. They shoot on one side of it, and embrace a deceit of their own instead of it.<sup>1093</sup>

It was the “fashion of the day” made by the “reasoners of this age,” who distorted the revealed Truths.<sup>1094</sup> Newman wanted to confirm his listeners in the “Articles of Faith” that the Church had ever confessed, but the Liberalism of the day denied or reduced:

The doctrine of the Trinity; of the Incarnation of the Son of God, His Mediatorship, His Atonement for our sins on the Cross, His Death, Burial, Resurrection on the third day, and Ascension; of Pardon on Repentance, Baptism as the instrument of it, Imposition of hands, the General Resurrection and the Judgment once for all.<sup>1095</sup>

---

<sup>1090</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>1091</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1092</sup> JHN, “The Gospel, a Trust committed to Us,” *PPS* 2: 251.

<sup>1093</sup> Ibid., 257-258.

<sup>1094</sup> Ibid., 259.

<sup>1095</sup> Ibid., 265.

Newman felt that these Articles of Faith “are sacred.”<sup>1096</sup> He put the doctrine of the Trinity in the first place among the Articles, and insisted that this doctrine is “essential” for Faith,<sup>1097</sup> the “Gospel Doctrine,”<sup>1098</sup> and the “foundation of the whole Dispensation.”<sup>1099</sup> The doctrine of the Trinity is “necessary to be believed by every one in order to salvation.”<sup>1100</sup> It is “delivered down to us from the first ages, together with the original baptismal or Apostles’ Creed itself.”<sup>1101</sup>

Newman emphasized this point because the Socinians, Rational Dissenters (Unitarians), and Latitudinarians did not believe that faith in the Holy Trinity is necessary for salvation. They said that to believe God as “supremely just” is necessary to salvation, “whereby we are persuaded that He will hold to His promise.”<sup>1102</sup> And the belief in God’s highest wisdom is held necessary, for God ever scrutinizes and knows the depth of our heart.<sup>1103</sup> They strongly denied the doctrine of the Trinity with two reasons. First as rational proof, a “person” is an “individual intelligent essence” (*essentia* = *persona*), and thus the “individual intelligent essence” that we call “God” must be one person and only one

---

<sup>1096</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1097</sup> Ibid., 272.

<sup>1098</sup> Ibid., 256.

<sup>1099</sup> Ibid., 271.

<sup>1100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1101</sup> Ibid., 257.

<sup>1102</sup> Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Neil Buchanan, trans., vol. VII (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1900), 145; hereafter cited: Harnack, *History of Dogma*.

<sup>1103</sup> Ibid.



person.<sup>1104</sup> Second, the doctrine has no Scriptural proof.<sup>1105</sup> Moreover, the doctrine of the Trinity, for them, is really dangerous, for it “overthrows God’s unity,” “obscures God’s glory,” “subverts the way of faith by allowing the Son and the Spirit their secondary operation in the role of salvation,” and becomes the major “stumbling blocks for the conversion” of the Gentiles because they would think that Christians believe in three Gods. In response to the Socinians, Newman’s sermons in this second period emphasized such doctrines as the unity of God in the economy of salvation, the glory of God, the role of the Son and the Spirit.

The Socinians and Unitarians considered the Son and the Holy Spirit as having a “secondary operation” in the economy of salvation; they said that “Jesus is a mere man, but He was sent into the world by a benignant God, and only through Him can salvation be secured.”<sup>1106</sup> They recognized that Jesus was distinguished from all other men by his birth of a virgin, his sinlessness, his special Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and above all his perfect obedience on earth, so that he had been “raised to heaven and constituted God’s victory over the whole universe.” Therefore, He “ought to be worshipped.”<sup>1107</sup> However, they did not find biblical support for the divinity of Jesus. Rather Jesus exercised his authority and miracles

---

<sup>1104</sup> Philip Dixon, ‘Nice and Hot Disputes’ – *The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century* (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 41; hereafter cited: Dixon, ‘Nice and Hot Disputes’.

<sup>1105</sup> Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 145.

<sup>1106</sup> Hugh Ross Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1914), 245.

<sup>1107</sup> Roger R. Nicole, Charles Evan Hill, Frank A. James, *The Glory of the Atonement: Biblical, Historical & Practical Perspectives* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 340.

just as “the prophets did before him, to God the Father,” “even after his resurrection he was styled by his followers a *man*.”<sup>1108</sup> Relying on St. Paul, they maintained:

“For since by man,” says he [Paul], “came death, by MAN also came the resurrection of the dead; for, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” (1 Cor., xv, 21, 22) For, if Jesus had been a being of a superior order, the apostle would doubtless have expressed himself in some such terms as the following: “by man, indeed, came death, but by *a person of a more exalted nature*, by an *angel*, by a GOD-MAN, by JEHOVAH himself, came the resurrection of the dead.”<sup>1109</sup>

They were completely opposed to interpreting Psalm 2: 7 as a biblical basis for the divinity of Jesus: “Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.” If St. Paul used this text in Acts 13: 33, he did not mean of “the generation of Jesus, as the coeternal Son of God, but of his resurrection from the dead.”<sup>1110</sup> They saw Jesus as the first raised up, the “*first born*” (Col. 1: 18), the *first begotten from the dead* (Rev. 1: 5),” and “the living voucher for the future resurrection of all men.”<sup>1111</sup> His resurrection did not mean that he was of the same nature with God, “the equal of Jehovah in honour, power, and eternal duration.”<sup>1112</sup> In regard to the birth of Jesus, they insisted that his miraculous conception was just like those of Isaac, Sampson, Samuel or John. It did not prove his Godhead or his existence before time.<sup>1113</sup> The term “Only-begotten Son” did not signify the Son from “a previous state of glory,” but only meant “a Prophet to be born into our world”<sup>1114</sup>

---

<sup>1108</sup> *Six Letters*, 37.

<sup>1109</sup> *Ibid.*, 37-38.

<sup>1110</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>1111</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>1112</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1113</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>1114</sup> Joseph Cottle, *Essays on Socinianism* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1850), 160; hereafter cited: Cottle, *Essays on Socinianism*.

Newman, in order to respond to Socinians and Unitarians concerning the divinity of Jesus, in his sermon “The Incarnation” (1834) stated:

The Word was from the beginning, the Only-begotten Son of God. Before all worlds were created, while as yet time was not, He was in existence, in the bosom of the Eternal Father, God from God, and Light from Light, supremely blessed in knowing and being known of Him, and receiving all divine perfections from Him, yet ever One with Him who begat Him.<sup>1115</sup>

With this statement, Newman rejected the arguments of the Socinians and Unitarians. In addition, he emphasized two significant aspects about the second person in the immanent life of the Trinity: Jesus is “the Only-begotten Son *of* God” and Jesus is “*in* the bosom of the Eternal Father.”<sup>1116</sup> The terms “*of* God” and “*in* God” here describe two cardinal doctrines which safeguard the divinity of Christ and the unity of the Trinity: *Monarchia* and *Coinherence*.<sup>1117</sup>

Similarly, Newman in his *Arians of the Fourth Century* carefully distinguished two important terms, “First-born” and “Only-begotten”, which the Socinians and Unitarians confused. Newman clarified that “Only-begotten” means “His *genesis*”; “First-born” concerns “His *condescension*.” “Only-begotten” is internal to the “Divine Essence”; “First-born” external to it. The first one is *of nature*, the other *of office*.<sup>1118</sup> In a word, “Only-begotten” is *immanent*; “First-born” is *economic*. Newman would continue his defense of the divinity of Christ the Son through his other sermons particularly in the second period of the Oxford Movement.

---

<sup>1115</sup> JHN, “The Incarnation,” *PPS* 2: 29-30.

<sup>1116</sup> *Ibid.*, 30; italics added for emphasis.

<sup>1117</sup> *Arians*, 38; 173.

<sup>1118</sup> *Ibid.*, 420.

In regard to the third person in the Holy Trinity, Newman's sermon, "The dwelling of the Holy Spirit" (1834) constituted a response to the Socinians on the personhood of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit, for the Socinians, was the power, energy and influence of God. They did not recognize the Holy Spirit as a "Person."<sup>1119</sup> Instead, the Socinians declared that in the Bible, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, was constantly represented as a "Divine Agent." They did not have any problem with the biblical expressions about the Holy Spirit as "a personal and intelligent Agent."<sup>1120</sup> Nevertheless, they interpreted phrases like the "Holy Spirit," and "Spirit of God" to "signify the One True God the Father."<sup>1121</sup> In other words, they believed that the "Divine Agent," the Holy Spirit "is distinctly and uniformly identified with God the Father." The Holy Spirit and God the Father are "merely as different names for the One Almighty Being."<sup>1122</sup> In a word, the Holy Spirit is the power of God the Father, the "personification of God's actions."<sup>1123</sup> He is a "person" in the sense of the person of the Father, for "God is spirit."<sup>1124</sup> For instance, with 2 Corinthians 13: 14, Socinians would say, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and *the communion of God be with you all.*"<sup>1125</sup>

Newman totally opposed these unorthodox arguments. In the very first sentence of his sermon "The dwelling of the Holy Spirit," Newman asserted, "God the Son has graciously

---

<sup>1119</sup> Roberto Bordoli, "The Socinian Objections," *Socinianism and Arminianism*, Martin Mulsow, Jan Rohls, eds. (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005), 177-208, at 188.

<sup>1120</sup> Cottle, *Essays on Socinianism*, 197.

<sup>1121</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1122</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1123</sup> Dixon, 'Nice and Hot Disputes', 41.

<sup>1124</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1125</sup> Cottle, *Essays on Socinianism*, 198.

vouchsafed to reveal the Father to His creatures from without; God the Holy Ghost, by inward communications.”<sup>1126</sup> Newman plainly declared the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit in the Trinity in the economy of revealing God the Father, who is the “First Source of all perfection, in and together with His Co-equal Son and Spirit.”<sup>1127</sup> Newman, in response to Socinianism, insisted that the Holy Spirit is not only “the Spirit of God,” but also “the Spirit of Christ.”<sup>1128</sup> As the Son is a “Person,” distinct from the Father, the Spirit is a “Person,” distinct from the Father and the Son. He came “to us as Christ came, by a real and personal visitation.”<sup>1129</sup> He came “to us from and instead of Christ.”<sup>1130</sup> Newman, by comparing the Holy Spirit with Christ, directly denied the Socinian identification of the Spirit and the Father.

The Socinians, in addition to denying the Holy Spirit as a person and identifying him with the Father, attempted to explain the phrase, “communion of the Holy Spirit” or “the communion of God.” They questioned, “Can we *partake* of God, or of any *person*? No; but we may partake of *powers, energies and influences*; we may enjoy a communion of *spiritual gifts*.”<sup>1131</sup> For them, “a *participation of a person* is an idea which cannot enter the mind.” Therefore, the phrase the “communion of God” or the “communion of the Holy Spirit” means a “participation of *Divine influences*.”<sup>1132</sup> This explanation, for Newman, was untenable; and he gave a clear answer straight to the point: the Holy Spirit is “Eternal Love,” the

---

<sup>1126</sup> JHN, “The Dwelling of the Holy Spirit,” *PPS* 2: 217.

<sup>1127</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.

<sup>1128</sup> *Ibid.*, 220.

<sup>1129</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

<sup>1130</sup> *Ibid.*, 220; cf. *supra*, 77-79.

<sup>1131</sup> Ralph Wardlaw, *Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy* (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, & Green, 1828), 494.

<sup>1132</sup> *Ibid.*

“Communion” of the Father and the Son.<sup>1133</sup> In the Holy Spirit, in his very person, the Father and the Son are one in unity. And it is the Holy Spirit who dwells in us and makes us children of God in communion with him.<sup>1134</sup> Thus, we might say, the Holy Spirit is person as communion, and communion as person.

Newman, during the first period of the Oxford Movement, focused very much on the immanent life of the Trinity, analyzing each divine person of the Trinity in their names, titles, personhood, and relationship with one another. Newman wanted people to hold steadfastly to the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the essential and fundamental doctrine of faith that Dissenters, Unitarians, Socinians, Latitudinarians were distorting and reducing to various positions contrary to the teachings of the Church. Scripture and Apostolic Tradition were the two major sources that Newman and the Tractarians used to rescue the Church from the threat of Liberalism.<sup>1135</sup>

Scripture, for Newman, as he stated in his dialogue with Abbé Jager in 1834, is “the rule of faith,” “the court of ultimate appeal which has the right of definitely settling all

---

<sup>1133</sup> *PPS* 2: 229.

<sup>1134</sup> *Ibid.*, 221, 225-226.

<sup>1135</sup> In accord with the practice of the World Council of Churches, Tradition will be capitalized in the text when referring to Apostolic Tradition, while tradition (small “t” and often in the plural) will be used to refer to particular traditions; see, for example, Cyril Hovorun, “Tradition and traditions: Teachers and Witnesses of the Church: Space for Ecumenical Convergence” (10 October 2009), available at: <http://www.oikoumene.org/gr/resources/documents/wcc-commissions/faith-and-order-commission/x-other-documents-from-conferences-and-meetings/plenary-commission-meeting-crete-2009/tradition-and-traditions-archimandrite-cyril-hovorun.html>

questions of faith.”<sup>1136</sup> In a letter to Froude in 1835, Newman again acknowledged his continual surprise to see how “the Fathers insist *on the Scriptures* as the rule of faith – even in proving the most subtle parts of the doctrine of the Incarnation.”<sup>1137</sup> Therefore, for the Church of England, “Scripture is the ultimate basis of proof, the place of final appeal, in respect to all fundamental doctrines.”<sup>1138</sup> Newman nonetheless recognized the significant position of Tradition: “We do not deny that ceremonies and practices may lawfully be made to rest upon tradition, but that doctrine may so rest; nay not simply all doctrines, but fundamental doctrines.”<sup>1139</sup> Newman particularly insisted that the three words, “*ultimate appeal, doctrines, and fundamentals*” that he used here meant the “three orders of Ministry”; and they must be clearly understood in the sense that “we should be ready to receive these

---

<sup>1136</sup> Louis Allen, *John Henry Newman and the Abbé Jager: A Controversy on Scripture and Tradition (1834- 1836)* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), 117; hereafter cited: Allen, *Newman and Jager*. Also see Paul D. L. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 240.

Abbé Jean-Nicolas Jager was a French Roman Catholic priest and a professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Sorbonne. He came to England to promote prayer for the unity of the Church. He also engaged in a theological debate with members of the Oxford Movement, especially with John Henry Newman, on Scripture and Tradition. Cf. Wulstan Peterburs, “Scripture, Tradition and Development towards Rome: Some Aspects of the Thought of John Henry Newman,” *What is It that the Scripture Says?* Philip McCosker, ed. (New York: T & T Clark, 2006): 183-196, at 186.

<sup>1137</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriel College, 9 August 1835), *LD* 5: 118-120, at 119.

<sup>1138</sup> Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 35.

<sup>1139</sup> *Ibid.*, 36. Concerning the “fundamental doctrines,” Newman explained, “If we are asked what we mean by fundamentals, we answer that we mean such doctrines as are necessary for the Church Communion; if we are asked which these are, we answer briefly the articles of the Creed.” *Ibid.*

three orders of the Ministry even on *tradition*, as being a point of *discipline*.”<sup>1140</sup> In a way that seemingly anticipates the ecumenical distinction between Tradition and traditions, Newman’s succinctly summarized his view: “The reception of pure tradition is pious, of doctrines conveyed to us by Tradition but proved by Scripture is imperative.”<sup>1141</sup>

In his exchange with Jager, Newman was working out his ideas on the relationship of Scripture and Tradition. On the one hand, as he indicated in a letter to Hurrell Froude, Scripture is the “depository” of “fundamental doctrines” of Christian life.<sup>1142</sup> On the other hand, he allowed that “Apostolical or Episcopal Tradition” could carry all the articles necessary for Church Communion: “They are the Apostles’ Creed, which are the fundamentals even if the Scripture said nothing about them.”<sup>1143</sup> Apparently, Newman allowed for the possibility that there could be some doctrines in Tradition that were not in Scripture: “Therefore *no wonder* Scripture *agrees* with this Apostolical Tradition.”<sup>1144</sup> Newman also made a comparable sentence in his first letter to Jager that Scripture “is all along the one basis of the Rule of Faith, containing expressly or implicitly the fundamental doctrines.”<sup>1145</sup>

In his last letter to Jager, he summarized his view of Scripture and Tradition: “Tradition is as much necessary to explain Scripture as Scripture to verify and circumscribe

---

<sup>1140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1141</sup> Ibid. Although the distinction between Tradition and traditions is implicit, this concluding sentence is the only place in this paragraph where Newman used a capital “T”.

<sup>1142</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriental College, 20 July 1838), *LD* 5: 103.

<sup>1143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1145</sup> Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 37.



Tradition.”<sup>1146</sup> Newman criticized the “tendency of the day” in taking the view of “sola Scriptura.” He pointed out that the Apostolic Tradition was an “authority in conjunction with Scripture,” and “prior to all heretical innovation.”<sup>1147</sup>

We have some difficulty in putting ourselves into the situation of Christians in those times, from the circumstance that the Holy Scriptures are now our sole means of satisfying ourselves on points of doctrine. Thus, every one who comes to the Church considers himself entitled to judge and decide individually upon its creed. But in that primitive age, the Apostolical Tradition, that is, the Creed, was practically the chief source of instruction, especially considering the obscurities of Scripture; and being withdrawn from public view, it could not be subjected to the degradation of a comparison, on the part of inquirers and half-Christians, with those written documents which are vouchsafed to us from the same inspired authorities.<sup>1148</sup>

For Newman and the Tractarians, “the real teaching of Christianity would be found, in balanced emphasis, if you went back far enough for it.” That meant “Christian dogma was inseparable from true history [Tradition].”<sup>1149</sup> Newman, in his sermon on Trinity Sunday in 1834, declared: “As the tradition of men witnesses to a Moral Governor and Judge, so the tradition of Saints [Apostles and Fathers] witnesses to the Father Almighty, and His only Son, and the Holy Ghost.”<sup>1150</sup> In other words, if Scripture provides “seminal evidence” for the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine also needed interpretations and clarifications of the

---

<sup>1146</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>1147</sup> Kenneth Parker, Michael J. Pahls, eds., *Authority, Dogma and History: The Role of the Oxford Movement Converts in the Papal Infallibility Debates* (Bethesda: Academica Press, 2009), 57.

<sup>1148</sup> *Arians*, 134-5.

<sup>1149</sup> Adolphus William Ward, Alfred Rayney Waller, eds. *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. XII – the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916), 308.

<sup>1150</sup> *PPS* 2: 257.

ecclesiastical teachings from the Apostolic Tradition.<sup>1151</sup> Newman concluded, “We received the doctrine of the Trinity, a *fundamental, immediately* from tradition, *ultimately* from Scripture.”<sup>1152</sup>

## II. The Second Period: 1835 to 1838

### 1. Years 1835 and 1836

The controversy against Liberalism became stronger and more obvious in Newman’s second period in the Oxford Movement. Newman, in a letter in January 1835, told Froude that the Christian Knowledge Society<sup>1153</sup> was now in the “disordered state,” promoting “heresy and false doctrine.”<sup>1154</sup> In addition, “at present you hear,” Newman said, “Nestorianism preached in every other pulpit.”<sup>1155</sup> Then, Newman, in a letter to Samuel Wilberforce in February, expressed his deep concern about “the lowminded school of Burnet

---

<sup>1151</sup> In the *Arians* (151-178), Newman first treated the “Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity,” then the “Ecclesiastical Doctrine of the Trinity.”

<sup>1152</sup> *Newman and Jager*, 36.

<sup>1153</sup> The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1701 by Thomas Bray (1656-1730) with the aim of evangelizing all non-Christian races. Gerald Newman, Leslie Ellen Brown, *Britain in the Hanoverian Age, 1714-1837*, 667.

<sup>1154</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (London, 18 January 1835), *LD* 5: 9-11, at 10.

<sup>1155</sup> *Ibid.* According to his opponents, Nestorius believed that there are two natures (nature = *physis*) in Christ, *two subjects* each subsistent in itself (subject = *hypostasis*) and two persons (person = *prosopon*). In other words, there is in Christ a divine person (the Word) and a human person (Jesus the man). But these are so closely linked to one another that in practice it is as if there were only one person, namely they constitute a kind of union person (a union *prosopon*), a conjunction (*synapheia*) or a close communion of two persons. In a word, there are two natures and two persons in Christ. Nestorius argued that God could not suffer on the cross, for he is omnipotent. Therefore, when Jesus died it was the human person and not the divinity that suffered. Cf. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, eds., *Christian Dogmatics*, vol. I (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 503-6.

and Hoadley [who] have robbed the Church of all her more beautiful characteristics.”<sup>1156</sup> In March, Newman cautioned James Stephen “about the present degeneracy of the school, the School of T. Scott, Joseph Milner, Venn etc.” Newman commented:

They have the merit . . . of bringing out the Incarnation, especially in that part of it which relates to the Atonement – (for about the Divinity of Christ their knowledge is generally incomplete.) – Yet what I shrink from is their rudeness, irreverence, and almost profaneness; the profaneness of making a most sacred doctrine a subject of vehement declamation, or instrument of exciting the feelings, or topic for vague, general, reiterated statements in technical language.<sup>1157</sup>

The Incarnation and the atonement, in fact, could be seen as Newman’s major topic for the years 1835 and 1836. This was the time when Newman had to deal with so many whom he described as

the great Masters [who] range from the Latitudinarians Tillotson and Burnet down to the Socinianizing or Socinian Hoadley – a chilling, meagre, uncompassionate, secular divinity [theology] indeed – of which Paley’s shallowness, Warburton’s coarse ingenuity, and the present Bishop of Peterborough’s deadness, are representatives in the three provinces of Argument, Philosophy, and Orthodoxy.<sup>1158</sup>

Thanks to them, as Newman commented, the “divinity [theology] of the last century was the divinity [theology] of the Revolution.”<sup>1159</sup> This was also the time Newman had to encounter persons such as Thomas Arnold (1795–1842), with “his lax views about doctrinal error and the Old Testament”; Samuel Hinds (1793–1872), with “his notions about Inspiration and his Sabellianism and Nestorianism”; Richard Whately (1787–1863), with “his Sabellianism and

---

<sup>1156</sup> JHN to Samuel Wilberforce (Oriental College, 4 February 1835), *LD* 5: 21-23, at 21.

<sup>1157</sup> JHN to James Stephen (Oriental College, 16 March 1835), *LD* 5: 44-48, at 45.

<sup>1158</sup> *Ibid.*, 45-46.

<sup>1159</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

Nestorianism”; Blanco White (1775–1841), with his “depreciation of Old Testament”; and Renn Dickson Hampden (1793 –1868), with his “religious dissent.”<sup>1160</sup>

During this period, Newman was providing what might be considered the official answer of the Oxford Movement to the rationalism of the age. By clarifying his opponents’ erroneous points and confirming the orthodox teachings of the Church to the faithful through his sermons, Newman began to deepen his doctrine of the economic Trinity, namely his teaching on revelation and the salvific work of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation or the “*Dispensation*.” He described it as: “The history of Christ’s humiliation, as exhibited in the doctrines of His Incarnation, ministry, atonement, exaltation, and mediatorial sovereignty, and, as such distinguished from the ‘*theologia*’ or the collection of truths relative to His personal indwelling in the bosom of God.”<sup>1161</sup>

#### **a. Gilbert Burnet and John Tillotson**

One of the authors whom Newman mentioned was Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715), who was a prominent Whig and Latitudinarian Bishop of Salisbury. In the 1690s, the High Church party in the Church of England accused a number of leading Latitudinarian theologians, including Gilbert Burnet and John Tillotson, of the anti-trinitarian heresy of Socinianism.<sup>1162</sup> Two works of Burnet, *Four Discourses Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Sarum* and *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, were the focus of

---

<sup>1160</sup> JHN to Henry Wilberforce (23 March 1835), *LD* 5: 50-51, at 51.

<sup>1161</sup> *Arians*, 74.

<sup>1162</sup> Martin Greig, “The Reasonableness of Christianity? Gilbert Burnet and the Trinitarian Controversy of the 1690s,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 44, no. 4 (October 1993): 631-651, at 631-632.

attention. Burnet's "view of the Trinity", in the *Discourses*, was considered "unclear in its language and unorthodox in its rejection of traditional patristic learning"; and his "epistemological approach to the Trinity was flawed."<sup>1163</sup>

In fact, Burnet's language of the doctrine of the Trinity was somehow unclear and confusing. He stated, "Scripture only calls by the Names of *Father, Son* or *Word*, and *Holy Ghost*. . . These *Three* were only different names of the same thing."<sup>1164</sup> Burnet called Father, Son and Holy Spirit the "Blessed Three," who "do in many places express themselves as if they only meant the same Being in a general sense, as all human souls are of the same substance."<sup>1165</sup> In another place, he explained God's work in the economy:

By the first, God may be supposed to have made and to govern all things; by the second, to have been most perfectly united to the humanity of Christ; and by the third, to have inspired the penmen of the Scriptures and the workers of miracles, and still to renew and fortify all good minds. But though we cannot explain how they are Three and have a true diversity from one another, so that they are not barely different names and modes; yet we firmly believe that there is but one God."<sup>1166</sup>

Burnet in fact acknowledged three persons in One God, but "when we use the word 'Person', we use it in no sense that implies a plurality of Gods, for we own a strict Unity of Essence in the Godhead."<sup>1167</sup> Charles Abbey and John Overton commented that the above

---

<sup>1163</sup> Martin Greig, "Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701," *The Historical Journal*, 37, 3 (1994): 569-592, at 572; hereafter cited: Martin Greig, "Heresy Hunt."

<sup>1164</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *Four Discourses Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Sarum* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1694), 96; hereafter cited: Burnet, *Four Discourses*.

<sup>1165</sup> *Ibid.*, 98.

<sup>1166</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>1167</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A Defense of Natural and Revealed Religion*, vol. 2 (London: Kessinger Publishing, 2004), 392.

paragraph of Burnet was “a form of Sabellianism.”<sup>1168</sup> Charles Leslie (1650-1722), an Anglican theologian, stated that Burnet’s doctrine of the Trinity was “three manifestations of the Divine nature.”<sup>1169</sup> Leslie also insisted that the “‘Discourses’ had plainly shown Burnet to be a ‘rank Socinian.’”<sup>1170</sup> Holdsworth, an English theologian, argued, “Burnet’s explanation of the ‘Blessed Three’ could be subscribed to by Sabellians, Arians, Macedonians, Socinians, or an ‘Anti-Trinitarian of any sort.’”<sup>1171</sup>

Burnet never called himself a Sabellian or Modalist; however, he felt that “there is no reasonable basis in the Bible for the doctrine of the Trinity.”<sup>1172</sup> As a Latitudinarian bishop, he argued that the Church of England “should tolerate the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity,” for without the doctrine of the Trinity, theology would be much easier to reconcile with the Dissenters.<sup>1173</sup> In this intention, Burnet wrote *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* as “‘a platform laid for Comprehension’ with the Dissenters and other ‘Adversaries of our Church.’”<sup>1174</sup> Francis Atterbury (1663-1732), bishop of Rochester, commented that Burnet’s *Exposition* was “heretical.”<sup>1175</sup> Probably, Burnet’s Latitudinarianism had led him into heterodoxy. However, Burnet’s *Exposition* was praised by

---

<sup>1168</sup> Charles J. Abbey, John H. Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, 1906), 129.

<sup>1169</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1170</sup> Martin Greig, “Heresy Hunt,” 572.

<sup>1171</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1172</sup> Richard Popkin, “The Religious Background of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy,” *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth Century*, vol. I, Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003): 393-424, at 401.

<sup>1173</sup> Richard G. Olson, *Science and Religion, 1450-1900* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 130.

<sup>1174</sup> Martin Greig, “Heresy Hunt,” 569.

<sup>1175</sup> Ibid.

his eminent Latitudinarians such as Tenison, Stillingfleet and Patrick. They considered it as “a kind of ‘manifesto’ of the Latitudinarian party.”<sup>1176</sup>

Concerning the divinity of Christ, Burnet also had a problem. He said that the phrase “*Son of God*” just meant Jesus “as the Messiah.”<sup>1177</sup> He insisted that both the Old and New Testament are very much against idolatry, no other true gods being worshipped. Therefore, he assumed, “I should not attempt to prove the divinity of Christ from the Old or New Testament; rather I should regard it as a deduction from the worship rendered to him.”<sup>1178</sup> He used an image to illustrate: “The honour due to the soul is extended to the body; and in the same way we now also worship the supreme God, when we worship Christ.”<sup>1179</sup> In other words, we may profess Christ as truly God and truly man, for the true divinity of Christ consisted in “the indwelling of the Eternal Word in Christ,” which “became united to His human nature, as our souls dwell in our bodies and are united to them.”<sup>1180</sup> It is clear, therefore, that Burnet denied the doctrine of the hypostatic union.

John Tillotson (1630-1694), the Archbishop of Canterbury (1691-1694), was called the “most Latitudinarian in England.”<sup>1181</sup> According to Charles Leslie (1650-1722), an Anglican theologian, both Burnet and Tillotson were defenders of the Low Church and held

---

<sup>1176</sup> Ibid., 583.

<sup>1177</sup> Burnet, *Four Discourses*, 100.

<sup>1178</sup> T. E. S. Clarke, H. C. Foxcroft, *A Life of Gilbert Burnet Bishop of Salisbury* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907), 228.

<sup>1179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1180</sup> Burnet, *Four Discourses*, 127.

<sup>1181</sup> Martin I. J. Griffin, *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 106; hereafter cited: Griffin, *Latitudinarianism*.

“heterodox positions on Christ and the Trinity.”<sup>1182</sup> Tillotson, in a letter to Burnet frankly declared: “The account given of Athanasius’ Creed appears to me in no wise satisfactory. I wish we were well rid of it.”<sup>1183</sup> Burnet gave his reason for rejecting the Athanasian Creed: “It [the Creed] was never heard of before the eighth century; and then it was given out as the Creed of Athanasius, or as a representation of his doctrine, and so it grew to be received by the Western Church; perhaps the more early, because it went under so great a name, in ages that were not critical enough to judge of what was genuine, and what was spurious.”<sup>1184</sup> Dr. Arnold, also a supporter of the Low Church, stated: “I do not believe the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed under any justification given of them, except such as substitutes for them propositions of a wholly different character.”<sup>1185</sup>

This indeed was one of the Newman’s urgent concerns. The rejection of the Athanasian Creed showed the heterodox positions particularly on the doctrines of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ that had begun in the seventeenth century and strongly prevailed in the nineteenth century. John Sherren Brewer commented: “The Englishmen in this latter half of the nineteenth century . . . object to the Athanasian Creed, that it offends *their* reason.” Therefore, instead of ruling their “individual reason by the Creed,” they insisted that the

---

<sup>1182</sup> Robert Cornwall, “Charles Leslie and the Political Implications of Theology,” *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*, William Gibson, Robert G. Ingram, eds., (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 27-42, at 35.

<sup>1183</sup> Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *The Athanasian Creed* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1871), 20.

<sup>1184</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *An Exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1814), 142.

<sup>1185</sup> Stanley, *The Athanasian Creed*, 20.



“individual reason” “should supersede the universal reason of the Catholic Church.”<sup>1186</sup>

Newman and the Tractarians strongly opposed this tendency. For them, the Creed was the “Profession of the Catholic faith,” which the Liberals totally disliked.<sup>1187</sup> Newman called it the “Creed of the Saints, and Anthem of the Blest, and calm-breathed warning of the kindest love.”<sup>1188</sup> Moreover, he maintained:

The Athanasian Creed is not a mere collection of notions however momentous: it is a Psalm, a hymn of Praise, of confession and of profound homage, parallel to the Canticles of the elect in the Apocalypse. It appeals to the imagination as much as to the intellect. It is the war-song of faith, with which we first warn ourselves, and then each other, and then all who are within its hearing and the hearing of the Truth, Who our God is, and how we must worship Him, and how vast our responsibility will be if we know what to believe, and yet believe not . . . . For myself, I have ever felt it as the most simple and sublime, the most devotional formulary to which Christianity has given birth, more so than the *Veni Creator* or the *Te Deum*.<sup>1189</sup>

The Tractarians, in opposing anti-Athanasianism, published a volume of *Plain Sermons*, with a sermon devoted especially to a discussion of “the Athanasian Creed.” The sermon began:

We must all tremble when we hear those awful declarations in the Athanasian Creed respecting the Catholic faith, such as, “Which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.” And some are offended, and wish that these sentences were not there. But surely, as it can be abundantly

---

<sup>1186</sup> John Sherren Brewer, *The Athanasian Origin of the Athanasian Creed* (London: Ringtons, 1872), 76.

<sup>1187</sup> JHN, *Loss and Gain* (Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1854), 128: hereafter cited: *Loss and Gain*.

<sup>1188</sup> Henry Charles Beeching, ed., *Lyra Apostolica* (London: Methuen & Co, 1901), 124. Also see See Donald Graham, “Newman’s Sermon on “the Mystery of the Holy Trinity”: A Response to Richard Whately?” *Newman Studies Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1: 64-65.

<sup>1189</sup> Quoted in Charles Anthony Swainson, Walter Farquhar Hook, “*The Athanasian Creed*” and *Its Usage in the English Church: An Investigation as the Original Object of the Creed and the Growth of Prevailing Misconception Regarding It* (London: Rivington, 1870), 83-84.

shown that all this is true and certain, from Holy Scripture, and that our eternal salvation does depend on our rightly believing this doctrine of the Three Persons in One God, in which we are baptized, it is a very great mercy that the Church does bring it before us in this strong, and, it may be said, startling manner.<sup>1190</sup>

The sermon went straight to the point of the Liberals of the time who rejected the Athanasian Creed and, accordingly, the doctrine of the Trinity as well. Newman and the Tractarians firmly insisted that the Creed, particularly the doctrine of the Trinity is “necessary to be believed by every one in order to salvation.”<sup>1191</sup> Newman, in 1835, highlighted this point in a letter to Richard Hurrell Froude:

I incline to say the Creed is the faith necessary to salvation as well as to Church communion – and to maintain that Scripture, according to the Fathers, is the authentic record and document of this faith. It surely is reasonable that “necessary to salvation” should apply to the baptismal Creed “In the name etc.”<sup>1192</sup>

In fact, many Anglican clerics, including Burnet and Tillotson, in the seventeenth century denied this point; in addition, in Newman’s time, there were theologians who followed their footsteps in rejecting the Athanasian Creed and the doctrine of the Trinity, such as Renn Dickson Hampden and Blanco White.

#### **b. Renn Dickson Hampden and Blanco White**

Renn Dickson Hampden drew Newman’s attention, beginning with his publication of a pamphlet, *Observations on Religious Dissent*. On 20 August 1834, Newman wrote to Hugh James Rose: “Hampden, Principal of St. Mary Hall, has just published a pamphlet which, I

---

<sup>1190</sup> Contributors to the “Tracts for the Times,” *Plain Sermons*, vol. X (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1848):153-162, at 153. The book does not indicate who the author of the sermon was, but its style and language suggest that it was by Newman.

<sup>1191</sup> *PPS* 2: 271.

<sup>1192</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriël, 13 August 1835), *LD* 5: 125-127, at 126.

fear, destroys our glory.”<sup>1193</sup> The “glory” was seemingly the orthodoxy of Oxford University, which required every student to subscribe to the 39 Articles when they matriculated. This requirement, according to Hampden, should be waived in order to allow Dissenters to enter the University.<sup>1194</sup> Newman, a few months later, wrote to Hampden that the principles contained in his pamphlet “altogether” could “make shipwreck of Christian faith.”<sup>1195</sup>

Hampden’s principles were opposed to both the 39 Articles and the Creeds. For Hampden, “Christian revelation is matter of fact.”<sup>1196</sup> The “substance of the revelation is the doings and actions of God.” Therefore, the “truth concerning God is independent of any particular *wording* of it.”<sup>1197</sup> In other words, “texts, *as texts*, prove nothing; texts establish Divine truths, only as indices to real facts, in the history of Divine Providence.”<sup>1198</sup> From this point of view, as a result, Hampden rejected doctrines: “Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are no doctrines.”<sup>1199</sup> He asserted that the “notions” in the 39 Articles, Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are “unphilosophical and unscriptural.” They belong to “ancient theories of philosophy, and are only less obviously injurious to the simplicity of the Faith, than those which they exclude.”<sup>1200</sup> Concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, he used “Sabellian language”: The Trinity is “the manifestations of God, as the Father, the Son and the Holy

---

<sup>1193</sup> JHN to Hugh James Rose (Bisley, 20 August 1834), *LD* 4: 322-323, at 323.

<sup>1194</sup> Cf. Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 71.

<sup>1195</sup> JHN to Renn Dickson Hampden (28 November 1834), *LD* 4: 371.

<sup>1196</sup> Charles Richard Cameron, *Dr. Hampden’s Past and Present Statements Compared* (Oxford: W. Baxter, 1836), 20; hereafter cited: Cameron, *Dr. Hampden’s*.

<sup>1197</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1198</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1199</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>1200</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

Spirit.”<sup>1201</sup> He assumed that “the differences of opinion thereon did not affect the Catholic faith,” and “the Unitarians did not differ *in religion* from other Christians,” and the “whole discussion was fundamentally dialectical.”<sup>1202</sup> Hampden considered Jesus Christ as “the only-begotten Son of God, who was with the Father and the Holy Spirit before all worlds.”<sup>1203</sup> Hampden omitted “God of God” and “of one substance with the Father.” Then Hampden stated: “He took our nature upon Him.” Hampden did not explain how the two natures function or mention the hypostatic union.<sup>1204</sup> Hampden resolved the atonement into the “*fact*, that we cannot be at peace without some *consciousness* of atonement made.”<sup>1205</sup> For Hampden, the human heart is “inexorable against *itself*,” “cannot forgive *itself*,” but in Scripture there is a “parallel fact, the perfect righteousness of Christ, which it has *connected* with our unrighteousness.”<sup>1206</sup> For Hampden, Original Sin is “the fact that there is a *tendency* to sin existing in human nature.”<sup>1207</sup>

Writing in 1836, Newman took issue with Hampden:

I hope I am duly impressed by your serious protestation of your belief in the Trinity and Incarnation, and beg to remind you, I have no where expressed a doubt of it . . . for since you state in your pamphlet that an Unitarian holds ‘the *whole* revelation’ as *holding* ‘the basis of divine facts’ (vid. *Observ.* pp 13. 19) you surely do deny that ‘the truth of the Trinity and Incarnation’ are ‘revealed.’<sup>1208</sup>

---

<sup>1201</sup> Ibid., xxiii.

<sup>1202</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>1203</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>1204</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>1205</sup> Ibid., xxiii-xxiv.

<sup>1206</sup> Ibid., xxiv.

<sup>1207</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1208</sup> JHN to Renn Dickson Hampden (Oriental College, 14 February 1836), *LD* 5: 235-236, at 235-236. Hampden’s *Observations on Religious Dissent* brought upon him the charge of Arianism. And for Newman, Arianism could easily drift into an Anti-Trinitarian form of

While Newman was in the midst of his concern about Hampden, in January 1835, Blanco White, “impregnated with” the thought of Whately, became a Unitarian, or more specifically a Socinian, and published *Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy*.<sup>1209</sup> Newman called it a “most miserable”<sup>1210</sup> and “melancholy book.”<sup>1211</sup> In this book, Blanco White plainly confessed: “Sabellianism is only Unitarianism disguised in words.”<sup>1212</sup> Newman saw Blanco White’s book as very useful in turning a “witness of the tendency” of the time against Hampden.<sup>1213</sup> Newman, in a letter to his aunt, commented: “Sabellianism [Unitarianism] has been spreading of late years, chiefly because people have said ‘What is the harm of Sabellianism? It is a mere name.’”<sup>1214</sup> According to William Goode, people were experiencing an “indifferent environment of religion,” in which they were confused or lost in their unstable holding of fundamental doctrines. Among the present ministers of the Church

---

Unitarianism. Cf. JHN, *Arians*, 116-117; and John Fletcher Hurst, *Short History of the Christian Church* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1893), 351.

<sup>1209</sup> See JHN to Arthur Philip Perceval (Oriol, 20 March 1835), *LD* 5: 48-49, and a note on p. 51. The term *Unitarian* has a general meaning, *Socinian* a specific one: “Every Socinian is an Unitarian, but every Unitarian is not a Socinian.” A Socinian believes Jesus is both a man and an object of religious worship. A Unitarian *honors* Jesus “by following his oft repeated solemn injunctions, and by worshipping the Father.” The term *Unitarian* is applicable to all, who believe “in the unity of God, in contradistinction to those, who believe, or profess to believe, in a Trinity.” Jared Sparks, Francis William Pitt Greenwood, *The Unitarian Miscellany and Christian Monitor*, vol. I (Baltimore: Baltimore Unitarian Book Society, 1822), 202.

<sup>1210</sup> JHN to John William Bowden (Oriol College, 3 August 1835), *LD* 5: 114.

<sup>1211</sup> JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriol College, 6 August 1835), *LD* 5: 115-116, at 115.

<sup>1212</sup> Joseph Blanco White, *Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (London: John Mardon, 1839), xxii; hereafter cited Blanco White, *Observations*. Also see *LD* 5: 114, 116.

<sup>1213</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriol College, 9 August 1835), *LD* 5: 118-120, at 119.

<sup>1214</sup> JHN to Elizabeth Newman (Oriol College, 9 August 1835), *LD* 5: 120-121, at 121.

of England were some “Romanists; some Pelagians; some Calvinists; some Socinians,” who differed “fundamentally in their explanation” of the Creeds.<sup>1215</sup> With people like Hampden and Blanco White in mind, Newman sadly stated: “The most religiously minded men are ready to give up important doctrinal truths because they do not understand their value.”<sup>1216</sup> Newman then added: “A cry is raised that the Creeds are unnecessarily minute, and even those who would defend, through ignorance cannot.”<sup>1217</sup>

Blanco White, for example, argued, “Is there anything in the Scriptures upon which Christians are agreed? . . . All good men, who acknowledged Christ as their Divine Master, agree *in the Spirit* of his doctrine.”<sup>1218</sup> For Blanco White, the “Spirit of Christ” that was implied and taught in the Gospel, and nothing else, was essential. Thus, his focus was the “Spirit of the Gospel” rather than “letters.” He asserted: “The Spirit of God strengthened the apostles to preach the *Spirit* of the Gospel, and thereupon the revelation is perfect.”<sup>1219</sup> Therefore, true Christians are “ministers of the *New Testament, not of the letter; but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.*”<sup>1220</sup> Similarly, the Old Testament, for Blanco White, “is a collection of venerable records of the peculiar government of God, in

---

<sup>1215</sup> William Goode, “The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice,” Charles Hodge, ed., *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review for the Year 1842*, vol. 14 (1842): 598-630, at 608.

<sup>1216</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1217</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1218</sup> Joseph Blanco White, *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White*, John Hamilton Thom, ed., vol. II (London: John Chapman, 1845), 21; this is an autobiography in three volumes; hereafter cited: Blanco White, *Life*.

<sup>1219</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1220</sup> Ibid.

relation to that people from which Christ was to come.”<sup>1221</sup> Concerning the divinity of Christ, he declared as a Unitarian that the divinity of Christ is “not contained in the Scripture according to their true sense.” Blanco White insisted, “Very true: and for that reason I conceive that the acknowledgment of the Divinity of Christ cannot be one of the essentials of Christianity.”<sup>1222</sup> In regard to Creed and the doctrine of the Trinity, Blanco White advised:

Compare the creed of the Trinitarian with that of the Unitarian. The former may be true, and the latter erroneous, though I adhere to the latter; but unquestionably, the *Trinitarian creed* is nearly made up of *inferences* – it is almost entirely a work of *reason*, though, in my opinion, sadly misapplied.<sup>1223</sup>

### c. Newman’s Trinitarian Theology as a Response to Liberalism

In order to respond to the anti-dogmatic tendencies of his time, Newman, on 8 March 1835, preached the sermon, “The Humiliation of the Eternal Son.”<sup>1224</sup> This sermon was given just a week before Newman had sent James Stephen a letter in which he listed all the schools of Liberalism from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century, from Burnet and Tillotson to Hampden and Blanco White. Newman’s sermon, as indicated in chapter III, first asserted the fullness of the Son’s Godhead. Newman then clarified the term “the Son of God,” which Burnet interpreted to mean Jesus “as the Messiah.”<sup>1225</sup> For Newman, this term meant our Lord “the very or true Son of God, that is, His Son by nature,” for “*God is not solitary*.”<sup>1226</sup> “We, in Christ, are called the sons of God by adoption, but the Lord is Son of

---

<sup>1221</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>1222</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>1223</sup> Blanco White, *Observations*, 114.

<sup>1224</sup> Cf. *supra*, 104.

<sup>1225</sup> Burnet, *Four Discourses*, 100; cf. *supra*, 261.

<sup>1226</sup> JHN, “The Humiliation of the Eternal Son,” *PPS* 3: 162.

God really by *birth* and “He alone is such.”<sup>1227</sup> In effect, Newman’s sermon was also an answer to Hampden, whose discussion omitted the term “begotten of the Father”<sup>1228</sup> as well as to Blanco White, who considered the term “Son of God,”

As a title of honour expressing the peculiar favour with which God had distinguished him [Christ], above all created intellectual Beings. If I am in error may he pardon me, whose words taken in their natural sense I make the ground of my disbelief in the Athanasian doctrine.<sup>1229</sup>

Newman, in his sermons and works, very rarely used the title “Jesus.” Newman preferred terms such as “The Eternal Son,” “Eternal Word,” “Son of God,” “Everlasting Son,” “Only begotten Son,” “Incarnate Son,” “Incarnate Word,” “Eternal Co-equal Son,” “Infinite Son,” etc.<sup>1230</sup> When Newman mentioned the terms “the Lord” or “Christ,” he often added one or two titles which indicated the fullness of Christ’s divinity. In addition, when talking about the Son as the second divine person and the Holy Spirit as the third divine person, Newman always capitalized the words “He,” “Him” and “His.” In contrast, in the works of Hampden and Blanco White, “Jesus” was often used to indicate Jesus as a man and terms which indicated the Godhead of Christ were omitted. In addition, when Hampden and Blanco White spoke of Christ or the Holy Spirit, they did not capitalize subject or object pronouns. These little details suggest two different Christological tendencies: one that emphasized the fullness of Christ’s divinity as Lord and God; the other that rejected or neglected the divine nature of Christ and focused on the humanity of Jesus. The former tendency, emphasizing Christ’s

---

<sup>1227</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1228</sup> Richard Cameron, *Dr. Hampden’s*, 7.

<sup>1229</sup> Blanco White, *Life*, 1: 357.

<sup>1230</sup> Cf. *supra*, 105.



divinity was characteristic of the High Church, the Tractarians. The latter tendency, emphasizing the humanness of Jesus, was characteristic of the Broad and Low Church and the Liberals: Latitudinarians, Unitarians, Socinians, Dissenters, et al.

In his sermons, Newman used titles that emphasized the fullness of Christ's Godhead not only in the Incarnation but also in the pre-existence of the Son of God. In contrast, Blanco White believed that the "Logos" was not

the supreme self-existing God, but a created and dependent, though pre-existing, and highly exalted being; who, after having been, under God, instrumental in the creation of this nether world, descended from this high state of exaltation, was clothed with a human body, and for a time, dwelt with men, for the purpose of becoming their Saviour.<sup>1231</sup>

The phrase "clothed with a human body" was a characteristic expression of Unitarians for whom the Incarnation "cannot possibly be ascribed to the Supreme God," because the "Omnipresent God" cannot be "limited to, or circumscribed by a human body."<sup>1232</sup>

Unitarians, accordingly, rejected the term "incarnate God," which for them, "either conveys ideas totally derogatory of God," or "has no meaning at all."<sup>1233</sup> In other words, the Logos, as a "created and pre-existing being," before being clothed with a human body, was "an instrument" in the hands of God the Father in creating the material world; then the man Jesus

---

<sup>1231</sup> H. J. Huidekoper, *The Unitarian Essayist*, vol. I (Meadville: Thomas Atkinson, 1831), 91.

<sup>1232</sup> An Association of Gentlemen, "Remarks on the Term *Logos* or *Word*," *The Unitarian Advocate and Religious Miscellany*, vol. II (Boston: Leonard C. Bowles, 1830), 166-174, at 172; hereafter cited: "Remarks on the Term *Logos*."

<sup>1233</sup> *Ibid.*

was “an instrument” of God *through* the Logos in saving the world.<sup>1234</sup> Accordingly, in the Unitarian doctrine of atonement, God was “the author of the reconciliation,” and Christ was “the instrument.”<sup>1235</sup>

Some Unitarians understood the atonement in the sense of *reconciliation*. Christ died for us, “not in our stead, but on our behalf,” to reconcile us to God, and to procure “the benefit of a new and better dispensation.”<sup>1236</sup> They explained that if a man is alone, he must bear all the “consequences of his sins,” but if he has friends, they will “relieve him of some by their self-sacrificing kindness.” Namely “their *sufferings* take the place of his *punishment*.”<sup>1237</sup> Similarly, the sufferings of Christ were “*substituted* in this way for ours,” and “this divine substitution is continued in the sacrifices of Christians.”<sup>1238</sup> Though Christ died for our sins, and his blood was the price by which “we were purchased to God FROM the power of sin (and death),” he indeed was just an “instrument of God.”<sup>1239</sup> God was the one who reconciled all to him, the “originator of this ransom,” the author of our redemption. Therefore, the title

---

<sup>1234</sup> James Yates, *A Vindication of Unitarianism*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., (London: Edward T. Whitfield, 1850), 81.

<sup>1235</sup> Charles Abraham Elton, *An Appeal to Scripture and Tradition, in Defence of the Unitarian Faith* (London: R. Hunter, 1818), 153; hereafter cited: Elton, *Scripture and Tradition*.

<sup>1236</sup> Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge (Great Britain), “Unitarian,” *Penny Cyclopaedia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, vol. 25 (London: Charles Knight, 1843): 5-6, at 6.

<sup>1237</sup> James Freeman Clarke, *Orthodoxy: Its Truth and Errors* (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1918), 249.

<sup>1238</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1239</sup> Elton, *Scripture and Tradition*, 156.

“Redeemer” was “of the most High God,” since “the epithet *redeemer* is no where in Scripture given to Christ.”<sup>1240</sup>

However, another group of Unitarians completely denied the doctrine of atonement. For them, the death of Christ was “not to appease the wrath of God, not as a satisfaction to divine justice, not to exhibit the evil of sin, nor in any sense whatever to make an atonement for it.”<sup>1241</sup> They insisted that this doctrine is “irrational, unscriptural, and derogatory from the Divine perfections.” Christ’s death was “as a martyr to the truth, and as a necessary preliminary to his resurrection.”<sup>1242</sup> Walter Chamberlain commented that Unitarians “differ among themselves” concerning the pre-existence of Christ and the atonement. Some believed, the others rejected, but they “all deny that he [Christ] was the Eternal God.”<sup>1243</sup>

Newman, in response to Blanco White and Unitarianism, asserted the pre-existence of the Son in the fullness of the Godhead with the Father. In contrast to the Unitarian phrase “instrument of God the Father in creating the material world,” Newman used the phrase “Co-equal Minister of all things” with the Father.<sup>1244</sup> The Son or the Word of God, Newman insisted, in his pre-existence, was not an instrument of God, but “all-holy, all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, eternal, infinite,” “ever one with and in” the Father.<sup>1245</sup> Describing the

---

<sup>1240</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1241</sup> Walter Chamberlain, *The Christian Verity Stated Being a Summary of Trinitarian Doctrine Especially Adapted from Present Times*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt, 1862), 38.

<sup>1242</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1243</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>1244</sup> *PPS* 3: 162.

<sup>1245</sup> Ibid.

Son as “Co-equal Minister” was a way of answering the Unitarian notion of the Son as a “created dependent being” assisting God as an instrument in creation.<sup>1246</sup>

Newman, nonetheless, when speaking about the Incarnation, also used the terms “clothed” and “instrument,” but not in the Unitarian sense. He used Unitarian language but in the sense of the hypostatic union: the Son “clothed Himself with a created essence, He made it the instrument of his humiliation; He acted in it, He obeyed and suffered through it.”<sup>1247</sup> “He attached to His own Person, as if an attribute, simply, absolutely, indissolubly.”<sup>1248</sup> However, as Newman carefully noted, while “adding a new nature to Himself, He did not in any respect cease to be what he was before.”<sup>1249</sup> Accordingly, Newman declared, “Christ is God.”<sup>1250</sup> This assertion cannot be accepted in any Unitarian or Socinian or Latitudinarian sense. As indicated in chapter III, “Christ” is the “economic title” of the Son of God.<sup>1251</sup> With the declaration “Christ is God,” Newman placed the whole economy of salvation in a Trinitarian context. Since the Unitarians denied Christ’s divinity and so rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and the Creeds, Newman always linked the trio—Trinity, Incarnation, Athanasian Creed—together and envisioned the “gracious economy” *with* the Trinitarian lens, *in* the light of the Incarnation, and *through* the profession of the Athanasian Creed.

---

<sup>1246</sup> “Remarks on the Term *Logos*,” 170.

<sup>1247</sup> *PPS* 3: 165.

<sup>1248</sup> *Ibid.* Also see JHN, “Christ the Son of God made Man,” *PPS* 6: 53-68, at 64-5.

<sup>1249</sup> *Ibid.*, 164.

<sup>1250</sup> *PPS* 6: 56.

<sup>1251</sup> Cf. *supra*, 139.

Newman's own treatment of the doctrine of atonement rejected the "Calvinistic gloss"<sup>1252</sup> that "the anger of God was so intense against his offending creatures," so that God would not pardon their sins until "his only Son, a being equal to himself, had suffered agony and death in this world, and the torments of wicked spirits in hell, to appease his wrath, and satisfy his justice."<sup>1253</sup> According to this view, then God justified sinners by "imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ upon them," but this was applied only to the elect, whom God "did from all eternity decree to justify."<sup>1254</sup> Newman admitted to Wilberforce that he did not know how the Father's wrath was put away because it was not revealed, but he strongly denied the Calvinistic view<sup>1255</sup> as well as the Unitarian interpretation of Christ's death "as a martyr to the truth." Newman insisted that Christ "was not a Martyr, but He was much more than a Martyr . . . the Son of God dies as an Atoning Sacrifice."<sup>1256</sup> Thus, in response to Unitarians and Calvinists, Newman linked Christ with the notion of the High and Eternal Priest. The terms "Atoning Sacrifice" and "Eternal Priest" together helped him to view the doctrine of atonement through a different lens. These two terms highlighted the divine nature and salvific mission of the Son of God—which, for Newman, is so important: otherwise, if Christ were a mere man, there would be no salvation. For Newman, salvation is nothing other

---

<sup>1252</sup> JHN to Henry Wilberforce (11 August 1836), *LD* 5: 336-339, at 337.

<sup>1253</sup> Jared Sparks, *An Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines* (Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823), 201.

<sup>1254</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1255</sup> *LD* 5: 337.

<sup>1256</sup> JHN, "The Incarnate Son, a Sufferer and Sacrifice," *PPS* 6: 69-82, at 70-71; cf. *supra*, 129-130.

than becoming “partakers of the divine nature” and this grace is received through the Incarnation and the passion and the glorification of the Son of God.

Newman, as already indicated in chapter III, turned the theory of atonement into a theology of glorification, in which the sufferings and death of Christ became the summit of the glorious revelation of the mystery of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation.<sup>1257</sup> In this theology of glorification, Newman rejected the Unitarian notions of Christ as just an “instrument” of the Father, and the title “Redeemer” as belonging to the Father. Newman not only asserted that Christ “was God,” “God becoming incarnate and dying on the Cross,”<sup>1258</sup> but also emphasized that “Christ underwent [his passion] voluntarily” and was “cheerfully doing God’s will.”<sup>1259</sup> The two terms “voluntarily” and “cheerfully” contrast completely with the Unitarian notion of the “passive obedience” of an instrument and highlighted the “active obedience” of the Son of God in the passion.<sup>1260</sup> As Newman declared: “We must adore Christ as our Lord and Master, and love Him as our most gracious Redeemer.”<sup>1261</sup>

In addition, Newman pointed out that the passion was also the “Father’s business,”<sup>1262</sup> but certainly not in a Unitarian sense. Newman emphasized the “Father’s business” in order to highlight the salvific work of the Trinity in the “gracious Dispensation”: the passion was the summit of revelation that the Father would glorify his Son in the Holy Spirit, so that the

---

<sup>1257</sup> Cf. *supra*, 119-134.

<sup>1258</sup> *PPS* 6: 71.

<sup>1259</sup> *PPS* 3: 148.

<sup>1260</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.

<sup>1261</sup> *PPS* 1: 80.

<sup>1262</sup> *PPS* 3: 149.

whole creation within the incarnate Son would be glorified, being one and sharing the communion of God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In other words, for Newman, the mystery of the incarnate Son, in the Dispensation, is “the mystery of the new birth”<sup>1263</sup> of all humanity. The mystery of the Son is the mystery of the glorification of humankind, for “in viewing by faith His glory without and within us.”<sup>1264</sup>

In summary, it was in the context of controversy with the Liberals of the nineteenth century that Newman, in 1835 and 1836, developed his view of the economic Trinity and his Trinitarian theology of glorification. The controversy of Newman and the Tractarians with Liberalism, in the language of John Stoughton (1807-1879), an English Nonconformist theologian, “excited an amount of agitation . . . The feeling aroused was not only intense, but bitter. It was regarded as a war of life and death.”<sup>1265</sup> As Stoughton commented, “Tractarianism excited Rationalism to make a wider opposition than before to fundamental doctrines of the Christians religion, such as the Incarnation and the atonement, together with the assertion of the supernatural character of Divine Revelation.”<sup>1266</sup> In fact, *Tract 25* asserted the point that Stoughton mentioned:

These fundamentals are contained in the Creed, and have been expanded at various times by the Catholic Church acting together; such are the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the like; they have been held from the beginning, and to this day are taught in the east and the west, north and south.<sup>1267</sup>

---

<sup>1263</sup> Ibid, 265.

<sup>1264</sup> Ibid., 269.

<sup>1265</sup> John Stoughton, *Reminiscences of Congregationalism Fifty Years Ago* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881), 73.

<sup>1266</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>1267</sup> Members of the Oxford Movement, “Tract 25,” *Tracts for the Times*, vol. II, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1841), 45.

Among the fundamental doctrines at stake was the doctrine of the Incarnation. On the one hand, the Liberals denied the full Godhead of Christ, for it was impossible for God to become flesh. On the other hand, Tractarian theology considered the Incarnation as a key doctrine: if one believes that “Christ is God,” namely “God incarnate,” he will profess the doctrine of the Trinity, the atonement and all the Articles and the Creeds. Newman, in *Tract 73* (1836), asserted that the Incarnation was “necessary and important”, because it gives “virtue to the atonement;” likewise the doctrine of the Trinity, because it includes the “revelation, not only of the Redeemer, but also of the Sanctifier, by whose aid and influence the Gospel message is to be blessed to us.”<sup>1268</sup>

## 2. Years 1837 and 1838

### a. Rationalism – Anti-Doctrines or Anti-Creeds in the Church of England

In 1837, Newman published his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, which included a brief survey of the situation that the Church of England was facing:

In the English Church, we shall hardly find ten or twenty neighboring clergymen who agree together; and that, not in non-essentials of religion, but as to what are its elementary and necessary doctrines; or as to the fact whether there are any necessary doctrines at all, any distinct and definite faith required for salvation.<sup>1269</sup>

This disunity among the clergy had affected the laity:

They wander about like sheep without a shepherd, they do not know what to believe, and are thrown on their own private judgment, weak and inadequate as it is, merely

---

<sup>1268</sup> JHN, “Tract 73,” Members of the Oxford Movement, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. III (New York: Charles Henry, 1840), 92.

<sup>1269</sup> JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1837), 394-395; hereafter cited: JHN, *Prophetical Office*.



because they do not know whither to betake themselves for guidance. If they go to one church they hear one doctrine, in the next that comes, they hear another; if they try to unite the two, they are obliged to drop important elements in each, and waste down and attenuate the faith to a mere shadow; if they shrink, as they may naturally do, from both the one doctrine and the other, they are taught to be critical, skeptical, and self-wise; and all this is sure to lead to heterodoxy in one form or other, over and above the evil whether of arrogance or indifference in themselves.”<sup>1270</sup>

Newman attributed these confusions in mind and heart to the rationalism of Dissenters, Latitudinarians, Socinians, Unitarians, who required the “reasonableness of a religion.”<sup>1271</sup> This notion came from Thomas Erskine, to whom Newman responded in *Tract* 73. For Erskine, any doctrine or belief had to satisfy one’s “reason and conscience.”<sup>1272</sup> For instance, in regard to faith in Christ as the “Son of God,” Erskine said the history of Christ must be discerned in itself with “a light and a truth which will meet the demands both . . . reason and conscience,” because “it cannot be of any moral and spiritual benefit” until “its truth and meaning” are apprehended.<sup>1273</sup> Therefore, the satisfaction of reason and conscience became a requirement to determine the acceptability of every doctrine and belief, for only “real instructions” can help us “to perceive the truth and meaning of things.”<sup>1274</sup> This was the spirit of a rationalist, whom Newman described as a person who “makes himself his own centre, not his Maker; he does not go to God, but he implies that God must come to him.” For

---

<sup>1270</sup> Ibid., 395.

<sup>1271</sup> JHN, “Tract 73,” 96. Also see Thomas Erskine, Charles Leslie, *Erskine’s Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth and Leslie’s Short Method with the Deists* (London: Mark Newman, 1823), 56.

<sup>1272</sup> George C. Lorimer, *Christianity in the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1900), 335-6.

<sup>1273</sup> William Hanna, ed., *Letters of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1884), 21.

<sup>1274</sup> Ibid., 21-22.

Newman, this was a matter of concern: “This, it is to be feared, is the spirit in which multitudes of us act at the present day.”<sup>1275</sup>

This spirit of “reasonableness of a religion” motivated rationalists to deny all the creeds and fundamental doctrines. Yet, as Newman wrote in *Tract 85* (1838), the rationalists could not “agree what are these great truths, simple views, leading ideas, or peculiar doctrines of the Gospel.”<sup>1276</sup> For Newman, there is no religion without doctrines. “The common sense of mankind decides against it. Religion cannot but be dogmatic; it ever has been. All religions have had doctrines.”<sup>1277</sup> Newman reasoned that “if there is a Revelation, there must be a doctrine; both our reason and our hearts tell us so. If it is not in Scripture, it is somewhere else,”<sup>1278</sup> “as in Tradition.”<sup>1279</sup> If we do not submit to the notion that there are “doctrines of the Gospel being hidden under the text of Scripture”, we must then believe that “there are no doctrines at all in Christianity.”<sup>1280</sup>

However, if a rationalist accepted a “doctrine,” or a “creed,” as Pusey described, he would turn it into “something strange”—very different from the orthodox teachings of the

---

<sup>1275</sup> This statement is from “Tract 73,” vol. III, 33-34, as it appears at <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/essays/volume1/rationalism/section1.html>. This statement did not appear in the original *Tract 73*; instead, Newman stated: “Rationalism then in fact is a forgetfulness of God’s power, disbelief of the existence of a First Cause sufficient to account for any events or facts, however marvelous or extraordinary, and a consequent measuring of the credibility of things, not by the power of other attributes of God, but by our own knowledge; a limiting the possible to the actual, and denying the indefinite range of God’s operations beyond our means of apprehending them” (*Tract 73*, 84).

<sup>1276</sup> JHN, *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London: Longmans, Green, 1907), 128.

<sup>1277</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>1278</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>1279</sup> *Ibid.*, 127.

<sup>1280</sup> *Ibid.*

Church. He would pick and choose what he pleased. He would deem “some of the most authentic statements in the New Testament a ‘personification of ideas,’ and would direct the inquirer to the Jewish theology and the East for their true sense.”<sup>1281</sup> If he did not absolutely dismiss the truth, he would explain “it in a manner which destroys its efficacy.”<sup>1282</sup> For instance, he would not admit “God in the flesh,” but would call Christ “the most exalted and the wisest Being who ever lived on the earth.” He would accept “the death of Christ in expiation of sin; but the resurrection of the dead and the return of Christ to the future judgment, are too far removed from the comprehension of reason to obtain a place in his dogmas.”<sup>1283</sup> For rationalists, “the first authority is reason, and the Bible is not authority except in so far as it speaks in accordance with human reason.”<sup>1284</sup> The first thing that a rationalist would do with the Bible was “to sit it at the bar of his criticism – not accept it as a revelation from God by which his reason is to be enlightened and guided; but to sit in judgment upon it, as upon a book of human origin.”<sup>1285</sup>

According to Pusey, at this time, there were too many “Rational preachers,” who disputed the divinity of Christ “from their pulpits, his miracles controverted, his mediation

---

<sup>1281</sup> E. B. Pusey, “Churches in London,” *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, vol. II (London: William Pickering, 1837), 411-449, at 448. Hereafter cited Pusey, “Churches in London.”

<sup>1282</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1283</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1284</sup> Scottish Reformation Society, “The Rationalists and the Evangelicals,” *The Bulwark or Reformation Journal*, vol. XV – 1865-66 (London: Seeley, 1866): 309-312, at 311.

<sup>1285</sup> Ibid.

described as folly, his resurrection as a resuscitation from a trance.”<sup>1286</sup> Pusey later recalled that he dreaded rationalism “twenty-one years ago. It was repelled for a time” from the day it appeared in Hampden’s Lectures.<sup>1287</sup> This was the time when the Latitudinarians considered themselves as the ones who “maintain[ed] ‘Oxford views’”<sup>1288</sup> and showed that “they are not members of the ‘Establishment,’ that is, the local Church (which they say is heretical, etc.), but the ‘Catholic Church’.”<sup>1289</sup> In a word, this was the time that rationalism showed “itself among those, of course, who are opposed to Catholic truth.”<sup>1290</sup>

Rationalism, as Mac Mahon remarked, was not “a revulsion of feeling against an extreme party in the Church but an attack on the Church itself, and on Dogmatic Theology.”<sup>1291</sup> Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892), Archbishop of Westminster, commented that the Church of England at this time had “various minor symptoms which evince[d] the growth of Rationalism within the Church.”<sup>1292</sup> The Church of England was regarded as “helpless to define the truth, to set aside error, to teach authoritatively the one truth, and to steady and secure the consciences of the flock.”<sup>1293</sup> However, in the midst of this

---

<sup>1286</sup> Pusey, “Churches in London”, 448.

<sup>1287</sup> Henry Parry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. III (London: Longmans, Green, 1894), 116; hereafter cited, Liddon, *Life of Pusey*.

<sup>1288</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel: In festo SS. Innoc., [28 December]1838), *LD* 6: 365.

<sup>1289</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1290</sup> Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, 116.

<sup>1291</sup> John H. Mac Mahon, *Church and State in England; Its Origin and Use* (London: William Macintosh, 1873), 110; hereafter cited: Mac Mahon, *Church and State in England*.

<sup>1292</sup> Henry Edward Manning, “England and Christendom,” *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. 16, James Oswald Dykes, James Stuart Candlish, eds. (London: James Nisbet, 1867): 811-835, at 814.

<sup>1293</sup> *Ibid.*

“gloomy cloud,” the Oxford Movement emerged as “one of the most influential revivals of the Church of England” and “as an intended antidote to the virus of infidelity.”<sup>1294</sup> The Tractarians became known as “eminent writers within the Church” against the rationalism of the time. It was the Oxford Movement, “which preserved the Church of England from a complete relapse into Rationalism.”<sup>1295</sup> And Newman, in Pusey’s judgment, “was its most powerful and successful antagonist.”<sup>1296</sup>

It was in this context of a crisis prompted by the Liberalism and rationalism of the day that Newman recognized that the Church needed “one Thing,” which could unite all believers in one voice and one faith: the Creed. For Newman, the Creed is the key to the Church’s communion because when people professed one Creed, they were united in one faith, one Baptism, one Church, of one Lord and one Father who is above all, through all and in all. Newman, writing a letter to Richard Hurrell Froude in 1835, had insisted on this point: “I incline to say the Creed is the faith necessary to salvation as well as to Church communion.”<sup>1297</sup> In 1836, Newman wrote a letter to Abbé Jager: “I may impose nothing to be believed as terms of communion but the Creed, so I may impose nothing to be believed in order to Salvation, but what is founded on Scripture.”<sup>1298</sup> Newman, in his *Prophetical Office*, in 1837, stated that there is “some one object, some circle of sacred truths . . . doctrines independent and external, which may be emphatically called the gospel, which have been

---

<sup>1294</sup> Mac Mahon, *Church and State in England*, 109.

<sup>1295</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1296</sup> Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, 116.

<sup>1297</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriël, 23 August 1835), *LD* 5: 125-127, at 126.

<sup>1298</sup> Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 122.

committed to the Church from the first, which she is bound to *teach* as saving, and to *enforce* as the terms of communion.”<sup>1299</sup> In a word, Newman declared, the Creed was “the primitive condition of communion, or fundamental faith.”<sup>1300</sup> For Newman, the Creed was our faith and communion, it was the “treasure and legacy of faith which the Apostles had left” us and it would be “preserved in the Church to the end.”<sup>1301</sup> As Newman wrote to Henry Edward Manning in 1838: “The Church cannot insert a new article in the Creed. The tone of the Athanasian Creed seems to me decisive of this – ‘*This is the Catholic Faith etc.*’”<sup>1302</sup>

Newman emphasized the Creed as the terms of the faith and communion of the Church in order to respond not only to rationalism in general, but in particular to those Unitarians, who took the Bible, especially “the New Testament, as their *only* creed.”<sup>1303</sup> The Creed, according to Unitarians, had from the beginning served “not to unite, but to divide the Christian Church; not to produce harmony, but dissension.”<sup>1304</sup> Accordingly, the Unitarians “protested against creeds as conditions of communion.”<sup>1305</sup> The Creed was always “an attempt of the majority to coerce the minority,” and was felt by that minority to be “an enormous oppression, and thus occasions, not only dispute, but alienation of feeling,” which

---

<sup>1299</sup> JHN, *Prophetical Office*, 258.

<sup>1300</sup> *Ibid.*, 260.

<sup>1301</sup> *Ibid.*, 260-261.

<sup>1302</sup> JHN to H. E. Manning (Oriel, 6 June 1838), *LD* 6: 255.

<sup>1303</sup> George W. Burnap, *Popular Objections to Unitarian Christianity Considered and Answered in Seven Discourses*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1855), 105. Hereafter cited Burnap, *Popular Objections to Unitarian Christianity*.

<sup>1304</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1305</sup> F. A. Farley, “Congregational Unitarianism,” *Unitarianism Exhibited in Its Actual Condition*, John Rely Beard, ed. (London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1846): 1-53, at 7.

was “more anti-Christian than any mere diversity of opinion.”<sup>1306</sup> Another reason for objecting to Creeds is that “religious knowledge is progressive.” The Gospel “continues the same,” but “our understanding of it may be improved.”<sup>1307</sup> In other words, Christians should associate “upon basis of the Gospel alone, without note or comment,” in accordance with: “The sufficiency of the Scriptures and the right of private judgment.”<sup>1308</sup>

In summary, Newman considered the Creed as an expression of the faith necessary for salvation and for the Church communion; by reciting the Creed, the faithful profess their Catholic faith in one God and are in communion with the Church, in which the salvation of God is proclaimed. In addition, a deeper reason for considering the Creed as a “condition of communion” is that it expresses the mystery of the Holy Trinity. It is by professing that faith that believers receive Baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is within that greatest mystery that “we live, and move, and have our being,”<sup>1309</sup> namely in the Trinity, in whom, our “communion with each other consists.”<sup>1310</sup>

### **b. Calvinism and Evangelicalism – Invisible and Visible Church**

In addition to dealing with rationalism, the years of 1837 and 1838 were also a time when Newman had to contend with Calvinism and Evangelicalism about the issues of election to salvation and the invisible and visible Church. Newman, in February 1837, expressed his

---

<sup>1306</sup> Burnap, *Popular Objections to Unitarian Christianity*, 105.

<sup>1307</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>1308</sup> *Ibid.* Also see Joseph Henry Allen, *Our Liberal Movement in Theology - Chiefly as Shown in Recollections of the History of Unitarianism in New England* (Boston: Robert Brothers, 1882), 31-32.

<sup>1309</sup> JHN, “The Communion of Saints,” *PPS* 4: 168-184, at 168.

<sup>1310</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

concern about tenets of Calvinistic theology: “The chief of these is that of ‘election in Christ’;

The Calvinists maintain an election of individuals to eternal life.”<sup>1311</sup> Newman quoted the

Lambeth Articles of 1595 that

“God from eternity hath predestined certain men unto life; certain men He hath reprobated etc . . . There is predetermined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminished.” In like manner in the Conclusions at Dort it is declared, “that God, by an absolute decree, hath elected to salvation a very small number of men etc, . . . and secluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind, and appointed them by the same decree to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity or impenitency.”<sup>1312</sup>

---

<sup>1311</sup> JHN to an Unknown Correspondent (24 February 1837), *LD* 6: 35-36, at 35.

<sup>1312</sup> Ibid. According to Philip Schaff, the Lambeth Articles (1595) were a “brief predestinarian document of Calvin.” In fact, Calvin became more fully known in England during the reign of Edward VI. Calvin had great influence upon leading theologians and the universities of England, particularly the University of Cambridge. However, there was a great academic controversy about the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination in the University of Cambridge. To settle this controversy and to prevent future trouble, the heads of the University asked Archbishop John Whitgift (1530-1604) of Canterbury to call a Synod. The result of the Synod was the birth of the Nine Articles, at Lambeth, on November 20, 1595. The Articles were a clear and strong enunciation of the predestinarian system. Queen Elizabeth, who had no special liking for Calvinism and dogmatic controversies, was displeased with the calling of a Synod without her authority. She commanded the Archbishop to recall and suppress those Articles without delay. After the Queen’s death, in January 1604, at the Hampton Court Conference of King James I and several prelates with the leaders of the Puritans, Dr. John Reynolds (1549-1607), a prominent representative of the Puritan party, made the request that “the nine orthodoxal assertions concluded on at Lambeth might be inserted into the Book of [Thirty-Nine] Articles.” The Nine Articles were exhibited at the Synod of Dort by the English deputies, as the judgment of their Church on the Arminian controversy. Thus, as Schaff commented, the Articles “have never had full symbolical authority in the Church of England, but they are of historical interest as showing the ascendancy of the predestinarian system of Calvin in the last decade of the sixteenth century.” Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, vol. I – The History of the Creeds (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1878), 658-662.



Newman called it “the genuine Predestinarian doctrine,” which was “very different surely from that of our Article.”<sup>1313</sup>

For John Calvin, the theory of election and the theology of the Church cannot be separated. Calvin looked at the Church as invisible and visible. He believed that “the invisible Church is in the visible, as kernel in the shell, and God alone knows who belong to the invisible Church and are to be saved.”<sup>1314</sup> The invisible Church consisted of “the children of God by grace of adoption,” including “all the elect from the beginning of the world.”<sup>1315</sup> The visible Church is of those who “profess to worship one God and Christ.” It includes both the elect and “many hypocrites who have nothing of Christ but the name and outward appearance,”<sup>1316</sup> thus it is called a “mixed church” or “mixed body” where until the last day the true believers and the godless coexist.<sup>1317</sup> But true believers are called to “revere and keep communion” with this visible body, “which is called ‘church’ in respect to men.”<sup>1318</sup>

---

<sup>1313</sup> LD 6: 35.

<sup>1314</sup> Richard Taylor Stevenson, *John Calvin: The Statesman* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1907), 119.

<sup>1315</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, John T. McNeill, ed., vol. II (Louisville – London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960), 1021; hereafter cited: Calvin, *Institutes*.

<sup>1316</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1317</sup> David N. Wiley, “The Church as the Elect in the Theology of Calvin,” *John Calvin and the Church: a Prism of Reform*, Timothy George, ed. (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990): 96-118, at 100.

Calvin borrowed the term “mixed body” (*corpus permixtum*) from Augustine’s *Against the Donatists*, which stressed that the Church is a *corpus permixtum*, containing both good and evil, wheat and tares that will only be separated on the day of judgment. However, for Augustine, *corpus permixtum* does not mean that the body of Christ is composed of good and evil in this age, but rather it refers to the *corpus Christi* composed of the *boni*, which are found mixed with the *mali* in the communion of the sacraments. Carol Harrison, *Augustine–*

In regard to election, Calvin insisted that “according to the secret predestination of God,” as Augustine says, “many sheep are without, and many wolves are within” the visible Body, therefore God “knows and has marked those who know neither him nor themselves.”<sup>1319</sup> That means

We shall never be clearly persuaded, as we ought to be, that our salvation flows from the wellspring of God’s free mercy until we come to know his eternal election, which illumines God’s grace by this contrast: that he does not indiscriminately adopt all into the hope of salvation but gives to some what he denies to others.<sup>1320</sup>

In other words, for Calvin, in God’s predestination, even those who are “lost still convert, and even those who seem to stand the most firmly can still fall.”<sup>1321</sup> As for the elect, they may “tremble and be tossed hither and thither and even fall, but they cannot perish, for the Lord holds them with his hand.”<sup>1322</sup> In sum, the terms “visible” and “invisible” in a Calvinistic sense “stand to each other precisely as do the general and the special elections.”<sup>1323</sup>

Many Evangelical Protestants, following John Calvin, believed that “the true Church is *invisible*, being composed of the elect alone.”<sup>1324</sup> The visible Church is of believers who

---

*Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 220. Scott H. Hendrix, *Ecclesia in Via* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), 20.

<sup>1318</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, 1022.

<sup>1319</sup> Ibid. Also see Richard Taylor Stevenson, *John Calvin: The Statesman* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1907), 119.

<sup>1320</sup> Ibid., 921. Also see Donald K. McKim, *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 292.

<sup>1321</sup> Karl Barth, *The Theology of John Calvin* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 118.

<sup>1322</sup> Ibid., 180.

<sup>1323</sup> Benjamin Charles Milner, *Calvin’s Doctrine of the Church* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 69.

<sup>1324</sup> William H. Lyon, *A Study of the Sects*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Boston: Unitarian Sunday-School Society, 1892), 46; hereafter cited: Lyon, *A Study of the Sects*.

participate in the ministry of word and sacrament, but may also contain untrue believers.<sup>1325</sup>

In other words, the only true Church of Christ is the invisible Church; the visible may embrace the invisible, but they are not identical.<sup>1326</sup> However, the visible Church is important, for it is where we receive salvation in Christ. Through “external means and aids,” “God invites us into the society of Christ and holds us therein.”<sup>1327</sup> Thus, Evangelicals held that “true believers are sure to enter the Church which Christ has established,” and thus had a “Confession of Faith” that “outside of the visible Church there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.”<sup>1328</sup>

These Evangelicals, certainly, did not want to identify this “Confession of Faith” with the statement “out of the Church there is no salvation.” Rather, their “Confession of Faith” only meant “that there is no salvation without the knowledge and profession of the gospel; that there is no other name by which we must be saved, by the name of Jesus Christ.”<sup>1329</sup> When asked: “What must I do to be saved?”— Evangelicals answered: “You must have faith.” According to these Evangelicals, every sinner who hears the gospel, “in the exercise of faith and repentance,” can “go immediately to him [Christ], and obtain eternal life at his hands.”<sup>1330</sup> These Evangelicals emphasized the importance of faith because they felt that

---

<sup>1325</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1326</sup> Cf. Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734-1984* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), 222.

<sup>1327</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, 1011.

<sup>1328</sup> Lyon, *A Study of the Sects*, 46.

<sup>1329</sup> Henry Edward Manning, “Theories of the Church,” *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review and Quarterly Record of Christian Literature*, vol. I, James Oswald Dykes, ed. (Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1852): 152-169, at 161.

<sup>1330</sup> Ibid.

“human nature was entirely corrupted” in Adam, and thus “all men are born sinners, incapable of doing good in the account of God, enslaved to evil, drawing upon themselves by a just judgment condemnation and death.”<sup>1331</sup> Accordingly, they came to believe that the faithful are justified “not by works of righteousness which we have done, but solely by Grace, and through faith in Christ, whose righteousness is imputed unto us.”<sup>1332</sup>

Newman acknowledged that in his early years he “had full and eagerly taken up Calvinism.”<sup>1333</sup> He did not say which Calvinistic doctrines he had accepted, but “the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination was almost certainly not one of them.”<sup>1334</sup> Newman and the Tractarians, of course, were against this doctrine, insofar as it led Christians to “live without care or anxiety about their own spiritual condition; as if they were quite safe and secure, and need scarcely seek, much less strive to enter in at the strait gate.”<sup>1335</sup>

Newman also disagreed with the distinction between the Church as invisible and visible in the meaning of the Calvinists and Evangelicals. Newman, in response, used the same terms but with different interpretations. The invisible Church, for Newman, is not the Church of the elect alone, as in the Calvinistic and Evangelical sense. Newman conceived the

---

<sup>1331</sup> The Evangelical Alliance, “Profession of Faith,” no. 4, *Evangelical Christendom: Its State and Prospects*, vol. III (London: Partridge and Oakey, Paternoster Row, 1849): 44.

<sup>1332</sup> “Profession of Faith,” no. 8, *ibid.* Also see The Birmingham Oratory, ed., *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others . . . 1839-1845* (London: Longmans, Green, 1917), 116; hereafter cited: *Correspondence of John Henry Newman*.

<sup>1333</sup> JHN, a note in *LD* 1: 30.

<sup>1334</sup> *Correspondence of John Henry Newman*, 116. Also see Brian Martin, *John Henry Newman: His Life and Work*, 35.

<sup>1335</sup> Sermon CXIX “Necessity of Practical Conversion,” Contributors to the “Tracts for the Times,” *Plains Sermons*, vol. IV (London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1842), 234.

invisible Church in two senses: first, it is the “Communion of Saints,” of those “who sleep in the Lord.”<sup>1336</sup> It is called “unseen” and “invisible” “in the sense of the Church in glory, or the Church in rest.”<sup>1337</sup> Second, the Church is called “invisible” because “the Holy Ghost is her Lord and Governor,”<sup>1338</sup> and her “life and strength [rest] upon unseen influences and gifts from Heaven.”<sup>1339</sup> Newman, of course, could not accept the notion of the invisible Church *in* the visible Church as “kernel in the shell,” and was careful with the notion of the visible Church as a “mixed church” or “mixed body” (*corpus permixtum*). Newman, in his novel, *Loss and Gain*, written after his entrance into the Roman Catholic Church, described the dilemma:

You are making a distinction between a Church and a body which I don’t quite comprehend. You say that there are two bodies, and yet but one Church. If so, the Church is not a body, but something abstract, a mere name, a general idea; is *that* your meaning? If so, you are an honest Calvinist.<sup>1340</sup>

Newman did not deny the Augustinian notion of the Church as a *corpus permixtum*.<sup>1341</sup> As Newman stated, the Church contains “some most holy, perhaps even saints; others penitent sinners; but others . . . with nothing saintly, and little religious about them.” Yet “one and all, saints and sinners, have faith in the things invisible, which each uses in his own way.”<sup>1342</sup> Newman’s concern was that for the Evangelicals, the visible Church, as

---

<sup>1336</sup> *PPS* 4: 172.

<sup>1337</sup> *PPS* 3: 223. Also see “The Gift of the Spirit,” *PPS* 3: 257.

<sup>1338</sup> *PPS* 4: 173.

<sup>1339</sup> *PPS* 3: 222.

<sup>1340</sup> *Loss and Gain*, 32.

<sup>1341</sup> Cf. *supra*, 287, note 1317.

<sup>1342</sup> JHN, *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*, vol. I (London: Burns & Lambert, 1850), 232.

a mixed body, is not the true Church. They said: “the visible Church has not the gifts of grace, because wicked men are members of it.”<sup>1343</sup> Later, in *Loss and Gain*, Newman questioned the Evangelical position:

Is a dead branch part or not part of a tree? You may decide this way or that, but you will never say, because the branch is dead, that therefore the tree has no sap. It is a dead branch of a living tree, not a branch of a dead tree.<sup>1344</sup>

The visible Church might include evil people, but this does not mean that it is not the true Church or that it “is dead also.”<sup>1345</sup> Newman asserted that “there is only one true Catholic and Apostolic Church, visible and invisible.”<sup>1346</sup> One might speak of “the Visible and of the Invisible Church,” but it is “one and the same thing, separated by our minds only, not in reality.”<sup>1347</sup> The visible and the invisible are one true Church of Christ.

The Swiss-born American professor, Phillip Schaff, briefly summarized the view of Newman and the Tractarians: the “true visible Church” is the one “in which the Word is preached in its purity, the sacraments administered according to Christ’s ordinance, and discipline rightfully maintained;” and “the invisible Church is the household of God, in heaven and earth.”<sup>1348</sup> Newman believed that, according to Scripture, the “doctrine of the Visible Church” is “of importance” as St. Paul said, “There is *one body*, and one Spirit, even

---

<sup>1343</sup> *PPS* 3: 227. Newman quoted the arguments of the Evangelicals.

<sup>1344</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>1345</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1346</sup> William Palmer, John Henry Newman, *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church* (London: Kegan Paul Trench, 1882), 175.

<sup>1347</sup> *PPS* 3: 221.

<sup>1348</sup> Philip Schaff, “Tractarianism,” *A Religious Encyclopedia: Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology*, vol. III (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1889): 2372-4, at 2373.

as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.”<sup>1349</sup> The “existence of a Visible Church” is “a condition of the existence of the Invisible,” for “the *Sacraments* are evidently in the hands of the Church Visible.” It is in the Visible that “souls will be saved,” and thus the “Visible Church must exist as a means towards that end.”<sup>1350</sup> In other words, the Church here on earth is the “visible Temple” where all people receive fully the salvation of God; the Church is the “occasional and partial manifestation” of the invisible: “A Temple with God for its Light, and Christ for the High Priest, with wings of Angels for its arches, with Saints and Teachers for its pillars, and with worshippers for its pavement.”<sup>1351</sup>

Avoiding the ambiguity of the term “mixed body” and the confusion of “visible” and “invisible” of Evangelicalism, Newman chose the term “Mystical Body,” which could express the Church both as visible and invisible. For example, Newman in 1837 explained: “I mean to say out of that great invisible company, who are one and all incorporate in the one mystical body of Christ, and quickened by one Spirit.”<sup>1352</sup> In 1838, he again emphasized that the Church of Christ is indeed “His mystical Body, in joining which lay the salvation of the world.”<sup>1353</sup>

---

<sup>1349</sup> JHN, “Tract 11-The Visible Church,” 3, *Members of the Oxford Movement, Tracts for the Times*, vol. I for 1833-34 (London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1840): 23.

<sup>1350</sup> JHN, “Tract 11,” 2-3, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. I: 22-23.

<sup>1351</sup> JHN, “The Visible Temple,” *PPS* 6: 280-294, at 280. Also see Avery Dulles, *Newman* (London & New York: Continuum, 2005), 85.

<sup>1352</sup> *PPS* 4: 17. Also see JHN, *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. II (London: Longmans, Green, 1919), 21.

<sup>1353</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 309.

There is but one Christ, and as all the children of Adam have the same need of being mystically united to him, if ever they would escape the curse of Adam, so surely is there but one body, into which we are all engrafted.

There is but one Spirit, the Spirit of Christ poured largely on his mystical body the Church.<sup>1354</sup>

Thus, Newman attempted to emphasize the significant role of the Church for the salvation of humanity. In contrast, the Evangelicals “laid great stress on individual religion,” and “encouraged an undenominational temper.”<sup>1355</sup> They in fact had “little idea of the Church” and were very much concerned about “personal salvation.”<sup>1356</sup> They sought to “awake men to a sense of their sins and to bring them one by one to Christ” and then organize “those who have become disciples into the Church.”<sup>1357</sup> Newman spoke against individualism in salvation at the beginning of the Oxford Movement, in *Tract 2*, which quoted Bishop Pearson’s *Exposition of the Creed*:

There is none other name under heaven given among man whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Church . . . . There is a necessity of believing the Catholic Church, because except a man be of that he can be of none . . . [for] Communion with the Church is “generally necessary to salvation,” in the case of those who can obtain it.<sup>1358</sup>

---

<sup>1354</sup> Contributors to the “Tracts for the Times,” “the Unity of the Spirit,” *Plain Sermons*, vol. I (London: F. & J. Rivington, 1841), 223-233, at 226.

<sup>1355</sup> Francis Warre Cornish, “The English Church in the Nineteenth Century,” Part I, in William Richard Wood Stephens, William Hunt, eds., *A History of the English Church*, vol. VIII (London: Macmillan, 1910), 33.

<sup>1356</sup> Ibid. Also see Gerald Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*, 87-88.

<sup>1357</sup> Hensley Henson, ed., *Church Problems – A View of Modern Anglicanism* (London: John Murray, 1900), 530.

<sup>1358</sup> JHN, “Tract 2 - The Catholic Church,” p. 3, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. I: 15.



Newman, later as a Roman Catholic in *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*, declared that “the Catholic Church is the one ark of salvation”<sup>1359</sup> Such was Newman’s steadfast belief; in a letter written during his last years, he again insisted on the salvific role of the Church: “When it is said ‘Out of the Church is no salvation’ it is meant, there is no religious body but One in which is salvation.”<sup>1360</sup>

Newman insisted on the salvific role of the Church, because the foundation of the Church, as Newman wrote to Abbé Jager, is the “doctrine of Christ,” as St. Paul saying, “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ,” and the “doctrine of the Trinity, as confessed in the baptismal form.”<sup>1361</sup> It is not surprising that Newman took both doctrines as the foundation of the Church, for in his sermons, the “Trinity and Incarnation” are inseparable. As Newman remarked in *Tract 71*, in 1836:

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.<sup>1362</sup>

These two doctrines were for Newman the “essential portion of the Sacred Treasure, of which the Church was ordained to be the Preacher.”<sup>1363</sup> These two doctrines were the fundamentals of faith and the main core of the Creed. They were doctrines essential for salvation. They were also a major weapon in Newman’s fight against rationalism. For Newman, one could

---

<sup>1359</sup> JHN, *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*, 1: 5.

<sup>1360</sup> JHN to Mrs. Christie (Birmingham, 20 December 1881), *LD* 30: 33.

<sup>1361</sup> Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 39.

<sup>1362</sup> JHN, “Tract 71,” Members of the Oxford Movement, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. III (New York: Charles Henry, 1840), 23. Also see JHN, *Tracts Theological*, 335.

<sup>1363</sup> JHN, “The Gospel, A Trust Committed to Us,” *PPS* 2: 255-273, at 264.

not speak of the “doctrine of the Trinity” without the “doctrine of Christ,” for it was in the Incarnation that the mystery of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit was revealed. In like manner, one would be heterodox if perceiving the “doctrine of Christ” without the “doctrine of the Trinity,” for the fullness of Christ’s divinity and his salvific mission can only be recognized completely in the light of the Holy Trinity.

The years from 1835 to 1838 were a time when Newman struggled with rationalism in varied forms—from Burnet and Tillotson to Hampden and Blanco White. It was a time when Latitudinarianism, Unitarianism, Calvinism and Evangelicalism were invading the Church of England. It was within this context that Newman deepened and developed his theology of salvation in response to his opponents. If in the early years of the Oxford Movement, Newman was interested in analyzing the doctrine of the Holy Trinity *in se*, in order to build a firm orthodox foundation for belief in the Triune God, in his second period, Newman preached about the economy of salvation, in which the mystery of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were fully revealed in the Dispensations of Christ, from the mystery of the Incarnation to that of the Church, and thus the portrait of the Trinity *pro nobis* was formed. In a word, Newman’s concern in this second period, could be summarized as: “Creeds.” There were Anglican clerics who denied the Creeds, thereby rejecting the Trinity and Incarnation. Newman later in his book, *Essays Critical and Historical*, discussing “the Catholicity of the Anglican Church,” admitted that the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation “are

developments,” in response to the question “did the Apostles hold the Athanasian doctrine?”<sup>1364</sup> Newman answered:

We avow they *did* hold the Athanasian doctrine; they did hold those developments which afterwards were incorporated in the Church system. There is no paradox in maintaining of any individual in the Apostles’ lifetime that he held them; for heresies arose while they were on earth, quite sufficient to lead to their holding and transmitting to the Church views as explicit and formal as those which were afterwards recognized and adopted in Councils and fixed in creeds; not to say that a mystery naturally leads the mind of itself, without external stimulus, to trace it to its ultimate points. There is nothing strange then in maintaining that the Apostles held just what the after centuries held; it is natural that they should do so.<sup>1365</sup>

For Newman, “developments” did not mean “changes,” but in responding to “external stimulus” the teachings of the Church became more “explicit and formal”; in other words, as a result of the heresies of the early Church, the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation were developed to their “ultimate points.” Pusey, for example, in *Tract 18* (1834) described the Church as a “tender mother very anxious for her children” always worried about “dangers” around them, a mother who gave her children a “rule of faith.”<sup>1366</sup>

Thus it may seem that, in the most ancient, the Apostles’ Creed, a plain simple rule of faith is given. In the next, the Nicene Creed, *the same rule is laid down*, but more at length, and in a tone of anxiety and caution as if the enemy were at hand. But in the last, the Athanasian Creed, where still the *very same rule of faith is laid down*, the alarm is loudly sounded, there is throughout an expression of urgent warning, as needful for persons in the very midst of foes, some open, and more secret foes, who would rob God of His honour, and man of the everlasting inheritance, purchased for him by his SAVIOUR’s Blood.<sup>1367</sup>

---

<sup>1364</sup> JHN, *Essays Critical and Historical*, 2: 14.

<sup>1365</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-15.

<sup>1366</sup> Pusey, “Tract 18,” 9, *Tracts for the Times*, vol. I: 49.

<sup>1367</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9.

What Pusey called “dangers” Newman named “external stimulus”; however, he did not need to go back to the early Church to find examples; Newman had to do battle with contemporary Arians and Socinians in order to protect the Church. Newman developed his teachings on the Trinity and the Incarnation in response to the claims of the Liberals that many terms in the Creeds were not found in or from Scripture. Newman replied that language “requires to be refashioned even for sciences which are based on the senses and the reason.”<sup>1368</sup>

In like manner, the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation “are from the nature of the case above our intellectual reach and were unknown till the preaching of Christianity; they required on their first promulgation new words, or words used in new senses, for their due enunciation.”<sup>1369</sup> Newman recognized that the Church “for centuries” had undergone “variety in the use, and confusion in the apprehension of” these two doctrines, and that that was “unavoidable in the interval.” Indeed, “the difficulties of forming a theological phraseology for the whole of Christendom were obviously so great.”<sup>1370</sup> Nevertheless, Newman, pointed out that as “terms” and “definitions are not intended to go beyond their subject, but to be adequate to it, so the dogmatic statements of the Divine Nature used in our confessions, however multiplied, cannot say more than is implied in the original idea, considered in its completeness, without the risk of heresy.”<sup>1371</sup> In other words,

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

---

<sup>1368</sup> *Arians*, 433.

<sup>1369</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1370</sup> *Ibid.*, 433-4.

<sup>1371</sup> JHN, “The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine,” *Fifteen Sermons*, 312-351, at 331.

upon that idea, except piecemeal, cannot use it in its oneness and entirety, nor without resolving it into a series of aspects and relations.<sup>1372</sup>

Newman agreed with his opponents that reason was important, yet for him reason also has its own limits. In the mystery of the Trinity and Incarnation, in particular, reason can only “ascertain the profound difficulties of our condition, it cannot remove them; it has no work, it makes no beginning, it does but continually fall back, till it is content to be a little child, and to follow where Faith guides it.”<sup>1373</sup> Hence, to the question: “The Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, why are these revealed?” Newman replied, surely not to satisfy our reason, but “to give us reason for loving God.”<sup>1374</sup> Finally, Newman suggested to Liberal opponents a new “pattern of Faith,” namely the Blessed Mother Mary,

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 it; not enough to submit the Reason, she reasons upon it; not indeed reasoning first, and believing afterwards.<sup>1375</sup>

### III. The Third Period: From 1839 to 1843

#### 1. Justification and Sanctification

In the years 1839 and 1840, Newman continued with his strong protest against Liberalism. In retrospect, during “the Spring of 1839” Newman’s “position in the Anglican

---

<sup>1372</sup> Ibid., 331-2.

<sup>1373</sup> Ibid., 351.

<sup>1374</sup> JHN, *Sermon Notes of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, Green, 1913), 209.

<sup>1375</sup> JHN, *Fifteen Sermons*, 313.

Church was at its height”: “I had supreme confidence in my controversial *status*, and I had a great and still growing success, in recommending it to others.”<sup>1376</sup> He stated:

It was true that I held a large bold system of religion, very unlike the Protestantism of the day, but it was the concentration and adjustment of the statements of great Anglican authorities, and I had as much right to do so, as the Evangelical party had, and more right than the Liberal party could show, for asserting their own respective doctrines.<sup>1377</sup>

For Newman, if the Liberals “had a right to speak loud,” he too “had both the liberty and the means of giving them tit for tat.”<sup>1378</sup> His aim was indicated in the motto of the *Lyra*, “They shall know the difference now.” Newman, indeed, wanted to show the Liberals “the difference” between their views and the Catholic Church that the Tractarians were attempting to protect.<sup>1379</sup> This was the time when the Tractarians got their “golden seat” in the Church of England. They became “the owner of a review, the *British Critic*” with Newman as its “sole editor.”<sup>1380</sup> They published “brilliant articles,” which “forced intellectual men at any rate to reckon with them.”<sup>1381</sup> The Tracts, as Newman reported, “are selling faster than they can print them.”<sup>1382</sup> The Tracts, at the beginning, as Newman told Thomas Mozley, “were called injudicious and repulsive when they first appeared,” but “*now* they are especially admired

---

<sup>1376</sup> *Apologia*, 136.

<sup>1377</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1378</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

<sup>1379</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1380</sup> Sidney Leslie Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1915), 60. In 1836, Newman had become partly responsible for the *British Critic*; from March, 1838 he was its editor until he resigned in July 1841. *Ibid.*

<sup>1381</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1382</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel College, 22 January 1839), *LD* 7: 15-16, at 15.

because of ‘THEIR TONE’!!”<sup>1383</sup> Not only did the Tracts spread the Tractarian message throughout England, but every Sunday, as Matthew Arnold described, people waited “in the dim afternoon light” of St Mary’s in order to listen to the “tone of a man” from “the pulpit . . . in the most entrancing of voices, breaking the silence with words and thoughts . . . subtle, sweet, mournful.”<sup>1384</sup>

No one would deny the great impact of Newman and his fellow Tractarians upon people. The special point was that they did not teach or write something that was unusual or strange to the people. They took the very basic teachings in the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England, which were very familiar to everyone, and analyzed and explained them in the light of Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. Yet the Liberals did the same. They took themes from the *Book of Common Prayer*, but explained them in what they called the “new light of reason,” and thus created a kind of “fashion of the day.” Newman and the Tractarians, in order to help the faithful to reject the various forms of Liberalism and to drink from the very source of Tradition, were translating patristic works and establishing a library of the Fathers for the people. As Newman said: “We *must* familiarize people to them [Fathers] – *or* the Fathers will frighten them.”<sup>1385</sup>

Newman’s sermons of this time were concerned with justification and sanctification—one of the most important as well as confusing themes in the spiritual life of the faithful, since the Unitarians, Antinomians and Evangelicals had presented it in heterodox fashion. The

---

<sup>1383</sup> JHN to Thomas Mozley (Oriel College, 11 February 1839), *LD* 7: 32-33, at 33.

<sup>1384</sup> Matthew Arnold, *The Works of Matthew Arnold*, vol. IV – Essays in Criticism, second series (London: Macmillan and Co., 1903), 349-350.

<sup>1385</sup> *LD* 7: 33.

Unitarians reasoned that “no man living” can be justified by his own righteousness, thus he needs the perfect justice of Christ, “*imputed* to him for his justification.”<sup>1386</sup> Similarly, the Antinomians held that the believer’s “righteousness is nothing but the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.”<sup>1387</sup> The Unitarians, interpreting 1 Corinthians 1: 30, explained that “righteousness, and sanctification and redemption” mean the same, namely “Jesus redeemed us from sin, or sanctified us, by teaching us, and setting us an example of righteousness.” They are the “several different blessings, which we receive from Christ.”<sup>1388</sup>

He is made unto us redemption, because he has redeemed us by his blood from the curse of God’s broken law; he is made unto us righteousness, because he has worked out a perfect righteousness, which is imputed to us for our justification; he is made unto us wisdom and sanctification, because he gives us heavenly wisdom and holiness of heart.<sup>1389</sup>

The Unitarians believed that our sin was “imputed to” Jesus, in order that “his righteousness might be imputed to us.” Accordingly, we are made righteous not “by him,” but “in him.”<sup>1390</sup> The Unitarians also insisted that “by deeds of law there shall no flesh be justified” in God’s sight;<sup>1391</sup> therefore, the only thing we need is “faith alone,”<sup>1392</sup> for those who are “justified by faith shall have eternal life.”<sup>1393</sup>

---

<sup>1386</sup> Samuel Minton, *Lectures on Unitarianism* (Hanley: Allbut and Son, 1847), 239; hereafter cited: Minton, *Lectures on Unitarianism*.

<sup>1387</sup> Robert David Adam, *The Religious Displayed*, vol. I (London: L. B. Seeley and Son, 1823), 127; hereafter cited Adam, *The Religious Displayed*.

<sup>1388</sup> Minton, *Lectures on Unitarianism*, 239.

<sup>1389</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1390</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1391</sup> *Ibid.*, 241.

<sup>1392</sup> *Ibid.*, 240.

<sup>1393</sup> *Ibid.*, 241.



Similarly, for the Antinomians, “justification by faith” is “not necessarily productive of good works.”<sup>1394</sup> “Good works are hurtful to salvation.”<sup>1395</sup> The faithful need neither good works nor obligations to observe the law, for “Christ’s obedience and sufferings have satisfied the demands of the law.”<sup>1396</sup> Believers indeed have no holiness in themselves “but *in* Christ only,” and when they have been justified, they are “wholly sanctified” in Christ. Hence, they need “not fear either their own sins or the sins of others, since neither can do them any injury.” They are “incapable of losing their spiritual holiness, justification and final salvation by any violation of the law of God.”<sup>1397</sup> Their holiness is “neither more nor less holy from that hour to the day” of their death.<sup>1398</sup> These Antinomian arguments were based on a very negative anthropology, in which a human can “do nothing in his own conversion, but is merely passive.”

If God have justified him before he was born, he shall be a justified person; and if God will give him grace, well and good; if not, he cannot help it. . . . If we are elected we shall be saved; if not, let us do what we can, we cannot be saved.<sup>1399</sup>

The Evangelical theory on justification made a distinction between *imputation* and *infusion*. The Evangelicals asserted that “God imputes, or reckons righteousness to none who

---

<sup>1394</sup> Adam, *The Religious Displayed*, 127.

<sup>1395</sup> Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology*, vol. III (Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1909), 875.

<sup>1396</sup> Adam, *The Religious Displayed*, 127.

<sup>1397</sup> Harry Loewen, *Luther and the Radicals* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1974), 126.

<sup>1398</sup> Adam, *The Religious Displayed*, 127.

<sup>1399</sup> Richard Baxter, *The Practical Works of Richard Baxter*, vol. IV (London: George Virtue, 1838), 658.

do not actually possess it.”<sup>1400</sup> John Owen (1616-1683) argued that there is a “two-fold justification”<sup>1401</sup> or a “double imputation.”<sup>1402</sup> First, all our sins are “transferred to Christ in the atonement,” and then “his righteousness is transferred to us.”<sup>1403</sup> That means “all our sins past, present, and to come, were at once imputed unto and laid upon Jesus Christ.”<sup>1404</sup> All our sins “were on him, he bare them all at once, and therefore once died for all.”<sup>1405</sup> John Owen quoted Isaiah 63: 6, 7 and 1 Peter 2: 24 in order to prove this point. Then God imputed “the obedience and satisfaction of Christ” unto us, and we are “receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith.”<sup>1406</sup> In other words, according to the Helvetic Confession of Faith (Geneva, 1535), “The righteousness of Jesus Christ is imputed to believers.”<sup>1407</sup> If any one says “the righteousness previously infused into the believer,” he in fact “gives to works a share in the justification of the sinner.”<sup>1408</sup>

The Evangelicals emphasized the *imputation* of justification in opposition to the Roman Catholic notion of *infusion*. According to Aquinas, there are four components to justification: “an infusion of grace, a movement of the free will toward God in faith, a

---

<sup>1400</sup> John Forbes, “Analytical Commentary on the Romans,” *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. XVII (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1868), 684-721, at 697; hereafter cited Forbes, “Analytical Commentary on the Romans”.

<sup>1401</sup> John Owen, *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1823), 91; hereafter cited Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*.

<sup>1402</sup> R. C. Sproul, *Justified by Faith Alone* (Illinois: Crossway Books, 1999), 32.

<sup>1403</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1404</sup> Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 95.

<sup>1405</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>1406</sup> Robert Haldane, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1874), 143; hereafter cited Haldane, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*.

<sup>1407</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1408</sup> Forbes, “Analytical Commentary on the Romans”, 698.

movement of the free will in recoil from sin, and the remission of guilt.”<sup>1409</sup> The infusion of grace is the action of God, the author of our justification. Aquinas believed that the “infusion of grace” is the “cause of all the other things required for the justification of the unrighteous” inasmuch as grace is the cause of our free choice of God and free choice against sin and is, consequently, the ground of forgiveness.<sup>1410</sup> According to Aquinas, grace is operative and cooperative. Grace as the “source of meritorious acts a person performs” is *cooperating grace*. Grace that “justifies or heals a person’s soul” is *operating grace*.<sup>1411</sup> In other words, God is acting from without and within us. What is good for us is not that we ourselves alone can do it, but God who “moves us to a good work by his *cooperating grace*.” God is responsible for all that is good in us. However, what is good in us is also attributed to us because our will cooperates with God. Aquinas, following Augustine, said that God does not justify us “without ourselves.” That means “simultaneous with God’s justifying us, we consent to God’s justice in an act of free will.”<sup>1412</sup> Therefore, God does not justify us without ourselves. God needs human cooperation with an act of free will, which he helps with the infusion of grace.<sup>1413</sup>

---

<sup>1409</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I.2ae, Q. 113, Art. 6, *Aquinas on Nature and Grace*, A. M. Fairweather, ed. (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006): 192. Instead of *Summa Theologiae*, this edition is titled *Summa Theologica*.

<sup>1410</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1411</sup> Richard L. Velkley, *Freedom and the Human Person* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 92.

<sup>1412</sup> Ibid. Aquinas stated: “The motion of the free will, which occurs in the justification of an impious person, is the ultimate disposition to grace. For this reason, in one and the same instant there is the infusion of grace together with this motion of the free will.” *ST III*, q. 89, a. 2. Quoted in Velkley, *Freedom and the Human Person*, 93.

<sup>1413</sup> Ibid., 93.

Newman's writings in this period show his concern about the topic of justification and sanctification. Newman could not accept the notion of imputation of justification in the Unitarian, Antinomian and Evangelical sense. Newman, in his *Lectures on Justification*, wrote:

Christ . . . is our Righteousness by dwelling in us by the Spirit; He justifies us by entering into us, He continues to justify us by remaining in us. *This* is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation, but through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ."<sup>1414</sup>

In Newman's arguments, there is a very special point that should be highlighted. His main purpose was neither to deny "by faith alone" nor argue against "a mere imputation," although he did discuss these issues. Newman aimed to find a new term which could both avoid the misunderstanding of justification that the Unitarians and Evangelicals presented and also illustrate the profound meaning of the true doctrine. Newman, hence, chose the term "Christ in us"<sup>1415</sup> which could express the center point of justification and sanctification as well as the continuous process carried out within us. Newman asserted that Christ *is* our justification; by his "dwelling in us by the Spirit" and continuously "remaining in us" we are justified and sanctified, becoming "partakers of the divine nature." The term "Christ in us" first of all expresses the "inward presence" of God in believers, which is "sometimes described as God's presence or communion," the presence of "Father and Son," "of the Holy Ghost," "of Christ the Incarnate Mediator," "of God through the Spirit," "of Christ, of His Body and Blood, of

---

<sup>1414</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 167.

<sup>1415</sup> *Ibid.*, 166.

His Body in ‘flesh and bones,’ and this through the Spirit.”<sup>1416</sup> In other words, it is the Trinitarian presence. It is “the habitation in us of God the Father, and the Word incarnate through the Holy Ghost.”<sup>1417</sup> It is the Holy Trinity’s presence within us that makes us righteous and sanctified.

Newman depicted the Holy Trinity in the economy of salvation: Christ *is* our Righteousness; the Father, Son and Holy Spirit *is* our Righteousness. And Newman declared that although Righteousness is “within us, as it must be,” yet it “is not of us or in us, not any quality or act of our minds, not faith, not renovation, not obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain divine gift in which all these qualifications are included.”<sup>1418</sup> Is there any “divine gift,” which includes all qualifications that a believer needs to be justified; is there any “divine gift,” which is within us, but simultaneously neither of us nor in us, yet always within us as it must be, if it is not God himself? God himself is the Divine Gift. In giving himself to us he justified and sanctified us, in his Only-begotten Son, through the Holy Spirit, to be his adopted children. He is always within us, but simultaneously he is almighty and omnipresent, out of time and space and any limitation, and thus he is neither of us nor in us, yet he is within us always as he must be. This seemingly paradoxical expression of Newman can be understood by considering the immanent and economic Trinity. With regard to God *in se*, God indeed is “not *of* us or *in* us.” God does not belong to anyone or anything, and nothing and no one can contain him. With regard to God *pro nobis*, he is “*within* us, as

---

<sup>1416</sup> Ibid., 167.

<sup>1417</sup> Ibid., 160.

<sup>1418</sup> Ibid., 159.

he must be.” He is the God who is yearning to be one with his creatures and recapitulating all into one in him so that he will be all in all. The language of Newman both safeguards God in his immanent life which is beyond human perception, and simultaneously illustrates God in his economy of salvation in which he is for us, with us, and in us, in order to make us partakers of his very own inward life.

Secondly, for Newman, the term “Christ in us” expresses the mystery of the Incarnation by which our justification and sanctification have been initiated and are processing to their fullness. Justification and sanctification did not begin with Christ on the cross, they were already rooted in the mystery of the “Word became flesh.” Christ is in us through our “blood relationship,” and “brotherhood” with the Son of God, for in the Incarnation He took our nature and “sanctified our nature in Himself,” and then “He communicates it to us.”<sup>1419</sup> Newman seemingly wanted to point out to Unitarians and Antinomians that we do not need to wait until the moment that God decides to impute Christ’s righteousness to us in order that we may be justified and sanctified. God, in the Incarnation of his Son, “has implanted [it] in us,” “by the operation of the Blessed Spirit.”<sup>1420</sup> Newman did not see the human being as hopeless and useless in the Antinomian sense. Rather, Newman maintained that God has implanted within us “a seed of truth and holiness” and “a new law [has been] introduced into our nature.”<sup>1421</sup> When the Son of God came in his Incarnation, he

---

<sup>1419</sup> *PPS* 5: 87.

<sup>1420</sup> JHN, “Righteousness not of Us, but in Us,” *PPS* 5: 128-142, at 136. Also see JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 104.

<sup>1421</sup> *PPS* 4: 4.

transformed us into “new creature[s] in righteousness and true holiness.”<sup>1422</sup> For Newman, “righteousness, and sanctification and redemption” could not be taken as “several different blessings, which we receive from Christ.”<sup>1423</sup> They are *in us*, for we are *in Christ* — “from whom is the washing away of our inward guilt, and the implanting in us of a new nature.”<sup>1424</sup>

Newman used the notion of *cooperating grace* in order to emphasize the significant role of the human in salvation and to reject the doctrine of predestination:

His [God’s] mercy is over all His works, and to no one does the word of life come but with the intent that he may live. If the many remain in unbelief, they “are not straitened” in God’s love, but they “are straitened in their own bowels.” Man will not be what by God’s renewing and cooperating grace he might be. It is man’s doing, not God’s will.<sup>1425</sup>

Similarly in his *Lectures on Justification*, Newman stated:

We can do nothing good of ourselves; with God’s grace we can do what is good . . . . *with* His grace we are gifted not only with the capacity of being led into truth and holiness, but with the power of co-operating with Him . . . . It enables us to obey, not as instruments merely, but as free agents . . . “not by constraint,” but “willingly” and “heartily.”<sup>1426</sup>

Newman very obviously insisted on “a cooperation on our part.”<sup>1427</sup> Newman strongly denied the position of an Evangelical or a “modern Predestinarian”: “The whole work of salvation is of God, *therefore* man has no real part in securing it.”<sup>1428</sup> For Newman, Predestinarians forgot the words of the Apostle, “Man must exert himself, *because* God is

---

<sup>1422</sup> PPS 5: 179.

<sup>1423</sup> Minton, *Lectures on Unitarianism*, 239.

<sup>1424</sup> PPS 5: 135.

<sup>1425</sup> JHN, “Many Called, Few Chosen,” PPS 5: 254-269, at 258.

<sup>1426</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 102-103.

<sup>1427</sup> *Ibid.*, 103.

<sup>1428</sup> JHN, “Human Responsibility,” PPS 2: 320-332, at 328.

present with him.”<sup>1429</sup> In fact, Newman would not have any problem if one used the term imputation, but remembered that first God needs our cooperation, namely, our “obedience is one with God’s imputation by association;” secondly, God has implanted “in part within us the very thing which in its fulness He imputes to us;” and, lastly, “because our concurrence in being justified is a necessary condition of His justifying.”<sup>1430</sup>

Newman, as mentioned in chapter IV, developed a “theology of Within-ness,”<sup>1431</sup> which could be seen as his answer to the Unitarian notion of being made righteous “not by Christ but *in* Christ,” and to the Evangelical notion of the “two-fold justification” or a “double imputation,” both of which denied human cooperation in salvation. When Newman emphasized human cooperation, it did not mean that the believer could do something good on his own, but Newman wanted to show the salvific work of God both from without and within the human. If the believer could do “what is good,” it is because of God’s grace. God grants us grace not to make us to obey “as instruments merely, but as free agents.” God wants his people “willingly” and “heartily” to obey and believe in him.<sup>1432</sup> To describe the obedience of the Son in his passion, Newman used the term “voluntarily,” which also means “willingly.” Newman, however, in order to highlight the profoundness of the Son’s obedience, added one special term, that is “cheerfully.”<sup>1433</sup>

---

<sup>1429</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1430</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 104.

<sup>1431</sup> Cf. *supra*, 180-191.

<sup>1432</sup> Ibid. 103.

<sup>1433</sup> PPS 3: 148; cf. *supra*, 119.



Newman's view about justification and sanctification was accused of being "Popery." John Cumming (1807-1881), a Scottish clergyman, criticized: "Dr. Newman, ignorantly or designedly, confounds" justification and sanctification.<sup>1434</sup> For Cumming, justification is "Christ's righteousness imputed to us;" sanctification is "the Holy Spirit working within us." "Justification is an *act*, whereby we are made righteous in the sight of God; sanctification is a *work*, whereby we are renewed in the image of God."<sup>1435</sup> Cumming was seemingly separating justification from sanctification; act from work; Christ from Holy Spirit. This was never the case in Newman's sermons. He disagreed with Cumming. Newman always tied—undividedly and inseparately—Christ and the Holy Spirit, justification and sanctification – anything Christ did was always *in* and *through* His Spirit. In Newman's thought, Christology cannot be separated from Pneumatology; and because of this he was criticized for not distinguishing justification from sanctification.

Pusey was also charged along with Newman for stating in a letter to the Bishop of Oxford: "The Anglican Doctrine conceives Justification to be, not imputation merely, but the act of God's imparting his *Divine presence* to the soul through baptism."<sup>1436</sup> At this time,

---

<sup>1434</sup> John Cumming, *Lectures on Romanism: Being Illustrations and Refutations of the Errors of Romanism and Tractarianism* (London: John P. Jewett and Company, 1854), 102. Newman was criticized for the following statement: "Christ . . . is our Righteousness by dwelling in us by the Spirit; He justifies us by entering into us, He continues to justify us by remaining in us. This is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation, but through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ" (*Lectures on Justification*, 167).

<sup>1435</sup> Cumming, *Lectures on Romanism*, 102.

<sup>1436</sup> Edward Bouverie Pusey, *A letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford* (New York: J. S. Redfield, 1843), 46; italics added. Also see Cumming, *Lectures on Romanism*, 103.

questions were being raised at Oxford such as “what is the Popish error, in regard to justification?” “Is it taught at Oxford?”<sup>1437</sup> These questions purposely targeted Newman and Pusey. Three points should be considered as “Popish errors”: first, “confounding the gifts of justification and sanctification;” then, “making sanctification or personal righteousness the ground of justification;” and the last, “justification is progressive.”<sup>1438</sup> Newman was also in trouble because of this statement: “First, justification is, properly speaking, a *declaration* of righteousness; secondly, it *precedes* renewal; thirdly, it is the *means, instrument, or cause* of renewal.”<sup>1439</sup> Newman’s view was construed “in favour of the at least *tolerably* intelligible Heresy so verbosely laid down by the Council of Trent.”<sup>1440</sup>

What is Popery? Newman answered: “*self-righteousness* is what most men mean by Popery.”<sup>1441</sup> In other words, “Popery says, honestly, that we are justified by faith in baptism, but we are saved by our meritorious living after it.”<sup>1442</sup> James Ingram, a frequent author of *The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review* defended Newman: he was not an “abettor of Popery, and a traitor to the Reformation.”<sup>1443</sup> What Newman proposed, according to the *Critic*, was “the inward presence of Christ in the soul, as the formal cause of our

---

<sup>1437</sup> Arthur Philip Perceval, “*Puseyism*” “*No Popery*,” (Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1843), 22.

<sup>1438</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1439</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 71. Also see Perceval, “*Puseyism*”, 22.

<sup>1440</sup> G. S. Faber, “The Tendency of Mr. Newman’s Essay,” *The Christian’s Monthly Magazine and Universal Review*, vol. V (London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1846), 353-370, at 365.

<sup>1441</sup> JHN to John Keble (Oriel, 4 February 1838), *LD* 6: 195-196, at 196.

<sup>1442</sup> Samuel Charles Wilks, “Tractarianism,” *The Christian Observer*, vol. 42 (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1843): 181-191, at 185. In his discussion about Newman and popery, the author gave the definition of popery.

<sup>1443</sup> James Ingram, “Newman and Faber,” *The British Critic, and Quarterly Theological Review*, vol. XXIII (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838): 82-119, at 116.

justification; under which term he comprises all the gifts and blessings of the renovated state: not only the remission of sins, but also, every thing which is usually contemplated by those, who speak in the loftiest and most vivid terms of the righteousness of sanctification.”<sup>1444</sup> In addition to the accusation that Newman’s theory of justification and sanctification was Popery, there was a rumor that he was a “Papist.”<sup>1445</sup> Newman explained himself in a letter to his sister:

Any one who knew any thing of theology would not have confounded me with the Papists; and, if he gave me any credit for knowledge of theology or for clearheadedness, he would not have thought me in danger of becoming one. True it is, any one who by his own wit had gone as far as I from popular Protestantism, or who had been taught from without, not being up to the differences of things, and trained to discrimination, might have been in danger of going further; but no one who either had learned his doctrine historically, or had tolerable clearness of mind, could be in more danger than of confusing the Sun and the Moon.<sup>1446</sup>

This letter Newman wrote in April 1837. Two years later, Newman, on 22 September 1839, got his “first real hit from Romanism” when he read Dr. Wiseman’s article on Augustine and the Donatists in the *Dublin Review*. Newman wrote to Frederic Rogers: “I must confess it has given me a stomach-ache. You see the whole history of the Monophysites has been a sort of alterative, and now comes this dose at the end of it. It does certainly come upon one that we are not at the bottom of things.”<sup>1447</sup>

---

<sup>1444</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1445</sup> Walter Walsh, *The History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England 1833-1864* (London: James Nisbet, 1900), 39.

<sup>1446</sup> JHN to Mrs. John Mozley (St. Mark’s, 25 April 1837), *LD* 6: 61.

<sup>1447</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel College, 22 September 1839), *LD* 7: 154-155, at 154.

## 2. Journey to the Roman Catholic Church

The Roman Catholic Church haunted Newman; on 10 November 1839, he wrote to Robert William:

I really believe I say truly that, did I see cause to suspect that the Roman Church was in the right, I would try not to be unfaithful to the light given me. And if at any future time, I have any view opened to me, I will try not to turn from it, but will pursue it, wherever it may lead. I am not aware of having any hindrance, whether from fear of clamour, or regard for consistency, or even love of friends, which could keep me from joining the Church of Rome, were I persuaded I ought to do so . . . . By impulses short of divine truth, I think I should never make up my mind to any overt act towards Rome, without giving up two or three years as a time of religious preparation towards forming a judgment.<sup>1448</sup>

While Newman had questions about the Church of Rome, he acknowledged more clearly “a schism in the Church” of England: “Our Church is not at one with itself--there is no denying it. We have an heretical spirit in us. Whether it can be cast out, without ‘tearing’ and destroying the Church itself, is quite beyond me.”<sup>1449</sup> Newman, in his letters of 1840, made a brief summary of some heretical schools in the Church of England:

Socinianism is quite a legitimate consequence of the principles on which the multitude of Protestants read Scripture, though happily religious feeling or the bias of education keeps them from going on to it . . . . The faulty principle I chiefly allude to is expressed in the words “This text need not mean more than so and so.” An inquirer does not honestly throw his mind upon the question “What in matter of fact did the inspired writer mean?” but, taking it for granted he wrote with mathematical exactness, he refuses to believe till texts are brought which cannot possibly be interpreted except in an orthodox way.<sup>1450</sup>

---

<sup>1448</sup> JHN to Robert William (Oriel College, 10 November 1839), *LD* 7: 180-181, at 180.

<sup>1449</sup> JHN to Mrs. John Mozley (Oriel College, 17 November 1839), *LD* 7: 182-184, at 183.

<sup>1450</sup> JHN to Lord Adare (Oriel College, 28 September 1840), *LD* 7: 396-398, at 396.

Latitudinarianism is an unnatural state; the mind cannot long rest in it; and especially if the fact of a revelation be granted, it is most extravagant and revolting to our reason to suppose that after all its message is not ascertainable and that the divine interposition reveals nothing.<sup>1451</sup>

It is for God to judge whether a Unitarian is wicked in rejecting truths now revealed . . . “I regard the Unitarian controversy as a singularly difficult one”. . . “The Unitarian rests on the Old Testament [,] on the first three gospels and the Acts; as also on reason and the necessities of sound logic; and his opponent rests on the exordium of the 4th gospel, on the Epistles of Paul, and perhaps on Church decisions.” The Trinitarian admits all that the Unitarian affirms, from the Old Testament etc. <(that Christ is man)>; the Unitarian does not admit what the Trinitarian affirms from St John etc (that Christ is God.) Thus the Trinitarian takes the whole of Scripture, as it stands, whereas the Unitarian makes the doctrine of one part the rule of interpreting, and the reason for not literally interpreting, the other part; which is unfair unless what are obvious senses of this and that portion respectively be inconsistent with each other. Thus the Unitarian does not argue from Scripture, but from the assumption that “He who is literally and wholly man, cannot be literally and wholly God.” This may be right or wrong, but it is not an argument from Scripture.<sup>1452</sup>

These quotations suggest that Newman found the Church of England of his day difficult and confusing. In a letter to a friend, he frankly declared: “For what we know, Liberalism, rationalism, is the foe at our doors. St Mary’s pulpit may be given me against an enemy which may appear tomorrow. I am more certain that Protestantism leads to infidelity than that my own views lead to Rome.”<sup>1453</sup> Newman, in his last years as an Anglican, was greatly concerned about the situation of the Church of England. He wondered whether all the works of the Tractarians could rescue the Church: “We don’t know yet what the English Church will bear of infused Catholic truth. We are, as it were, proving cannon. I know that

---

<sup>1451</sup> JHN to F. W. Newman (22 October 1840), *LD* 7: 412-415, at 412-413.

<sup>1452</sup> *Ibid.*, 413.

<sup>1453</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel, 25 November 1840), *LD* 7: 448-452, at, 450.

there is a danger of bursting; but still, one has no right to assume that our Church will not stand the test.”<sup>1454</sup>

For Newman, the Church of England was “a true branch of the Church,” but “a branch in schism.”<sup>1455</sup> For “the English Church is showing herself intrinsically and radically alien from Catholic principles,” so even Newman came to feel “difficulties in defending her claims to be a branch of the Catholic Church.”<sup>1456</sup>

We are suffering dreadfully (so are the Romanists [[Romans]]), and that we are wrong in our separation, I do not doubt. It is quite consistent to say that I think Rome the *centre* of unity, and yet not to say that she is infallible, when she is by herself. Now this is a long prose, and I don’t know if you will understand it. The upshot is, whether I continue so or not, that I am much more comfortable than I have been. I do not fear at all any number of persons as likely to go to Rome, if I am secure about myself. If I can trust myself, I can trust others. We have so many things on our side, that a good conscience is all that one wants.<sup>1457</sup>

There was a two-fold recognition in Newman’s mind and heart: first, the schism of the Church of England and second, the truth of the Church of Rome. Newman was at a crossroads; he had to make a choice. The words of Augustine – “*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*”<sup>1458</sup> – provided Newman with “a meaning that appealed to his inmost conscience.” It called him to “a duty to join the Church of Rome” and to “abandon the *Via Media*.”<sup>1459</sup> As Newman wrote later in his *Apologia*, “By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting

---

<sup>1454</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1455</sup> JHN to Robert Francis Wilson (Littlemore, 24 April 1845), *LD* 10: 636-637, at 636.

<sup>1456</sup> JHN to H. E. Manning (Oriel College, 14 October 1843), *LD* 9: 573-574, at 574.

<sup>1457</sup> JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel, 25 November 1840), *LD* 7: 450-451.

<sup>1458</sup> Cf. *supra*, 35-36.

<sup>1459</sup> Allen Freer, “Newman on Development,” *The North British Review*, vol. V (Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy, 1846), 418-453, at 421.

and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverized.”<sup>1460</sup>

Henry Wilberforce later recalled that it was in the beginning of October, 1839, that Newman made “the astounding confidence,” mentioning the two subjects with which he was concerned: “The position of St Leo in the Monophysite controversy, and the principle, “*securus judicat orbis terrarum*” in that of the Donatists.”<sup>1461</sup> Newman confessed: “I cannot conceal from myself, that for the first time since I began the study of theology, a vista has been opened before me, to the end of which I do not see.”<sup>1462</sup> He was walking in the “New Forest.”<sup>1463</sup> There was a “fear [that] came like a thunderstroke” upon his friends, and they said that Newman “might die rather than take such a step.” Newman—presumably dreading the possibility of his becoming a Roman Catholic—asked his friends to pray that “if ever the time should come when he was in serious danger” and “if it was not indeed the will of God, he might be taken away before he did it.”<sup>1464</sup>

In the midst of his worries about the Roman Church and the English Church, the storm of *Tract 90* came. Newman was in serious trouble. There was protest as well as support. The tract was regarded as “a highly dangerous tendency,” for it suggested that “certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England,” such as the doctrines of “Purgatory,” “Pardons,” “the Worshipping and Adoration

---

<sup>1460</sup> JHN, *Apologia*, 212.

<sup>1461</sup> Note 1 in *LD* 7: 161.

<sup>1462</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1463</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1464</sup> *Ibid.*

of Images and Relics,” “the Invocation of Saints,” “the Mass.”<sup>1465</sup> J. W. Bowden told

Newman frankly,

One thing, (candidly) I do *not* like in the tract is its vagueness – it does not clearly tell us what you *do* mean – what you really wish to say, and *what not*. – The impression on reading it is that “all which Rome teaches, authoritatively, might be taught under our articles – and that the more in all points we expound those articles in conformity with her authoritative teaching, the more catholic we make them.” Now it seems to me that the great error of Rome has been that she has made (so to speak) all her teaching authoritative.<sup>1466</sup>

Pusey offered an explanation on Newman’s behalf:

His feelings were these; our Church has condemned nothing Catholic, but only Romish errors; yet there are certain opinions and practices, more or less prevailing in Catholic antiquity, having some relation to the later Romish error, which might seem to be condemned by our Articles, as they are often popularly understood.<sup>1467</sup>

W. F. Hook sent to Newman his “most cordial sympathy” in this “painful Crisis,” but also unhesitatingly pointed out to Newman: “I do not like your *seeming* to assert that High Churchmen generally have found a difficulty in holding Catholic Principles consistently with a subscription to the Articles: I do not like your asserting that our Reformers were uncatholic.”<sup>1468</sup> Arnold, however, attempted to understand Newman, “I am extremely glad that the Tract has been so noticed; yet it is to me far more objectionable morally than

---

<sup>1465</sup> From T. T. Churton and Others to the Editor of the ‘Tracts for the Times’ (Oxford, 8 March 1841), *LD* 8: 59-60, at 59.

<sup>1466</sup> From J. W. Bowden (Roehampton, 15 March 1841), *LD* 8, Gerard Tracy, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999): 70-71, at 71.

<sup>1467</sup> From E. B. Pusey to Philip Wynter (Christ Church, 12 March 1841), *LD* 8: 73-74, at 73.

<sup>1468</sup> From W. F. Hook (Vicarage Leeds, 17 March 1841), *LD* 8: 98.



theologically.”<sup>1469</sup> William Palmer, who valued highly the Tract, expressed his “gratification” to Newman:

While I should hesitate to commit myself to every statement contained in it, I have no hesitation in expressing an opinion that it is the *most valuable* of the series of Tracts that has come under my observation. It will tend to shake people out of their implicit reception of *traditional interpretations* which impose human opinions as little less than articles of faith. It will lead to a really *critical* system of interpreting the Articles, and will ultimately produce more union on the articles of *Catholic faith*, and more toleration of *opinions*, which have been at all times tolerated in the Universal Church.<sup>1470</sup>

Robert Belaney recognized the significant role of the Tract in the revival of the Church.

I have on more than one occasion expressed my gratitude for the benefit of your writings ... I feel it no more than due to truth . . . I must say my astonishment was never greater than when I got to the concluding words. . . . I could not detect a single statement which could be found fault with. I am rejoiced with the Tract . . . You have, I think, broken the chain which bound the Christian community to a deadly and deadening system – a system as remote from that which has been preserved to us in the Liturgy, as truth is from its counterfeit.<sup>1471</sup>

Nutcombe Oxenham was also a strong support to Newman,

I *fully* share in your surprise at the outcry. I cannot see any danger in it, except that which always may result from a *misunderstanding*: and it does seem to me a very useful and a very satisfactory Tract.<sup>1472</sup>

Newman realized very clearly the situation in which he was. Although Newman was supported by his friends, he recognized that he had “got into what may prove a serious mess.”<sup>1473</sup> He told Thomas Mozley, “I think people are sick of the subject, and will in

---

<sup>1469</sup> Note 3 in *LD* 8: 103.

<sup>1470</sup> From William Palmer (St Giles’s Tuesday, 9 March 1841), *LD* 8: 63.

<sup>1471</sup> Note 1 in *LD* 8: 147.

<sup>1472</sup> Note 2 in *LD* 8: 152.

<sup>1473</sup> JHN to Mrs. T. Mozley (9 March 1841), *LD* 8: 61.

weariness let us rest. They have cried wolf till they have no voice.”<sup>1474</sup> The Tract for Newman “was necessary to keep people either from Rome or schism or an uncomfortable conscience.” Nevertheless, Newman said, “people *did not know* me”; and he himself “really cannot repent of having done it.”<sup>1475</sup> He knew that he had to “prepare” himself “for the worst.” Yet he said, “I am as quiet and happy as I could wish.”<sup>1476</sup> He knew that “no one can enter into my situation but myself.”<sup>1477</sup> However, he was looking for peace.

He preached on “Peace in Believing.” He used the text, “Keep innocency, and take heed to the thing that is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last.”<sup>1478</sup> This text was from the *Book of Common Prayer*, talking about the righteous man, that his mouth “is exercised in wisdom, and his tongue will be talking of judgment,” that he “shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever.”<sup>1479</sup> Newman also used this text in his sermon “The Fellowship of the Apostles”:

Let us conquer by meekness, gentleness, forbearance, and perseverance. When the voice of error and strife is loud, let us keep silence; let us not be unwilling to be triumphed over as blind and prejudiced persons, as bigots, or as fanatics, or as zealots, or to be called any other hard names by the world. . . . God will avenge us in His own way and at His own time. The weak shall be strong, and the despised shall become honourable. “He shall make our righteousness as clear as the light, and our just dealing as the noon-day.”<sup>1480</sup>

---

<sup>1474</sup> JHN to Thomas Mozley (Oriental, 7 March 1841), *LD* 8: 57-58, at 58.

<sup>1475</sup> JHN to A. P. Perceval (Oriental, 12 March 1841), *LD* 8: 68-69, at 68.

<sup>1476</sup> JHN to Mrs. Mozley (15 March 1841), *LD* 8: 90.

<sup>1477</sup> JHN to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford (Oriental College, 20 March 1841), *LD* 8: 100-101, at 100.

<sup>1478</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1479</sup> The Church of England, *The Book of Common Prayer* (New York: New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, 1844), 170.

<sup>1480</sup> JHN, “The Fellowship of the Apostles,” *PPS* 6: 190-206, at 206.

Newman was apparently talking about his own situation. He believed that “truth can fight its own battle. It has a reality in it, which shivers to pieces swords of earth. As far as we are not on the side of truth, we shall shiver to bits, and I am willing it should be so.”<sup>1481</sup> In this battle, with his “own conviction,” Newman realized that “the Roman Catholic Communion [is] the Church of the Apostles”; as he wrote to John Keble:

I am very far more sure that England is in schism, than that the Roman additions to the Primitive Creed may not be developments, arising out of a keen and vivid realizing of the Divine Depositum of faith.<sup>1482</sup>

Newman also acknowledged that “the pope had a certain gift of infallibility, and that communion with the see of Rome was the divinely intended means of grace and illumination.”<sup>1483</sup> Newman believed that “truth was on that side.” There was no doubt at all that he was “approximating towards Rome.”<sup>1484</sup> He confessed: “I am not a good son enough of the Church of England,” and “I love the Church of Rome too well.”<sup>1485</sup> However, the decision to go to Rome was not easy. From “near four years ago,” namely from the June and July 1839 when Newman read about the Monophysite controversy,<sup>1486</sup> he prayed and asked his “friends to pray” for him as well, so that he “might die rather than go, if going were wrong.”<sup>1487</sup>

---

<sup>1481</sup> JHN to Rober Belaney (Oriol College, 25 January 1841), *LD* 8: 23-24, at 23.

<sup>1482</sup> JHN to John Keble (Littlemore, Thursday, 4 May 1843), *LD* 9: 327-329, at 328.

<sup>1483</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1484</sup> JHN to Mrs. William Froude (Littlemore, 28 July 1843), *LD* 9: 444-446, at 444.

<sup>1485</sup> JHN to James B. Mozley (Littlemore, 1 September 1843), *LD* 9: 493-494, at 494.

<sup>1486</sup> JHN to John Keble (Littlemore, Thursday, 4 May 1843), *LD* 9: 328.

<sup>1487</sup> JHN to Frederick William Faber (Littlemore, 2 September 1843), *LD* 9: 496-498, at 497.

Leaving the Church of England was hard for Newman. He felt “the pain which is being inflicted on all sides,” “which has made my heart ache and has drawn sighs from me in a way which (I think) nothing has before.”<sup>1488</sup> Newman felt “haunted by the one dreadful whisper repeated from so many quarters, and causing the keenest distress to friends.”<sup>1489</sup> One year later, in 1844, this pain was still with Newman: “The pain I suffer from the thought of the distress I am causing cannot be described . . . and at this moment my heart literally aches and has for days.”<sup>1490</sup>

I have gone through a great deal of pain, and have been very much cut up. The one predominant distress upon me has been the unsettlement of mind I am causing. This is a thing that has haunted me day by day – and for some days I had a literal pain in and about my heart . . . Besides the pain of unsettling people, of course I feel the loss I am undergoing in the good opinion of friends and well wishers – though I can’t tell how much I feel this. It is the shock, surprise, terror, forlornness, disgust, skepticism, to which I am giving rise – the differences of opinion – division of families – all this makes my heart ache.<sup>1491</sup>

Newman felt “like a guilty person with others”<sup>1492</sup> for his leaving. He confessed to a friend: “I deserve for my sins, I seem to take comfort to myself that I have not made my circumstances. This is what I keep saying to myself while I sigh ‘I did not make my circumstances.’”<sup>1493</sup> What Newman was undergoing could be seen as the “agony of truth.” This profound and painful experience helps us to understand why Newman’s last sermons,

---

<sup>1488</sup> JHN to J. D. Dalgairns (Littlemore, 31 October 1843), *LD* 9: 596-597, at 596.

<sup>1489</sup> JHN to H. E. Manning (Littlemore, 31 October 1843), *LD* 9: 598-599, at 598.

<sup>1490</sup> JHN to Mrs. William Froude (Littlemore, 12 November 1844), *LD* 10: 399-340, at 399.

<sup>1491</sup> JHN to Mrs. John Mozley (Littlemore, 24 November 1844), *LD* 10: 433-435, at 434-435.

<sup>1492</sup> JHN to John William Bowden (Littlemore, 21 February 1844), *LD* 10: 129-130, at 129.

<sup>1493</sup> JHN to J. D. Dalgairns (Littlemore, 31 October 1843), *LD* 9: 596-597, at 596.

entitled “Crucifixion” and “The Shepherd of Our Souls,” were so powerful and moving.

Although he had to undergo great sufferings in heart and soul, “nothing” could keep him from “surrendering” his heart “to the truth,” “to the authority of the Church of Rome.”<sup>1494</sup>

Newman shared with Keble what amounts to a summary of his journey to Rome:

I have had a strong feeling, often rising to an habitual conviction, though in the early portion of it after a while dormant, but very active now for two years and a half, and growing more urgent and imperative continually, that the Roman Communion is the only true Church – And this conviction came upon me while I was reading the Fathers and from the Fathers – and when I was reading them theologically, not ecclesiastically, in that particular line of study, that of the ancient heresies, to which circumstances, external to myself, had led me fourteen years ago, before the movement began . . . The time for argument is passed. I have been in one settled conviction for so long a time, which every new thought seems to strengthen . . . I really do not think my conviction is a bit shaken. So then I end as I began.<sup>1495</sup>

It was not *Tract 90* or the condemnations of the Bishops that led Newman to Rome. It was the Fathers of the Church, who step by step guided Newman; it was the truth shedding its light, in the “will of Providence,” that led Newman to the Roman Catholic Church, “the One and Only Fold of the Redeemer, the Church of St. Athanasius.”<sup>1496</sup> On 9 October 1845, Newman was received into that “One only Fold of Christ,” by Father Dominic, a Passionist.<sup>1497</sup> At last, Newman could experience “rest and peace.”

---

<sup>1494</sup> JHN to Mrs. William Froude (Littlemore, 3 April 1844), *LD* 10: 185-187, at 187.

<sup>1495</sup> JHN to John Keble (Littlemore, 8 June 1844), *LD* 10: 259-263, at 261-262.

<sup>1496</sup> JHN to R. F. Wilson (Littlemore, 8 October 1845), *LD* 11: 10-11, at 11.

<sup>1497</sup> JHN to William Dodsworth (Littlemore, 9 October 1845) *LD* 11: 12-13, at 12.

### Conclusion

This chapter is not a theological investigation but rather a historical examination, which has attempted to re-create the “environment” of Newman’s decade in the Oxford Movement. The main material, *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, together with other works, have shown us the battlefield where Newman and the Tractarians used every means available in order to protect the Church of England from “Liberalism.” Newman had to face many opponents: Dissenters, Socinians, Unitarians, Latitudinarians, Antinomians, Evangelicals, et al. But for Newman, they were not much different, for “the heretical spirit is ever one and the same in its various forms.”<sup>1498</sup> Newman, on the one hand, considered them as “dangers” that could harm and corrupt the Church; on the other hand, he called them an “external stimulus” that helped him to deepen and develop fundamental doctrines – such as those of the Trinity and the Incarnation – which strengthened the faith of the people and rejuvenated the teachings of the Church.

What Newman really wanted was to protect the Church of England from the “faded splendour, tawdriness, squalidness” of “the fashion of the day.”<sup>1499</sup> This kind of “religious fashion of the day” gave Newman “exceptional advantages to turn to account his lucid and earnest fervor.”<sup>1500</sup> Newman used all those “advantages with an impressiveness” together with his “personal character transparently sincere and devoted” in order to implant “into the

---

<sup>1498</sup> JHN, *Arians*, 139.

<sup>1499</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Catholicism in England* (London: Birmingham, 1851), 240.

<sup>1500</sup> Henry Hayman, “Cardinal Newman: A Tribute from the Anglican Standpoint,” *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. XLVIII, G. Frederick Wright, G. Ballantine, eds. (Oberlin, Ohio: E. J. Goodrich, 1891): 144-170, at 165; hereafter cited: Hayman, “Cardinal Newman.”

hearts and minds” of his people a steadfast faith in God the Trinity and in the mystery of the Incarnation in the economy of salvation.<sup>1501</sup>

Newman’s sermons and writings were his direct, clear and sharp response to the erroneous theories and teachings of the Liberals. The most effective characteristic of Newman’s arguments is that he never generalized or wandered around, but went straight to the main points. His arguments were very concrete and concise, such as the explanation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as being “not proposed in Scripture as a mystery” in reply to the term “inexplicable mystery” of the Dissenters; taking Matthew 28:19 as the starting point of Trinitarian theology in response to the arguments in *Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters*; interpretation of the term “person” as the answer to the Sabellianism of Richard Whately; picturing Nicodemus not as a “typical Rationalist” but as a “true follower of Christ” against the Latitudinarians.<sup>1502</sup> He particularly defined the terms “First-born” and “Only-begotten” in order to correct the errors of the Socinians and Unitarians.<sup>1503</sup> He emphasized the personhood of the Holy Trinity as countering the Socinian confusion of identifying the Holy Spirit with the Father.<sup>1504</sup> He clarified the term “Son of God” in answer to Burnet, and used particular titles signifying the full divinity of Christ in reaction to Hampden and Blanco White’s rejection of Christ’s Godhead.<sup>1505</sup> For the term “instrument,” Newman gave a new interpretation in order to avoid the Unitarian notion of the

---

<sup>1501</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1502</sup> Cf. *supra*, 233-234; 237-240; 242-243.

<sup>1503</sup> Cf. *supra*, 249.

<sup>1504</sup> Cf. *supra*, 250-252.

<sup>1505</sup> Cf. *supra*, 261; 264-269.

Son's "passive obedience."<sup>1506</sup> He chose the term "Christ in us" in arguments with Calvinists and Evangelicals on justification and sanctification and declared "Christ is God" as the Catholic profession to all the Liberals.<sup>1507</sup>

In each of Newman's sermons, one can see how he often chose one or two main points to focus on and develop for the purpose of correcting or attacking the teachings of Liberalism. Newman never said something in his sermons or writings without a reason: before a "what" he was going to say, there had been a "why" which concerned or worried him. Hopefully, this chapter explaining the "why" will help us to understand more the "what" that Newman wrote and developed in his sermons. Newman of the nineteenth century indeed was not all that different from the Fathers of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. If the heresies in the early Church were the reasons for the Fathers to write, develop and protect the essential doctrines of the Church such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc., then even a thousand years later there were still other "various forms" of heresies which stimulated Newman to preach, write, and safeguard the treasure that he had received from the Fathers. Accordingly, it does not seem exaggerated at all to call Newman "the Father of the nineteenth century"—for his style in response to the opponents was "so classical" and "so wholly unpedantic," and his writings "exhale[d] the aroma of their influence at every pore,"<sup>1508</sup> but over all he was the man of truth and the zealous defender of the Catholic Church.

---

<sup>1506</sup> Cf. *supra*, 271-276.

<sup>1507</sup> Cf. *supra*, 306-309; 138-139; 274; 278; 315.

<sup>1508</sup> Hayman, "Cardinal Newman," 166.



**CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION**  
**NEWMAN'S TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY**  
**IN HIS *PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS*: 1833-1843**

One might conclude that Newman's Trinitarian theology in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons* is unsystematic. In fact, his Trinitarian theology was expressed in the "form" of sermons, which were intended to be "messages of faith" rather than theological treatises. However, Newman, in defending the 39 Articles of the Church of England, early in 1831, planned to write a systematic theology of the doctrine of the Trinity, Incarnation, grace etc.; what resulted was his book *The Arians of the Fourth Century*.<sup>1509</sup> Rather, in attempting a revival of Catholic teachings against the growth of various anti-dogmatic schools in the Church of England, Newman actually developed a Trinitarian theology through his sermons: from the immanent Trinity to the economic Trinity to a Trinitarian theology of Rest and Peace.

If one takes one sermon of Newman and reads it in isolation, it may bring something profound and spiritual to the reader, but it is still a sermon, not a theology. However, if one puts the *content* of all his sermons within their *context*, a more complete portrait emerges. For example, small pieces of colored stone or glass may look very pretty in isolation; however, their real beauty comes only when they are set together by an artist to form a mosaic. Similarly, Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* together create a beautiful mosaic of the

---

<sup>1509</sup> JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriel College, 28 March 1831), *LD* 2: 321-322; also JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriel College, 24 August 1831), *LD* 2: 352-353.

Holy Trinity. Chapters II, III and IV presented an analysis of the content of the mosaic; chapter V presented the context of why and how the mosaic was formed; this last chapter first will summarize the whole process of development of Newman's Trinitarian theology in the context of his life, and then seek for some suggestions for both modern Trinitarian theology and ecumenical dialogue.

### 1. An Overview of Newman's Trinitarian Theology

How did Newman's Trinitarian theology develop? First, its development was stimulated by an anti-dogmatic tendency. It was a result of the battle against rational Liberalism. The year that marked a turning point of Newman's theology was 1829, the year when "came the formal break" with Richard Whately.<sup>1510</sup> Newman, in a letter to Whately in November 1834, frankly said,

I cannot doubt for an instant that you have long been aware in a measure that my opinions differed from your Grace's. You knew it when at Oxford, for you often found me differing from you. You must have felt it, at the time you left Oxford for Dublin. You must have known it from hearsay in consequence of the book [*Arians of the Fourth Century*] I have published. What indeed can account for my want of opportunities to speak to you freely my mind, but the feeling on your part, (which, if existing, is nothing but a just [[fair]] reason,) that my views are different from yours?<sup>1511</sup>

Newman indeed had "discovered" that Whately's opinions, as Newman told him, were "but part of intellectual views so different from your inward mind and character, so peculiar in themselves and (if you will let me add) so dangerous." For a long time Newman thought

---

<sup>1510</sup> *Apologia*, 72.

<sup>1511</sup> JHN to Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin (Oriel, 11 November 1834), *LD* 4: 357-359, at 358.

“them to be but different; for a longer, to be but in parts dangerous.”<sup>1512</sup> He admitted that now “I have so much *changed*.”<sup>1513</sup> Newman’s point of departure from Whately is marked by the sermon “The Christian Mysteries” on Trinity Sunday in 1829, which pointed out that the Holy Trinity is not a mystery to satisfy investigations of reason, but is perceived only by “knowledge through grace” and revealed to everyone, for it is “the mystery of faith.” For Newman, the notion that “*religious light is intellectual darkness*” is a “remarkable principle”<sup>1514</sup> against the “spirit at work” at the time: “Latitudinarianism, indifferentism, republicanism, and schism, a spirit which tends to overthrow doctrine.”<sup>1515</sup> This principle was probably derived from Joseph Butler (1692-1752), whose *The Analogy of Religion* Newman read for the first time in 1825.<sup>1516</sup> In his *Analogy*, Butler spoke of the great doctrines which are taught in the Gospel “with a degree of light; to which that of nature is but darkness.”<sup>1517</sup> In addition, Butler asserted that Christianity contains “an account of a dispensation of things, not discoverable by reason, in consequence of which several distinct precepts are enjoined us.”<sup>1518</sup>

Newman, in fact, in his youth had shown a tendency against rationalism. When he was nineteen years old, he recorded in his journal a dream in which a spirit came to him and

---

<sup>1512</sup> Ibid., 359.

<sup>1513</sup> Ibid., 358.

<sup>1514</sup> *PPS* 1: 211.

<sup>1515</sup> JHN to Mrs. Newman (13 March 1829), *LD* 2: 129-131, at 129-130.

<sup>1516</sup> Edward Sillem, ed., *The Philosophical Notebook of John Henry Newman*, vol. I (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1969), 170.

<sup>1517</sup> Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, 20<sup>th</sup> edition (New York: Newman and Ivison, 1853), 143.

<sup>1518</sup> Ibid., 145.

talked with him about the other world: “It was absolutely impossible for the reason of man to understand the mystery (I think) of the Holy Trinity, and in vain to argue about it; but . . . every thing in another world was so very, very plain, . . . there was not the slightest difficulty about it.”<sup>1519</sup> This dream of Newman echoes the legend of Augustine with the child on the seashore of Hippo.<sup>1520</sup> The content of Augustine’s conversation with the angel is not different from that of Newman in his dream – emptying the sea into a little hole is not more impossible than for human finite reason to comprehend the mystery of the Trinity. Decades later in 1880, in a visit to Oxford, he once again emphasized his great concern about rationalism:

The Sun, they knew, was the cause of all good to them; the sun was the source of heat, light and growth; and of all they were in a certain sense. They could not look at it. If they attempted to look at it they were blinded, and so it was in respect to that great mystery of the Holy Trinity in Unity. They could take it as presented to them. If they attempted to decide upon the point; if they attempted by their own skill and wit to come to a conclusion about it, other or beyond what Almighty God had told them by Revelation, they were as if they blinded themselves. That blindness was what they meant by heresy . . . . They blinded themselves because they attempted what was beyond human reason.<sup>1521</sup>

Although the “the Holy Trinity in Unity” is “beyond human reason,” a believer should not take it as an “inexplicable mystery” and a “chief stumbling block” in the sense of the Dissenters. For those who believed, it was revealed by Jesus Christ the Word incarnate, the full manifestation of God. It is in Him that a believer enters into a relationship with God, for God is a *relational being*. The term “relationship” indeed plays a key role in Newman’s Trinitarian theology. It expresses both the immanent life of God and the economy of

---

<sup>1519</sup> A note in *LD* 1: 108.

<sup>1520</sup> Edward Lewes Cutts, *Saint Augustine* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1888), 183.

<sup>1521</sup> JHN, *Sayings of Cardinal Newman* (London: Burns & Oates, 1890), 55.

salvation. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are always in an undivided and inseparable relationship with one another. That relationship was revealed splendidly in the Incarnation; God's salvation for all humanity is none other than participation in this relationship with God so that all might become "partakers of the divine nature."

Newman, in his sermon "The Mystery of the Holy Trinity" (1831), highlighted the immanent life of the Trinity. Newman took the *relationship* of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as his starting point as well as the frame of his Trinitarian theology. He analyzed and emphasized the "personhood" of each divine person, relational and distinct, communion and otherness. This sermon was a direct answer to Whately, whose misunderstanding of the term "person" led to a Sabellian view of the Trinity, as well as a reply to the *Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters*.

In 1831, Newman emphasized the immanent Trinity – the term "person"; the unbreakable and inseparable relationship of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; the primacy of the Father in the Godhead; communion and distinctness in God. In 1833—the year of the birth of the Oxford Movement<sup>1522</sup>—Newman, elaborated specific definitions and doctrines such as the divine *genesis*, *ousia* and *hypostasis*, *coinherence* and *monarchia*. Since the purpose of the Oxford Movement was to "withstand the Liberalism of the day,"<sup>1523</sup> Newman's first principle in that battle was dogma—the defense of "fundamental doctrines"—particularly

---

<sup>1522</sup> Walter Walsh, *The History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England 1833-1864* (London: James Nisbet, 1900), 18.

<sup>1523</sup> JHN, *Apologia*, 195.

the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>1524</sup> Simultaneously, his *The Arians of the Fourth Century* was in opposition to the anti-dogmatic and anti-creedal tendency of the day; in fact, his *Arians* was quoted in many works and discussions on the doctrine of the Trinity at the time.<sup>1525</sup>

At the end of 1834, Newman considered the economic Trinity with a Pneumatological ground for his Trinitarian theology and with Christology at its very center. Newman envisioned the Incarnation of the eternal Word as the revelation of *theologia* in *oikonomia*. In 1835 and 1836, Newman developed this theological point apparently in response to Hampden and Blanco White at a time when “Nestorianism [was] preached in every other pulpit.”<sup>1526</sup> Christ’s full divinity, thus, became the “key” of all arguments as well as solutions. Socinians, Unitarians and Latitudinarians rejected the doctrine that “Christ is God”, and thus denied the doctrine of the Trinity and the Athanasian Creed. Newman, on the contrary, maintained that “Christ is God” in order first to safeguard the doctrine of the holy Trinity, and second to present the economy as the work of the Trinity.

First, in the inseparable and undivided relationship of Christ and the Father, Newman saw that the Son whether he was in heaven or on earth, in the divine immanent life or in the economic history, in the bosom of the Father or in flesh suffering in the passion, in eternity or in time, was always in and one with the Father. His relationship with the Father “remained

---

<sup>1524</sup> Ibid., 120.

<sup>1525</sup> See Hugh H. Stannus, *A History of the Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Christian Church* (London: Christian Life Publishing Company, 1882), 14; Joseph Pohle, *The Divine Trinity – A Dogmatic Treatise* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1912), 146-147; S. Cheetham, *A History of the Christian Church during the First Six Century* (London: Macmillan, 1894), 256.

<sup>1526</sup> JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (London, 18 January 1835), *LD* 5: 9-11, at 10.

unaltered,” for He was “still performing the will of the Father;” for “He was a Son both before His Incarnation, and, by a second mystery, after it;”<sup>1527</sup> for “God is not solitary.”<sup>1528</sup>

Similarly, Augustine could not accept the notion of “the Father alone, or the Son alone”; he insisted: “Both the Father is with the Son, and the Son is with the Father, always and inseparably.”<sup>1529</sup> In addition, Augustine stated, “The Father always was, the Son always from the Father . . . therefore the Son was always born;”<sup>1530</sup> and when the hour came (the passion), “the Father was with Him, and He with the Father; the Father in Him, and He in the Father; He and the Father were one.”<sup>1531</sup>

Second, Newman insisted on the indivisible and interdependent relationship of Christ and his Spirit: “*His Spirit*” was a favorite term of Newman in his sermons. Only once did Newman speak of the Spirit separately, when mentioning that the Holy Spirit “proceedeth from the Father.”<sup>1532</sup> But Newman immediately added that “the Spirit of God” is “the Spirit of Christ;” He came to us “from and instead of Christ;”<sup>1533</sup> and Christ came to us “in the person of His Spirit.”<sup>1534</sup> He made “Christ present with us,” and also made “us present with

---

<sup>1527</sup> PPS 6: 58-9.

<sup>1528</sup> PPS 3: 162.

<sup>1529</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity*, VI: 7, in Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. III (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 18877): 101.

<sup>1530</sup> Augustine, *Sermon LXVII*, 12, Members of the English Church, trans., *A Library of the Fathers*, vol. II (Oxford: James Parker and Rivingtons, 1875): 497.

<sup>1531</sup> Augustine, *Psalm CXXXIX*, 22, Members of the English Church, trans., *A Library of the Fathers*, vol. VI – Expositions on the Book of Psalms, 126-150 (Oxford: James Parker and Rivingtons, 1857): 212.

<sup>1532</sup> PPS 6: 359.

<sup>1533</sup> PPS 2: 220.

<sup>1534</sup> PPS 4: 169.

Christ.”<sup>1535</sup> “It is *by* the Holy Ghost that this gracious communion is effected.”<sup>1536</sup> And only “through the Holy Ghost we have communion with Father and Son.”<sup>1537</sup> Athanasius said the same, “The Spirit indeed is inseparable from the Word. So when the Lord says, ‘I and the Father will come’ (Jn. 14:23) the Spirit also comes with them and dwells in us no differently than the Son.”<sup>1538</sup> While the content of Athanasius and Newman’s statements were seemingly no different, Newman’s terminology was more emphatic and particular. The phrase “in the person of His Spirit” at least signifies three highlighted points of Newman: first, the Spirit is a *person* distinct from Christ; second, the Spirit is *of* Christ; and third, Christ is *in* the Spirit.

In the economy, Newman envisaged the Son and the Holy Spirit as always together from the moment of the Annunciation to the fulfillment of salvation. The whole “Glorious Dispensation”<sup>1539</sup> of God is the undivided work of Christ and His Spirit in communion with the Father. In a similar way, Yves Congar asserted that the relationships between the Holy Spirit and Christ are “extremely close in the economy of salvation.”<sup>1540</sup>

He continues to do Jesus’ work, that is, to welcome by faith the one who is sent by the Father to reveal the Father and to keep his words and his commandments. He enables us to bring about the new relationship between Jesus and his own after Jesus has withdrawn his tangible presence from us.<sup>1541</sup>

---

<sup>1535</sup> *PPS* 6: 127.

<sup>1536</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>1537</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>1538</sup> Athanasius, *Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit*, 31, in Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius* (New York: Routledge, 2004): 187.

<sup>1539</sup> *PPS* 3: 254.

<sup>1540</sup> Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. I. David Smith, trans. (II, III) (New York: The Seabury Press, 1983), 56; hereafter cited: Congar, *Holy Spirit*.

<sup>1541</sup> *Ibid.*, I: 56.



Although Newman would presumably have agreed with Congar that the work of the Holy Spirit is the “continuation of the mission of Christ Himself,”<sup>1542</sup> in his sermons, Newman did not use the term “continuation,” since the Holy Spirit has always been with Christ from the moment of his Incarnation in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Moreover, the Holy Spirit is always with the Father and the Son in *theologia* as well as in *oikonomia*. He is the “Eternal Love,” “Divine Glory” within which the Father and the Son are in communion. He is the communion of the Father and the Son. He is person as communion and communion as person; He is glory as communion, and communion as glory. In the immanent life of the Trinity, the Father glorifies the Son, the Son glorifies the Father in the glory of the Holy Spirit; in the economy, particularly the passion, the Father continues to glorify his Son in the “glory which He had with Him before the world was” – the “Divine Glory,” the “Holy Ghost.”<sup>1543</sup> The “act of glorification” is always in the present tense whether in *theologia* or in *oikonomia*. *Oikonomia* is the revelation of what is happening in the *theologia*. In the economy, Newman saw glorification as the act not only of the Father and the Son, but also of the Holy Spirit himself. He is glory, and yet he is the “act of glory” as well. He “came especially to “glorify” Christ; and vouchsafes to be a shining light within the Church and the individual Christian, reflecting the Saviour of the world in all His perfections, all His offices, all His works.”<sup>1544</sup>

---

<sup>1542</sup> Ibid., I: 53.

<sup>1543</sup> *PPS* 2: 38-39.

<sup>1544</sup> Ibid., 227.

Within this view, Newman developed a theology of glorification whose core in the history of salvation was the passion. Similarly, Congar stated that “Jesus’ glorification is closely connected with his Passover and even more closely with his Passion.”<sup>1545</sup> “It was a glory that he, as the only Son, had from the Father (Jn 1:14) by his obedience and his carrying out of his plan.”<sup>1546</sup> Newman’s theology of glorification, as presented in chapter III, was an answer to the Latitudinarians, Dissenters, Socinians, and Unitarians.<sup>1547</sup> Newman’s arguments utilized concrete terms such as “instrument”; “voluntarily” and “cheerfully”; “imputing”; “passive obedience” and “active obedience”; the “Father’s business” and the “Redeemer”; the “wrath of God” and “satisfaction of Christ”; “Atoning Sacrifice” and “Eternal Priest”; “God’s glory without and within us.” The passion was indeed the Trinitarian revelation of glorification. In the mystery of the passion of Christ, we are glorified with and in Christ. Newman particularly emphasized the mystery of *theologia* in *oikonomia* in the term “God the Son, the Sufferer.”<sup>1548</sup> Newman clarified this term as a firm and inseparable relationship of the Son with the Father and the Holy Spirit. That is, the glorification of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the immanent Trinity now is taking place in the *oikonomia*, and the passion is its summit.

In this perspective, Newman, in 1839 and 1840, elaborated his view on what might be called a theology of within-ness. Newman looked at our salvation which does not come from outside of us, but from within us, for the “whole economy in all its parts is ever in us all at

---

<sup>1545</sup> Congar, *Holy Spirit*, 1: 51.

<sup>1546</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1547</sup> Cf. *supra*, 119 ff.

<sup>1548</sup> *PPS* 6: 73.

once”<sup>1549</sup>; for Christ “is our Brother”<sup>1550</sup>; for “Christ [is] in us” such that “God is in you for righteousness, for sanctification, for redemption, through the Spirit of His Son.”<sup>1551</sup> Newman held that God has implanted in each human “the seed of truth,” and in the Incarnation, the Son of God took our nature and “sanctified our nature in Himself,” and then “He communicates it to us.”<sup>1552</sup> In other words, it is the mystery of “God’s becoming man, [so that] men, through brotherhood with Him, might in the end become as gods.”<sup>1553</sup> All took place “in Christ,” and “Christ in us.”

For Newman, the term “Christ in us” does not mean only the presence of Christ. It is “God’s presence or communion” in us: The presence of “Father and Son,” “of the Holy Ghost,” “of Christ the Incarnate Mediator,” “of God through the Spirit,” “of Christ, of His Body and Blood, of His Body in ‘flesh and bones,’ and this through the Spirit.”<sup>1554</sup> In other words, it is “the habitation in us of God the Father, and the Word incarnate through the Holy Ghost.”<sup>1555</sup> In a word, the economic Trinity is always *in* us. Similarly, Congar asserted: “God, as it were, outside himself is God in us – God in his creatures.”<sup>1556</sup> That means,

God is not only in himself, but also in us! He is God not only in heaven, but also on earth! The Holy Spirit, who is the term of the communion of the divine life *intra Deum*, is the principle of this communication of God outside himself and beyond himself.<sup>1557</sup>

---

<sup>1549</sup> *PPS* 5: 139.

<sup>1550</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>1551</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>1552</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>1553</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>1554</sup> JHN, *Lectures on Justification*, 167.

<sup>1555</sup> *Ibid.*, 160.

<sup>1556</sup> Congar, *Holy Spirit*, 3: 150.

<sup>1557</sup> *Ibid.*

Theologians often speak of “God *in se*” and “God *pro nobis*.” However, for Newman and Congar, one might say “God *in se*” and “God *in nobis*,” because “God for us” *is* “God in us.” *Being in* is indeed the everlasting state of God. The divine persons are always *in* one another: the Father in the Son, the Son in the Father, the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit in the Father and the Son. Now in “His Gracious Economy,”<sup>1558</sup> that *being in* is manifested in time and history, that is, God is in us, we are in God, so that God may be all in all.

Congar explained: God “is in us in his activity and the movement by which he directs and inspires history. He is there, in us, above all by the gift that he makes of himself. As Augustine said, God gives us nothing less than himself.”<sup>1559</sup> In other words, the purpose of God in us is to give us Himself. Newman also highlighted this point with the phrase “rest and peace.” “Peace” is God’s “everlasting state,” and “rest” is “His eternal state.”<sup>1560</sup> Moreover, God himself is “Rest and Peace,” for “in giving us peace He does but give Himself.”<sup>1561</sup> And the “whole economy of redemption” came out of the rest-of-God and will end in the rest-of-God.<sup>1562</sup> Thus, to be saved means to be “partakers of Himself,” namely, entering “into our Rest,”<sup>1563</sup> being one with Him.

---

<sup>1558</sup> *PPS* 3: 159.

<sup>1559</sup> Congar, *Holy Spirit*, 3: 150.

<sup>1560</sup> *PPS* 6: 363.

<sup>1561</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1562</sup> *Ibid.*, 363-4.

<sup>1563</sup> *Ibid.*, 369.

Again Congar seems to have resembled Newman on this point by using the notion of “rest” in God, and the idea that we are called to be in that “rest.” Congar portrayed the Holy Trinity:

The Father and the Son are for each other, they are relative to each other. The Spirit is the one in whom they are united, in whom they receive each other, in whom they communicate with one another, and in whom they rest.<sup>1564</sup>

The Spirit is the one who completes all things and who brings a perfection in which we can rest in peace.”<sup>1565</sup>

Newman, from 1829 to 1843, indeed developed his Trinitarian theology from the immanent Trinity to the economic Trinity to a theology of rest and peace. Newman’s Trinitarian theology is very Christological—for Christ the Word-Son incarnate is the key of the whole economy. Newman’s Trinitarian theology is also very Pneumatological—for the Holy Spirit is the communion in the *theologia* as well as in the *oikonomia*. Newman’s Trinitarian theology could be called a “development” because Newman’s thoughts really changed during this time. Newman’s Trinitarian theology also seems to have been a fruit of the dogmatic *ressourcement* of the Oxford Movement, where Newman was the “dominating figure”<sup>1566</sup> in opposing the Liberalism and rationalism of the time.

In fact, Newman’s battle against Liberalism had begun in 1829 before the establishment of the Oxford Movement. However, with the birth of the Movement, Newman’s purpose became sharper and stronger. The Movement indeed opened the

---

<sup>1564</sup> Congar, *Holy Spirit*, 3: 148.

<sup>1565</sup> Ibid., 3: 144.

<sup>1566</sup> Arthur Lyon Cross, *A History of England and Greater Britain* (London: Macmillan, 1919), 1040.

battlefield where Newman and his fellow Tractarians were soldiers. Newman, as “a chief contributor” of the Movement, exercised “a magnetic appeal through his sermons from the pulpit of the University Church.”<sup>1567</sup> As the *Encyclopedia of Religion* of 1917 remarked:

From 1833 to 1843 Newman’s influence was supreme in the Movement, and it was felt not merely through his published writings, but also through his sermons preached in St. Mary’s Oxford, of which he had been vicar since 1828. They have been described by various writers, by none more carefully than by John Campbell Shairp, himself a Presbyterian: “After hearing those sermons you might come away still not believing the tenets peculiar to the High Church system; but you would be harder than most men, if you did not feel more than ever ashamed of coarseness, selfishness, worldliness, if you did not feel the things of faith brought closer to the soul.”<sup>1568</sup>

Similarly, Spencer Walpole described the effect of Newman:

The sweetness of his character, the charm of his style, whether in verse or prose, the earnestness of his mind, the impression which he made on younger men, all contributed to give him an influence which none of his contemporaries enjoyed. It was said of him, in 1837, that “every man of talent who during the last six years has come to Oxford has joined Newman, and when he preaches at St. Mary’s (on every Sunday afternoon) all the men of talent at the university come to hear him. His triumph over the mental empire of Oxford is said to be complete.”<sup>1569</sup>

Dean Church summarized the Oxford Movement in three figures: “Keble had given the inspiration, Froude the impulse, and . . . Newman had taken up the work.” Newman was the man, who “gave the Oxford Movement force and direction.”<sup>1570</sup> He gave the Movement the glory of orthodoxy, “leadership, and coherence, and influence, the form of a party.” He

---

<sup>1567</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1568</sup> S. L. Ollard, “The Oxford Movement,” *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. IX, James Hastings, John Alexander Selbie, eds. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1917): 585-589, at 586-587.

<sup>1569</sup> Spencer Walpole, *The History of Twenty-Five Years: 1876-1880*, vol. IV 1876-1880 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), 212.

<sup>1570</sup> Ibid.

was “the decisive kind, he made opponents and disciples.”<sup>1571</sup> He gave them the orthodox teachings of the Catholic Church on the fundamental doctrines, a beauty of language in sacramental apprehension, a love for the Fathers of the Church.<sup>1572</sup> *The Cambridge Modern History* gave an impressive portrait of Newman’s role in the Movement:

The characteristic features of Tractarians were summed up in its protagonist, John Henry Newman. An acute dialectician, his critical faculty moved in a narrow field; but within the limits of that field it was remorseless. No weak point in his opponent’s armour escaped him: he questioned, suggested, pleaded; he used irony, satire, pathos, with supreme art. As a writer of English prose he stands with Burke; he played on human nature with a master touch. His excessive subtlety, which was moral as well as intellectual, left an impression of disingenuousness: to get at his meaning it was necessary to decipher and unravel, to read behind the letter and between the lines. His knowledge, even judged by the standards of his time, was inadequate, and would not stand comparison with that of Thirlwall and Milman. German research, contemporary science, the actual movement of life – all this was a closed book to him; the world of his experience, if a decorous and an academic, was a thin and restricted, world. The logic of his position eventually led him to Rome.<sup>1573</sup>

However, Newman’s greatest and most significant contribution was the renewal of “a more intelligent grasp and a more courageous expression in the Church of England of the mystery of faith – the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, as well as a devout acceptance and reverent use of the Grace of God given in the Sacraments.”<sup>1574</sup> Concretely his book *The Arians of the Fourth Century* was “highly commended and admired by many who are

---

<sup>1571</sup> Owen Chadwick, ed., *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (California: Stanford University Press, 1961), 46.

<sup>1572</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1573</sup> The Late Lord Acton, A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, Stanley Leathes, eds., *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. XI (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909), 710-711.

<sup>1574</sup> Donaldson, *Five Great Oxford Leaders*, 140.

considered very accurate in their acquaintance with the doctrines” of the Church.<sup>1575</sup> Thanks to Newman’s principle of dogma, he had alerted the Church of England to the dangers of the Dissenters, Socinians, Unitarians, Latitudinarians, Calvinists, Evangelicals, specifically the “school of anti-dogmatic theology” of Whately, Hampden, Blanco White, et al. Thanks to Newman, the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation were “considered the most vital of all” at the time.<sup>1576</sup>

## 2. Newman’s Methodology and Terminology

Newman’s sources were very traditional: Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, and especially the Athanasian Creed. In regard to Scripture, many Unitarians would have agreed with Newman to consider it as the “rule of faith” insofar as they had no other “recognized standard of belief except the Bible.”<sup>1577</sup> In regard to the Athanasian Creed, many Unitarians wanted to “get rid of” it as “a stumbling-block” that should be “removed out of their path.”<sup>1578</sup> For example, the Athanasian Creed, at the time, was considered the “point” to make “the distinction between a Trinitarian and a Unitarian.”<sup>1579</sup> The Unitarians did not need the

---

<sup>1575</sup> Nicholas Patrick Wiseman, *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, vol. I (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1846), 112. Modern scholarship has reappraised Newman’s interpretation of the Arianism; see, for example, Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002).

<sup>1576</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1577</sup> John Wilson, *Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism* (London: Chapman, Brothers, 1846), 6.

<sup>1578</sup> Thomas Murray Gorman, *The Athanasian Creed and Modern Thought* (London: Longmans, Green, 1870), 18.

<sup>1579</sup> John R. Beard, *Reasons Why I Am a Unitarian* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1860), 36.



teachings of the Councils and Fathers. They simply took “no tradition but Scripture.” If one needed tradition, “the New Testament itself is but primitive tradition in another form.”<sup>1580</sup>

In reply, Newman’s sermons had an abundance of biblical quotations. He always chose a biblical sentence or phrase as a theme of a sermon. His sermons began with a quotation from Scripture, and often closed with a psalm or a statement of the epistles. Newman’s sermons used Scripture to prove a point, but always interpreted and clarified it in the light of patristic teachings and the Creed. For Newman, Scripture could not stand alone without Tradition, which helps us to understand the true meaning of Scripture. They are interdependent and the sources of revelation. Newman, in *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, asserted that

the two main sources of Revelation are Scripture and Tradition; that these constitute one Rule of Faith, and that, sometimes as a composite rule, sometimes as a double and co-ordinate, sometimes as an alternative, under the *magisterium*, of course, of the Church, and without an appeal to the private judgment of individuals.<sup>1581</sup>

Newman felt that the Liberals wanted to destroy the “force of the evidence in favour of our doctrine of Tradition.” In fact, they wished to maintain that “by Tradition . . . was commonly meant Scripture; and . . . when the Fathers speak of ‘Evangelical Tradition’ they mean the Gospels, and when they speak of ‘Apostolical’ they mean the Epistles.”<sup>1582</sup> For Newman, Scripture never exists by itself alone, but only in the context of the Church, and thus

---

<sup>1580</sup> Philip N. Shuttleworth, *No Tradition but Scripture* (Philadelphia: Hooker & Agnew, 1841), 62.

<sup>1581</sup> *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, 2: 312.

<sup>1582</sup> *Ibid.*

cannot be properly interpreted without the ongoing commentary and teachings of the Church.

Accordingly, Newman advised that one should read Scripture in conjunction with the Creed:

Surely the Sacred Volume was never intended, and is not adapted, to teach us our creed; however certain it is that we can prove our creed from it, when it has once been taught us, and in spite of individual producible exceptions to the general rule. From the very first, that rule has been, as a matter of fact, that the Church should teach the truth, and then should appeal to Scripture in vindication of its own teaching.<sup>1583</sup>

For Newman, “the error of heretics” was “to neglect the information” that was provided and “to attempt of themselves a work to which they are unequal, the eliciting a systematic doctrine from the scattered notices of the truth which Scripture contains.”<sup>1584</sup> In a word, “Scripture is interpreted by Tradition, Tradition is verified by Scripture; Tradition gives form to the doctrine, Scripture gives life; Tradition teaches, Scripture proves.”<sup>1585</sup>

Accordingly, in Newman’s sermons, there is an intertwining of Scripture and the Athanasian Creed under the interpretations of the Fathers of the Church.

Newman’s sermons, as indicated in chapters II, III and IV, show that his theology was influenced greatly by the Fathers. He had a special love and devotion to the Fathers. He “ever returns to what he calls ‘the Church of the Fathers,’ to the doctors and martyrs of the first centuries.” “Where the Fathers of the Church are concerned, he is never tired of speaking about them, of telling their stories, and of commenting upon them.” They “are his bosom friends.”<sup>1586</sup> In March 1864, Newman was sick, and in direct view of death, Newman

---

<sup>1583</sup> *Arians*, 50.

<sup>1584</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1585</sup> JHN, *Prophetical Office*, 274.

<sup>1586</sup> Henri Bremond, *The Mystery of Newman* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907), 256.

spoke of the Holy Trinity, Jesus the God incarnate, and the Fathers as those to whom he committed his soul:

I die in the faith of the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. . . I commit my soul and body to the most Holy Trinity, and to the merits and grace of our Lord Jesus, God Incarnate, to the intercession and compassion of our dear Mother Mary; to St. Joseph; and St. Philip Neri, my father, the father of an unworthy son; to St. John the Evangelist; St. John the Baptist; St. Henry [his patrons]; St. Athanasius, and St. Gregory Nazianzen; to St. Chrysostom and St. Ambrose . . . .<sup>1587</sup>

The standard for Newman “in the early days of his religious life was the Bible.” But as a college student, he faced the challenges of “faith and opinions.”<sup>1588</sup> He became familiar with the debates of Liberalism and rationalism about such doctrines as the Trinity, Incarnation, atonement, judgment. Newman decided to work out “a case for Trinity, Incarnation, atonement, on the detailed material of texts and arguments, giving and taking, and, as it were, bargaining for his life on that field.”<sup>1589</sup> The Scriptures, Fathers and the Creeds (Apostles, Nicene, Athanasian) became the significant trio of Newman in his arguments and writings. The “red thread” that could hold the trio together was the “principle of dogma.” For Newman, dogma is not something on paper, but the living faith professed in the mouths, hearts and lives of people. Newman did not wait until the birth of the Oxford Movement in order to select the principle of dogma, he had held it from the age of fifteen:

Dogma had been the fundamental principle of my religion . . . . Religion, as a mere sentiment, is to me a dream and a mockery. As well can there be filial love without the fact of a father, as devotion without the fact of a Supreme Being. What I held in 1816, I held in 1833, and I hold in 1864. Please God, I shall hold it to the very end. Even

---

<sup>1587</sup> JHN, *Meditations and Devotions*, 437-438.

<sup>1588</sup> Robert Rainy, “Cardinal Newman,” *The Expositor*, vol. VI, William Robertson, ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892): 34-48, at 38.

<sup>1589</sup> *Ibid.*

when I was under Dr. Whately's influence, I had no temptation to be less zealous for the great dogmas of the faith, and at various times I used to resist such trains of thought on his part, as seemed to me (rightly or wrongly) to obscure them.<sup>1590</sup>

Newman explained what he meant: the "principle of dogma, that is, supernatural truths irrevocably committed to human language, imperfect because it is human, but definitive and necessary because given from above."<sup>1591</sup> This principle of dogma explains why Newman was so attached to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation; he believed that "the Christian dogmas were in the Church from the times of the Apostles; that they were ever in substance what they are now."<sup>1592</sup> Moreover, Newman asserted that "they existed before the formulas were publicly adopted," and as time went on "they were defined and recorded, and that such formulas, when sanctioned by the due ecclesiastical acts, are binding on the faith of Catholics, and have a dogmatic authority."<sup>1593</sup>

Newman's methodology seems very much like that of the Fathers of the Church. As the Fathers relied on the Scriptures, the Creeds and the Councils in order to condemn heresies, Newman used the Scriptures, the Creeds and the Fathers to fight against the heresies of his time. As Athanasius, the Cappadocians, and Augustine in their writings fought against the Arians, Donatists, Sabellians, Manichaeans, Pelagians, et al., Newman in his sermons and writings responded to the Dissenters, Socinians, Unitarians, Latitudinarians, Evangelicals, Calvinists, et al. Newman's writings did not just discuss the dogmatic controversies of the early Church, but became a vehicle through which he attacked the burning issues of his time.

---

<sup>1590</sup> *Apologia*, 120-121.

<sup>1591</sup> JHN, *Essay on Development*, 325.

<sup>1592</sup> JHN, *Tracts Theological*, 333.

<sup>1593</sup> *Ibid.*

In other words, Newman preached and wrote directly in answer to what he saw as heretical tendencies in the Church of England. It was within the context of disputing against the Liberals that Newman's theology was developed. In a word, the *context* helped form the *content*. The "fashion of the day"<sup>1594</sup> raised serious concerns which prompted Newman and the Tractarians to formulate the theology of the Oxford Movement.

One of the most distinctive aspects of Newman's methodology was his terminology. Newman utilized terms to emphasize and highlight his theological points; he was not only a "man of sermons" or a "man of letters," but also a "man of theological terms." For example, in his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, Newman used a variety of terms in describing the Trinity.

1. For the Father:

"Almighty God,"<sup>1595</sup> "Supreme Being,"<sup>1596</sup> "Unchangeable God,"<sup>1597</sup> "First Source of all perfection,"<sup>1598</sup> "All-powerful, All-gracious Creator,"<sup>1599</sup> "Holy yet Merciful Governor of His creatures,"<sup>1600</sup> "Eternal Author of our being,"<sup>1601</sup> "Divine Author of our salvation,"<sup>1602</sup> "The First Cause," "Eternal Father,"<sup>1603</sup> "All-merciful Father."<sup>1604</sup>

2. For the Son:

---

<sup>1594</sup> *PPS* 2: 227; *LD* 3: 91; *Essays, Critical and Historical*, 1: 229.

<sup>1595</sup> *PPS* 2: 207.

<sup>1596</sup> *PPS* 6: 354.

<sup>1597</sup> *PPS* 1: 26.

<sup>1598</sup> *PPS* 2: 218.

<sup>1599</sup> *PPS* 6: 340.

<sup>1600</sup> *PPS* 2: 155.

<sup>1601</sup> *PPS* 1: 23.

<sup>1602</sup> *PPS* 2: 224.

<sup>1603</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>1604</sup> *PPS* 6: 81.

“Very Son of God,” “God incarnate,”<sup>1605</sup> “Only begotten Son,”<sup>1606</sup> “Eternal Word,”<sup>1607</sup> “New Adam,”<sup>1608</sup> “Co-eternal Son incarnate,”<sup>1609</sup> “Sun of Righteousness,”<sup>1610</sup> “Lord, Saviour, and Judge,”<sup>1611</sup> “High Priest,” “Minister of the Sanctuary,”<sup>1612</sup> “Living and Eternal Law of Truth and Perfection,”<sup>1613</sup> “Jesus, the Author and Finisher of faith,”<sup>1614</sup> “Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant,”<sup>1615</sup> “The Godhead in a New Manifestation,”<sup>1616</sup> “Partaker in all the fulness of His Godhead,”<sup>1617</sup> “Partaker of our nature,”<sup>1618</sup> “Only-begotten Word,”<sup>1619</sup> “Co-equal Minister in all things,”<sup>1620</sup> “Word Incarnate,”<sup>1621</sup> “Atoning Sacrifice,”<sup>1622</sup> “Almighty God Himself, God the Son, the Sufferer,”<sup>1623</sup> “Sanctifier,”<sup>1624</sup> “Immaculate Lamb of God,”<sup>1625</sup> “Most Gracious and All-Pitiful Son.”<sup>1626</sup>

### 3. For the Holy Spirit:

“Blessed Spirit,”<sup>1627</sup> “Spirit of God,” “Spirit of Truth,” “Giver of all gifts,” “Comforter, Ruler, and Guide of the Church,”<sup>1628</sup> “Almighty Power,”<sup>1629</sup> “Divine

---

<sup>1605</sup> *PPS* 2: 209.

<sup>1606</sup> *PPS* 6: 358.

<sup>1607</sup> *PPS* 2: 26.

<sup>1608</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>1609</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>1610</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>1611</sup> *PPS* 2: 228.

<sup>1612</sup> *Ibid.*, 210.

<sup>1613</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.

<sup>1614</sup> *PPS* 3: 236.

<sup>1615</sup> *Ibid.*, 237.

<sup>1616</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>1617</sup> *Ibid.*, 162.

<sup>1618</sup> *PPS* 2: 136.

<sup>1619</sup> *PPS* 3: 163.

<sup>1620</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1621</sup> *Ibid.*, 263.

<sup>1622</sup> *PPS* 6: 71.

<sup>1623</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>1624</sup> *PPS* 5: 86.

<sup>1625</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>1626</sup> *PPS* 6: 363.

<sup>1627</sup> *PPS* 2: 204.

<sup>1628</sup> *PPS* 6: 359.

<sup>1629</sup> *PPS* 2: 31.

Glory,”<sup>1630</sup> “Infinite Love,”<sup>1631</sup> “the Strength of man and beast, the Guide of faith, the Witness against sin, the inward Light of patriarchs and prophets, the Grace abiding in the Christian soul, and the Lord and Ruler of the Church,”<sup>1632</sup> “Secret Presence of God within the Creation,” “Voice of Truth in the hearts of all rational beings,” “‘life-giving’ Spirit,” “Soul of universal nature,”<sup>1633</sup> “Heavenly Gift,” “Spirit of God,” “Spirit of Christ,”<sup>1634</sup> “Sanctifier,”<sup>1635</sup> “our ‘Seal unto the day of redemption’.”<sup>1636</sup>

#### 4. For the Holy Trinity and the Economy:

“Sacred Mystery of the Trinity in Unity,”<sup>1637</sup> “the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity,”<sup>1638</sup> “Infinite perfections of the Eternal Godhead,”<sup>1639</sup> “Awful Unknown Truth,”<sup>1640</sup> “Gospel Doctrine,”<sup>1641</sup> “Eternal Trinity,”<sup>1642</sup> “Trinity in Unity, ... Foundation of the whole Dispensation,”<sup>1643</sup> “Providential arrangement,”<sup>1644</sup> “Gospel Economy (Incarnation),”<sup>1645</sup> “Economy of Mercy,”<sup>1646</sup> “His Gracious Economy,”<sup>1647</sup> “The Dispensation of mercy,” “Great Divine Work,”<sup>1648</sup> “Glorious Dispensation,”<sup>1649</sup> “Wonderful Economy of Grace.”<sup>1650</sup>

As J. M. Cameron commented: “Newman is very self-conscious about language and has a severe view of its functions.” He saw it as “a set of tools well enough adapted to the

---

<sup>1630</sup> Ibid., 38.  
<sup>1631</sup> *PPS* 2: 217.  
<sup>1632</sup> Ibid., 218.  
<sup>1633</sup> Ibid.  
<sup>1634</sup> Ibid., 220.  
<sup>1635</sup> Ibid., 222.  
<sup>1636</sup> Ibid., 223.  
<sup>1637</sup> *PPS* 6: 350.  
<sup>1638</sup> Ibid., 360.  
<sup>1639</sup> *PPS* 2: 134.  
<sup>1640</sup> Ibid., 209.  
<sup>1641</sup> Ibid., 257.  
<sup>1642</sup> Ibid., 270.  
<sup>1643</sup> Ibid., 271.  
<sup>1644</sup> Ibid., 187.  
<sup>1645</sup> Ibid., 195.  
<sup>1646</sup> *PPS* 6: 344.  
<sup>1647</sup> *PPS* 3: 159.  
<sup>1648</sup> Ibid.  
<sup>1649</sup> Ibid., 254.  
<sup>1650</sup> *PPS* 5: 87.

furthering of particular practical or even speculative purposes.”<sup>1651</sup> Edward Sillem commented that Newman “used the same kind of terminology as his contemporaries used for the simple reason that it would have been impracticable to employ any other in Victorian England.”<sup>1652</sup> In fact, Newman used just common terms that everyone could perceive easily, but he combined them in different configurations for his theological purposes. For example, Newman did not simply call God the “Father” but “All-merciful Father”; not merely “Creator” but “All-powerful, All-gracious Creator,” “Divine Author of our salvation,” “The First Cause.” These terms express both the characteristics of the Father and the primacy of the Father in the immanent divine life, creation and salvation. In regard to the Son, Newman used terms to describe the divine and human natures (“Partaker in all the fulness of His Godhead,” “Partaker of our nature”); the Son in *Theologia* as well as in *oikonomia* (“Co-eternal Son incarnate,” “The Godhead in a New Manifestation”), particularly in creation (“Co-equal Minister in all things”), in his passion (“Immaculate Lamb of God,” “Almighty God Himself, God the Son, the Sufferer”).

Although Newman was expert in using terms in his theological interpretation, he acknowledged that “human terminology, even though used by the Church, can but most faintly express the nature of the Incomprehensible Godhead, which eludes the grasp of words and ideas.”<sup>1653</sup> Newman on the one hand realized that “words are expressions of ideas, and ideas are expressions of the truth. Categories are the laws of our thoughts, and every man

---

<sup>1651</sup> J. M. Cameron, *The Night Battle* (London: Burns & Oates, 1962), 203-204.

<sup>1652</sup> Edward Augustus Sillem, *The Philosophical Notebook of John Henry Newman*, vol. 1 (New York: Humanities Press, 1969), 200.

<sup>1653</sup> JHN, *The Lives of the English Saints*, vol. 5 (London: Freemantle, 1901), 199.



knows what he means when he uses the terms Substance and Relation.”<sup>1654</sup> On the other hand, Newman confessed that “God is a Substance in a higher and truer sense than we can know, and the eternal Relations between the Persons of the adorable Trinity are not mere notions of our minds, but real and true in a transcendent sense surpassing all human thought.”<sup>1655</sup> Newman’s point seems to resonate with Augustine’s observation:

If thou hast been able to comprehend Him as thou thinkest, by so thinking thou has deceived thyself. This then is not God, if thou hast comprehended it; but if it be God, thou hast not comprehended it. How therefore wouldest thou speak of that which thou canst not comprehend?<sup>1656</sup>

Similarly, Gregory of Nyssa acknowledged that God remains “beyond the reach not only of the human but of the angelic and of all supramundane intelligence, unthinkable, unutterable, above all expression in words.”<sup>1657</sup> More recently, Joseph Ratzinger has called this “negative theology,” which rejects “all attempts to fathom the subject, a sort of cipher for the insolubility of the mystery of God.”<sup>1658</sup> If we attempt to “reduce God to the scope of our own comprehension,” Ratzinger remarks, it will lead to “the absurd.”

---

<sup>1654</sup> Ibid., 199-200.

<sup>1655</sup> Ibid., 200.

<sup>1656</sup> Augustine, “Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament,” Sermon II (52), 16, Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1<sup>st</sup> Series, vol. VI, St. Augustine: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007): 263.

<sup>1657</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*, 1, 42, in Phillip Schaff, ed., *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2<sup>nd</sup> series, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954): 99.

<sup>1658</sup> Joseph Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity*, J. R. Foster, trans. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press), 171.

We can only speak rightly about him if we renounce that attempt to comprehend and let him be the uncomprehended. Any doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, cannot aim at being a perfect comprehension of God.<sup>1659</sup>

Finally, the remarkable point of Newman's methodology is that he used the teachings of the Greek and Latin Fathers so naturally and fluently in his sermons and writings. Newman was influenced by both Greek and Latin writers, especially Athanasius, the Cappadocians, John of Damascus and Augustine. It is sometimes claimed that the Roman Catholic Church under the influence of Augustine has insisted more on the unity of the Trinity in the divine substance, while the Orthodox Church influenced by the Greek Fathers has emphasized the unity of the Trinity in the person of the Father.<sup>1660</sup> Newman's Trinitarian theology did not have this division. His theology is very Athanasian and Cappadocian, but simultaneously Augustinian. For example, while Newman emphasized the person of the Father as the cause of the unity of the Trinity, he did not lessen the significance of the divine substance or separate the divine persons from the divine essence. God is one in Himself: "His nature is solitary, peculiar to Himself, and one; so that whatever was accounted to be consubstantial or co-essential with Him, was necessarily included in His individuality."<sup>1661</sup>

---

<sup>1659</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1660</sup> Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness*, 33-34, 118; Colin Gunton, "Persons and Particularity," *The Theology of John Zizioulas*, Douglas H. Knight, ed. (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2007): 97-124, at 100-102; Donald Fairbairn, *Eastern Orthodoxy through Western Eyes* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 56.

<sup>1661</sup> *Arians*, 187.

For Newman, “the word ‘God’ denotes nothing but the being of Him who is.”<sup>1662</sup> God is “one in Himself,” “one in substance or essence.”<sup>1663</sup>

In this respect, Newman’s Trinitarian theology might well provide a directive for modern Trinitarian theology, which has sometimes tended to separate the Greek Fathers from the Latin. Newman’s emphasis on patristic sources might not only be helpful to modern Trinitarian theology as such, but also ecumenically, insofar as the separation of the Greek and Latin Fathers has set up an obstacle between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. Newman’s Trinitarian theology, which utilized both Greek and Latin Fathers, might help the Eastern and Western churches find commonality in that most fundamental of Christian mysteries—the Trinity.

### 3. Newman and Modern Trinitarian Theology

Would Newman have accepted Karl Rahner’s axiom: “The ‘economic’ Trinity is the ‘immanent’ Trinity and the ‘immanent’ Trinity is the ‘economic’ Trinity.”<sup>1664</sup> Newman’s Trinitarian theology is a *theologia* in *oikonomia*: the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity, for the Incarnation is the very revelation of the immanent Trinity. The first clause of this axiom would cause no problem at all for Newman, and it also affirmed by modern Trinitarian theologians. However, the second clause has been debated; for example, Yves Congar said that the first half of the axiom is “beyond dispute,” but that the second should be clarified, for (1) it confuses the free mystery of the economy and the necessary mystery of the

---

<sup>1662</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>1663</sup> *PPS* 6: 349.

<sup>1664</sup> See Karl Rahner, *The Trinity*, Joseph Doncell, trans. (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 22; hereafter cited: Rahner, *Trinity*.

Tri-unity of God; (2) the full self-communication of God will be complete only at the end of time in the beatific vision; (3) there is an unspeakable distance between what God is *in se* and what is communicated in the economy.<sup>1665</sup> Congar conceded that the economic Trinity “reveals the immanent Trinity” but “not entirely,” for “there is always a limit to this revelation, and the Incarnation imposes its own conditions, which go back to its nature as a created work.”<sup>1666</sup> Congar reasoned that if “all the data of the Incarnation were transposed into the eternity of the Logos,” one would say that the Son “proceeds from the Father and the Holy Spirit.”<sup>1667</sup>

In contrast, Newman would presumably have agreed with Rahner on the second clause. For Newman, it would have been acceptable because the “series of the Dispensation,” i.e., the economy of salvation, was rooted “upon Eternity, for God to manifest Himself as in Eternity He was and ever has been, as ‘All in all,’ and ‘as He is’ . . . as what He is in Himself.”<sup>1668</sup> In other words, God *in se* is now revealed to us in the economy of salvation. He manifested himself in the economy as in eternity he was and ever has been. He revealed himself to us as what he is *in se*. In addition, Newman saw the economy of salvation as not simply the work of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit but above all as the manifestation of the “Sonship” of the Only-begotten Son with the Father.<sup>1669</sup> Within this “Sonship,” we became “adopted children of God” and “partakers of the divine nature.” The “Sonship” of the second

---

<sup>1665</sup> Congar, *Holy Spirit*, 3: 13-16.

<sup>1666</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 16.

<sup>1667</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1668</sup> JHN, *Tracts Theological*, 192-193.

<sup>1669</sup> JHN, *Essay on Development*, 137.

divine person, for Newman, is very crucial, for it is the “guarantee to us of His Divinity,” and also the “condition of His Incarnation.”<sup>1670</sup> Therefore, Newman always safeguarded the fullness of Christ’s divinity *in* his inseparable and undivided *relationship* with the Father. In other words, Newman saw the “Sonship” of the Son as the key doctrine to understand the immanent life of God and the economy of salvation. There was no change at all in the relationship of the Father and the Son whether in the immanent life or in the economy of salvation. Thus, what has been revealed to us in the history of salvation is also what was and has been and always is in the immanent life of God. Therefore, God *in himself* is God *for us*.

Moreover, in his Trinitarian theology, Newman did not use the terms: “immanent Trinity” and “economic Trinity”; he preferred the phrase “the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity.”<sup>1671</sup> This phrase was taken from the Athanasian Creed and was the core of Newman’s Trinitarian theology. The crux of this phrase is that it does not make any distinction between *theologia* and *oikonomia*, God *in se* and God *pro nobis*. This phrase highlights the unity of the Triune God whether in God’s own self or in the economy. Newman did discuss and analyze God in his immanent relationship and God self-disclosing in the history of salvation, but Newman did not distinguish God *in se* from God *in oikonomia*. Newman acknowledged the limitations of human expressions about the mystery, but he did not mean that the mystery was not fully revealed or hidden until the end of time. Accordingly, Newman insisted on the necessity of “faith” and “knowledge through grace” so that even in limitations we still apprehend the mystery.

---

<sup>1670</sup> JHN, *Tracts Theological*, 185.

<sup>1671</sup> *PPS* 6: 360.

Newman, in discussing whether “the immanent Trinity is the economic Trinity,” probably would have disagreed with Congar’s view of the Son proceeding “from the Father *and the Holy Spirit*”—if taking all the data of the Incarnation into the eternity of the Word. Newman did not consider the Incarnation as the second generation of the Son. The Incarnation did not make Him “a second Son”, but “he was a Son both before His Incarnation, and, by a second mystery, after it.”<sup>1672</sup> The Son was ever the Son in *theologia* as well as in *oikonomia*. The Incarnation was the “Great Divine *Work*,” the “Gracious Economy”<sup>1673</sup> of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. Thus the phrase “conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit” should be taken in the sense of “Almighty Power” *at work*.<sup>1674</sup> In this sense, when one says “the immanent Trinity *is* the economic Trinity,” the Incarnation would not be taken in the sense of procession “a Patre *Spirituque*.”

Newman and Rahner seem to agree in considering the Incarnation as their key in understanding *theologia* and *oikonomia*.<sup>1675</sup> The Incarnation, for Rahner, discloses Jesus as not “simply God in general, but the Son”: the “second divine person, God’s Logos, is man, and only he is man.”<sup>1676</sup> Rahner saw the Incarnation as the revelation of the *theologia* in *oikonomia*:

Here something occurs “outside” the intra-divine life in the world itself, something which is not a mere effect of the efficient causality of the triune God acting as one in

---

<sup>1672</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>1673</sup> *PPS* 3: 195.

<sup>1674</sup> *PPS* 2: 31.

<sup>1675</sup> Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us* (New York: HarperCollins, 1973), 212.

<sup>1676</sup> Rahner, *Trinity*, 23.

the world, but something which belongs to the Logos alone, which is the history of one divine person, in contrast to the other divine persons.<sup>1677</sup>

Rahner carefully noted that we cannot say that the Word “has stepped outside his intra-divine inaccessibility and shown himself through his humanity and in his humanity.”<sup>1678</sup> The human nature, for Rahner, is not “a mask (*πρόσωπον*) assumed from without, from behind which the Logos hides to act things out in the world.” But from the beginning it is “the constitutive, real symbol of the Logos himself.”<sup>1679</sup> A “real symbol” in Rahner’s sense is not a sign or a natural symbol that signifies “what is other from itself.” A “real symbol” has an “intrinsic, ontological relationship to what is symbolized so that it makes it present.”<sup>1680</sup> It “is both an expression of and a self-actualization of reality.”<sup>1681</sup> It is “the self-realization of a being in the other, which is constitutive of its essence.”<sup>1682</sup> In this sense, Rahner concluded, “the Logos with God and the Logos with us, the immanent and the economic Logos, are strictly the same.”<sup>1683</sup>

At this point, Newman and Rahner seemingly meet. Newman asserted: “The Almighty Son of God, who had been in the bosom of the Father from everlasting, became

---

<sup>1677</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>1678</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>1679</sup> Ibid., 33. It is from the notion of “real-symbol” that flows Rahner’s Christology and Trinitarian theology; see Patrick Burke, *Reinterpreting Rahner: A Critical Study of His Major Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 128.

<sup>1680</sup> William Dych, *Karl Rahner* (London: Continuum, 2000), 78.

<sup>1681</sup> James C. Livingston, Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, Sarah Coakley, and James H. Evans, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. II, The Twentieth Century (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 212.

<sup>1682</sup> Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. IV, Kevin Smyth, trans. (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 234; hereafter cited: Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, 4.

<sup>1683</sup> Rahner, *Trinity*, 33.

man; became man as truly as He was always God.”<sup>1684</sup> “He became man, yet so as not to cease in any respect being what He was before. He added a new nature to Himself, yet so intimately, that it was as if He had actually left His former self, which He did not.”<sup>1685</sup>

Newman did not use Rahner’s term “real symbol,” but his interpretation is the same: “When He came on earth, His manhood became as truly and personally His, as His Almighty power had been from everlasting.”<sup>1686</sup> Newman would presumably have agreed with Rahner in emphasizing that Jesus Christ is not “simply God in general, but the Son,” since Newman took the “Lord’s Sonship” as “not only the guarantee” “of His Godhead, but also the condition of His Incarnation.”<sup>1687</sup> Accordingly for Newman, the immanent Word and the Word incarnate were strictly the same:

From eternity He had been the Only-begotten in the bosom of the Father; and when He came on earth, this essential relation to the Father remained unaltered; still, He was a Son, when in the form of a servant,—still performing the will of the Father, *as* His Father’s Word and Wisdom, manifesting His Father’s glory and accomplishing His Father’s purposes.<sup>1688</sup>

Both Newman and Rahner saw that in the gracious economy God gave Himself completely to us. The economy was not simply a divine work but above all the mystery of God’s self-giving to humanity in which we may perceive and partake of the mystery of the Trinity. Rahner expressed this in the term “God’s self-communication.” For Rahner, this

---

<sup>1684</sup> *PPS* 6: 71.

<sup>1685</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>1686</sup> *Ibid.*, 72-3.

<sup>1687</sup> *PPS* 6: 58.

<sup>1688</sup> *Ibid.*, 58-59.



term is intended to “signify that God in his own most proper reality makes himself the innermost constitutive element of man.”<sup>1689</sup> Rahner explained,

This divine self-communication, in which God makes himself a constitutive principle of the created existent without whereby losing his absolute, ontological independence, has “divinizing” effects in the finite existent in whom this self-communication takes place.<sup>1690</sup>

In other words, God’s self-communication to humanity is such that “the giver in his own being is the gift, that in and through his own being the giver gives himself to creatures as their own fulfillment.”<sup>1691</sup> Hence, Rahner concluded:

God has given himself so fully in his absolute self-communication to the creature, that the “immanent” Trinity becomes the Trinity of the “economy of salvation”, and hence in turn the Trinity of salvation which we experience *is* the immanent Trinity. This means that the Trinity of God’s relationship to us *is* the reality of God as he is *in* himself: a trinity of persons.<sup>1692</sup>

Rahner asserted this identification of the immanent and the economic Trinity because “the Trinity is a mystery of salvation. Otherwise it would never be revealed.”<sup>1693</sup> Rahner saw the Trinity as the “primordial mystery of Christianity” without which “all dogmatic treatises” cannot be made “comprehensible.”<sup>1694</sup> Rahner raised two concerns about modern Trinitarian theology: the first is the fact that most people are “monotheistic” in “actual religious existence.” Rahner saw that if the doctrine of the Holy Trinity were to be “erased as false,”

---

<sup>1689</sup> Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith*, William V. Dych, trans. (New York: Seabury Press, 1978), 116.

<sup>1690</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

<sup>1691</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1692</sup> Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, 4: 69.

<sup>1693</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>1694</sup> *Ibid.*

“most religious literature could be preserved almost unchanged throughout the process.”<sup>1695</sup>

According to Rahner, modern theology when speaking of the Incarnation tends to concentrate on “the fact that ‘God’ has become man, that ‘a’ person of the Trinity has assumed flesh – but not on the fact that this person is precisely that of the Word, Logos.”<sup>1696</sup> Rahner even asserted that “the Christian idea of the Incarnation would not have to change at all, if there were no Trinity,” since several modern Christologies do not pay attention to “which precisely of the divine hypostases has taken on human nature.”<sup>1697</sup> The theological textbooks (1951) would question “what it means that God became man,” but not “what it means in particular that the Logos, precisely as himself in contradistinction to the other divine persons became man.”<sup>1698</sup> As a result, “the existence of a clear and conscious faith in the Incarnation is far from being a proof of the fact that the Trinity means something in the normal piety of Christians.”<sup>1699</sup>

Rahner’s second concern was that *De Deo Uno* was divided from and placed before *De Deo Trino*.<sup>1700</sup> Rahner called this treatment “a splendid isolation,” which brings Trinitarian theology into a “greater danger” of “being found without interest for religious existence”: “It looks as though everything important about God which touches ourselves has already been said in the treatise *De Deo Uno*.”<sup>1701</sup> For Rahner, the Christian treatise *De Deo Uno* can and should be placed before *De Deo Trino*; however, a treatise “*De divinitate una*”

---

<sup>1695</sup> Ibid., 79.

<sup>1696</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1697</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1698</sup> Ibid., 80.

<sup>1699</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1700</sup> Ibid., 83.

<sup>1701</sup> Ibid., 84.

could be “very philosophical and abstract in development,” with “very little concrete reference to the history of salvation.”<sup>1702</sup>

It deals with the necessary metaphysical attributes of God, and not very explicitly with the experiences of the history of salvation which have come from God’s freely adopted relation to creation.<sup>1703</sup>

In addition, Rahner questioned: “What connexion is made between them [*De Deo Uno* and *De Deo Trino*] in the usual division.”<sup>1704</sup> In order to solve the problem, Rahner suggested a Trinitarian approach which would allow us to “re-state the question of the relationship, connexion and difference between the two treatises *De Deo Uno* and *De Deo Trino*”:

Starting from the presence of God the Father himself, communicated in the economy of salvation through the Word in the Spirit, one could show that the differentiation in the “God for us” is also that of the “God in himself”, and go on simply to explain that this three-fold quality of God in himself may be called triune “personality.” Thus we shall on principle confine the notion of “person” in this context to what may be affirmed of it from this starting-point, which is that offered by the testimony of Scripture.<sup>1705</sup>

Rahner acknowledged that it is not easy to distinguish *De Deo Uno* and *De Deo Trino* as Thomas Aquinas did; however, if we take *De Deo Uno* seriously, “we are not dealing merely with the essence and attributes of God, but with the unity of the three divine persons.”<sup>1706</sup> It is the unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and not merely “the unicity of the godhead.” In

---

<sup>1702</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1703</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1704</sup> Ibid., 86.

<sup>1705</sup> Ibid., 102.

<sup>1706</sup> Ibid.

other words, “if one begins with the treatise *De Deo Uno* and not with *De Divinitate Una*, one is concerned at once with the Father, the unoriginated origin of the Son and the Spirit.”<sup>1707</sup>

In his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, Newman had indeed highlighted the two points about which Rahner was concerned. First, Newman strongly emphasized the mystery of the Word incarnate. Newman did not generally speak of the Incarnation of God but of the *second* divine person, the “Incarnation of the Eternal Word.”<sup>1708</sup> It is the mystery that “the Eternal Son has taken into Himself a creature’s nature,”<sup>1709</sup> so that we might be “drawn one and all to Him,” for “He has redeemed us one and all.”<sup>1710</sup> For Newman, the Incarnation was the key doctrine to fight against the Liberals who strongly rejected Christ as the Son of God in the Trinity. In response to the Socinian and Unitarian Christologies, which purposely neglected the divinity of Christ, Newman highlighted the fullness of Christ’s Godhead as the *Word* and *Son* of God in relationship with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Second, although Newman did not start his Trinitarian theology by analyzing “the presence of God the Father himself,” he showed us that the Father “communicated in the economy of salvation through the Word in the Spirit.” The term “relationship” was the starting point of Newman’s Trinitarian theology. Newman analyzed the relationship of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the immanent life and in the economy. For Newman, central to the relationship of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit was the personhood of each divine person, through which he pointed out the otherness and communion in God the Trinity.

---

<sup>1707</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1708</sup> *PPS* 2: 24.

<sup>1709</sup> *PPS* 3: 157.

<sup>1710</sup> *PPS* 6: 70.

Newman would agree completely with Rahner that “the differentiation in the ‘God for us’ is also that of the ‘God in himself.’” And thus, “God *pro nobis*” is “God *in se*.” Moreover, Newman asserted that the mystery of the Trinity is the mystery of salvation: “the doctrine of the Holy Trinity must be held in order to salvation.”<sup>1711</sup> It was in the history of salvation that the mystery of God in himself was revealed for us in order to save us so that we might become “partakers of the divine nature.” In addition, in his Trinitarian theology, Newman did not tend to distinguish *De Deo Uno* from *De Deo Trino*. Newman looked at the mystery of the Holy Trinity as a whole. He simply named it the “doctrine of the Trinity in Unity,”<sup>1712</sup> the “Eternal Trinity in Unity”<sup>1713</sup> or just the “doctrine of the Unity.”<sup>1714</sup> In a word, Newman’s emphasis of the “Trinity in Unity” could be seen as a significant point, which should be highlighted in modern Trinitarian theology and in ecumenical dialogue with the Orthodox Church.

#### 4. Newman and Ecumenical Dialogue

John Zizioulas, a key Orthodox theologian in ecumenical dialogue, claimed that the priority of the “One God” over against the “Triune God” within the “traditional dogmatic manuals in the West” is mistaken:

We do not first speak of the One God (= divine substance) and *then* of the three persons as relations *within* the one substance – a favorite approach of medieval theology. The Trinity is just as primary as the one substance in the doctrine of God:

---

<sup>1711</sup> Ibid., 332.

<sup>1712</sup> Ibid., 338.

<sup>1713</sup> Ibid., 363.

<sup>1714</sup> Ibid., 337.

the “many” are constitutive of the One, just as the One is constitutive of the “many”.<sup>1715</sup>

For Zizioulas, the primacy of Peter is now the “thorny issue” which “lies in the very heart of Roman Catholic-Orthodox relations.”<sup>1716</sup> It is hard to solve this issue by Scripture and history. The only possible way to solve the problem is a “theological one”<sup>1717</sup>; and Trinitarian theology as well as Christology in its relation to Pneumatology offers a promising approach to this issue. The advantage of Newman’s Trinitarian theology is that it is very Athanasian and Cappadocian and so congenial to the Orthodox theology of the Trinity. Newman’s Trinitarian theology might open several avenues to a consideration of the Petrine ministry.

Zizioulas has questioned: “Is there a universal primacy?” He notes that many Orthodox believe: “There is no universal primacy . . . other than the ecumenical council.”<sup>1718</sup> The Orthodox saw papal primacy as “universal expansionism,” attempting to put all Christians under the “dominion of its power,” and thus as “oppression and ecclesiastical totalitarianism.”<sup>1719</sup> The Orthodox would accept the Bishop of Rome as *primus* but “only for the West,” since he is the “patriarch of the West and should have no primacy whatsoever over

---

<sup>1715</sup> Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon, “Primacy in the Church: An Orthodox Approach,” in *Petrine Ministry and the Unity of the Church*, James F. Puglisi, ed. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 118; hereafter cited: Zizioulas, “Primacy in the Church.”

<sup>1716</sup> Ioannis Zizioulas, “Recent Discussions on Primacy in Orthodox Theology,” in *The Petrine Ministry*, Cardinal Walter Kasper, ed. (New York: Newman Press, 2006), 231; hereafter cited: Zizioulas, “Recent Discussions on Primacy.”

<sup>1717</sup> Zizioulas, “Primacy in the Church,” 117.

<sup>1718</sup> Zizioulas, “Recent Discussions on Primacy,” 238.

<sup>1719</sup> *Ibid.*, 242.

the rest of the world.”<sup>1720</sup> Or the Orthodox would accept the “Roman primacy as a universal primacy” but as a “primacy of honor.” It should not be a “primacy of jurisdiction.”<sup>1721</sup> The Orthodox do not want “interference with the affairs of a local church” because it would be the “destruction or negation of its catholicity and ecclesial integrity.” For them, each “particular church” is headed by its bishop and is a “catholic church,” a “full church.”<sup>1722</sup> In addition, this primacy should not be “the prerogative of an individual but of a local church.” That means the primacy of the Pope is taken in the sense of the primacy of “a see, i.e., the Church of Rome,” for we speak of the ecclesiology of the communion not of “individuals but of churches.”<sup>1723</sup>

Zizioulas himself has employed the notion of “the one-and-the-many” as his fundamental principle in the arguments. The bishop is the *primus* at his local church. He is a “constitutive element in the local church.” He is the “head of the Eucharistic synaxis.” Without his presidency, there can be no Eucharistic synaxis. Thus, “the ‘many’ cannot be a church without the ‘one’, but equally the ‘one’ cannot be the *primus* without the ‘many.’”<sup>1724</sup> The same rule can be applied to the *regional* level for the *primus* of the synod and the region, as indicated in canon 34 of the Apostolic Canons that “all the bishops of a region (ἐθνός) must recognize their “first one” (πρωτός) as their “head” (κεφαλὴ) and do nothing without him,

---

<sup>1720</sup> Zizioulas, “Primacy in the Church,” 123.

<sup>1721</sup> Ibid., 124.

<sup>1722</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1723</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1724</sup> Ibid., 121.

while he should equally do nothing without them.”<sup>1725</sup> Indeed, the Orthodox do not deny the primacy of Rome, they even accept the universal primacy, but “what kind of primacy” do we have in mind?<sup>1726</sup> Do we have to go back to the time of Byzantium to reform the structure of the *Pentarchy* (Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem)?

Viewing the issue of primacy in terms of Trinitarian theology might be productive. In the Trinitarian theology of Anathansius and the Cappadocians—which Newman presented in his sermons and which Zizioulas recently presented in his book *Communion and Otherness*—one can see that the primacy of the Father is absolute in the Trinity. Newman, following Athanasius and the Cappadocians, saw the *person* of the Father as the source of the Godhead and the cause of the unity of the Trinity. That primacy is ultimately attached to the *person* of the Father. As mentioned in chapter II, Newman emphasized the personhood of each divine person; similarly, for Zizioulas, the Father is the “*ultimate ontological principle of divine personhood*.”<sup>1727</sup> The Father, the Son and the Spirit are distinguished hypostatically. Each divine person is different not by substance but by way of being who he is. None of the persons is subject to confusion with the other two. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are “absolutely different (*diaphora*).”<sup>1728</sup> Thus, “otherness is *absolute*”, but “otherness is *constitutive* of unity.”<sup>1729</sup> The Father is in the Son, the Son in the Father, the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit in the Father and the Son. The Three are One because

---

<sup>1725</sup> Ibid., 121-122.

<sup>1726</sup> Zizioulas, “Recent Discussions on Primacy,” 244.

<sup>1727</sup> Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness*, 130; cf. *supra*, 53-65.

<sup>1728</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>1729</sup> Ibid.



they *relate* and *are within* each other. This is the “*unity* of the Father, Son and Spirit in their co-inherence or inter-relatedness.”<sup>1730</sup> Newman indeed emphasized both the personhood of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and their unbreakable and inseparable relationships as revealed in the Scriptures.<sup>1731</sup>

One might apply this perspective to the issue of the primacy of Rome. This primacy can be attached to the *person* of the successor of Peter. The person of the Pope is the figure of unity of all the bishops around the world. He is the *cause* of unity, for his primacy is *relational*; for it is the “primacy of love.”<sup>1732</sup> The terms “relational” and “love” might stand well together. The phrase “primacy of honor” is ambiguous and raises many debates of how it functions. Yet the term “love” here expresses “relation” and “communion”, for love always invites a relationship of being one. Therefore, the primacy of Peter should be called, as Ignatius of Antioch had named it, the “primacy of love.” In the immanent life of the Trinity, the Father indeed holds the “primacy of love.” He is the Lover, the Son the Beloved and the Holy Spirit the Love. The Father is the One, who causes the Beloved and the Love. Within this “primacy of love,” one might understand what canon 34 says of the *prôtos* without whom the bishops can do nothing, while he himself can do nothing without them, as the Father does nothing without the Son and the Spirit, and the Son and the Spirit do nothing without the Father.

---

<sup>1730</sup> Ibid., 136. *Arians*, 173.

<sup>1731</sup> *PPS* 6: 357-359.

<sup>1732</sup> Ignatius of Antioch, *To the Romans*, prologue. See John Paul II, *Ut unum sint*, 88-93; Walter Kasper, “Introduction to the Theme and Catholic Hermeneutics of the Dogmas of the First Vatican Council,” *The Petrine Ministry* (New York: The Newman Press, 2006), 22.

In addition, love always calls to otherness. Each of the divine persons is so unique in their personal properties that “God is as wholly and entirely God in the person of the Father, as though there were no Son and Spirit; as entirely in that of the Son, as though there were no Spirit and Father; as entirely in that of the Spirit, as though there were no Father and Son.”<sup>1733</sup> “Otherness” in the Trinity, therefore, is *absolute*; and thus it is in the Church. No one would deny the “otherness” between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church, and neither of them is subject to confusion with the other. The Orthodox should then continue in their profound tradition of theology and liturgy and government. Indeed there are many things that the Catholics should learn from the Orthodox. Yet how could this relationship be described?

Newman’s Trinitarian theology is suggestive. Newman always linked the doctrine of the Trinity with that of the Incarnation. Trinity and Incarnation cannot be separated, for the Incarnation is the very revelation of the *theologia* in the *oikonomia*. Within the mystery of the Incarnation, one perceives the immanent relationship of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Father and the Son are always one in the Eternal Love of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is person as communion and communion as person. The oneness of the Father and the Son is revealed splendidly in the economy by the Son’s willingness of doing the Father’s will even to death and death on the cross.<sup>1734</sup> However, this did not make the Son less in being God than the Father. The Father is God; the Son is God, but there are not two Gods. There is One God, for the Father and the Son are ever one in their love, the Holy Spirit. The “active obedience” and “filial duty” of the Son towards the Father discloses obviously and sharply the

---

<sup>1733</sup> *PPS* 6: 358.

<sup>1734</sup> *PPS* 3: 148-150.

*three distinct* divine persons yet only *one* God. Within this light, if the Orthodox accept the “primacy of love” of the successor of Peter and “obey” him, it does not make the Orthodox Church less in being than the Roman Catholic Church, for there are not two Churches, but only one Church, one Baptism, one Lord Jesus Christ, and one God the Father. Accordingly, in *any decision*, the Pope should not do anything without the (Orthodox) bishops, and they would do nothing without him. This view is not concerned with either the “primacy of honor” or the “primacy of jurisdiction” which is feared as a form of “universal expansionism” or “oppression and ecclesiastical totalitarianism.” Rather this view presents a “primacy of love” which is *relational* and calls to *communion*.

One cannot go back to the time of Byzantium and reform the structure of the *Pentarchy*, for the world of today is larger than in Antiquity and in a process of globalization. The Church in fact needs a figure, a *person in flesh*, as the symbol of unity and hope, who can bring the Church into one. The Son of God *became flesh* in order to reconcile and recapitulate everything into one in him. Now the Son continues to do that in his Church, through his Apostles (bishops), trusting particularly to the person of Peter to whom Jesus said, “Once you have turned back, you *must strengthen* (στήρισον) your brothers” (Lk 22: 32).<sup>1735</sup> The word *στήρισον* here could mean to strengthen, make firm, establish, fix, set up. This statement Jesus did not address to all Apostles generally but *personally* to Peter. Peter’s role is to *strengthen* his brothers (bishops) in faith, hope and love. The “primacy of love” would help the successor of Peter to carry out this command. It is the primacy not to *rule* but to

---

<sup>1735</sup> Italics added for emphasis.

*strengthen* the Church. It is the primacy of relationship. Accordingly, every *primus* of the local church must be *relational* to the “first one” (πρωτος) and the “head” (κεφαλή) of all the bishops in a full communion in words and deeds, in decisions and actions, and vice versa.

The history of the Church has shown the primacy of the successor of Peter in strengthening his brothers in faith and hope, for example, at the time when the Church in many countries was in the control of communists. For instance, in Viet Nam, the Church has undergone many persecutions in the past as well as in the present. The successor of Peter has always been the symbol of unity and hope. His voice indeed has strengthened the bishops and the faithful in faith, hope and charity, bringing unity and perseverance in times of persecutions. Without the successor of Peter, the Church in Viet Nam would probably have been scattered or become the Church of the government. The successor of Peter indeed has carried out concretely the role that the Lord Jesus has entrusted to him in the Church.

The Petrine ministry indeed has been a fundamental concern in the Orthodox-Catholic relationship. However, the debates seemingly have not found yet a common agreement in Scripture or history or theology. Newman’s theology of the Trinity and Incarnation could be a help for Orthodox-Catholic dialogue on this thorny issue.<sup>1736</sup> Newman was greatly

---

<sup>1736</sup> This is indeed only a theological suggestion, which hopes to prompt more study on the primacy of love. In fact, the First Vatican Council described the primacy of jurisdiction: “Thus whoever says that the bishop of Rome has only the office of oversight and leadership and not the full and supreme power of legal jurisdiction over the entire Church – and not just in matters of faith and morals but also in whatever pertains to the order and governance of the Church spread over the whole world; or whoever says that he has only a larger share but not the whole fullness of this supreme power, or that this power of his is not ordinary and immediate power over the entire Church and the individual churches as well as over all and each and every shepherd and member of the faithful, let him be anathema.” DS

concerned about the unity of the Church. In 1840, he met Father Spencer, a Roman Catholic priest, and talked about praying every Thursday for the “restoration to the true faith and for the unity of the Church.”<sup>1737</sup> Spencer insisted that “all difficulties would soon vanish if there was real charity on both sides.”<sup>1738</sup> Newman agreed and said to Thomas Mozley, “I wish we were in the practice of praying e.g. every Thursday . . . He [Spencer] said the world would soon agree, if we all prayed for agreement.”<sup>1739</sup> For Newman, “it seems to me an excellent plan.”<sup>1740</sup> “They pray that we may be changed – and we should pray that they should.”<sup>1741</sup> Newman acknowledged that now “the time is arrived for the holy endeavour to effect the reunion of the Churches.”<sup>1742</sup> Newman remarked: “Rome must change first of all in her spirit. I must see more sanctity in her than I do at present.”<sup>1743</sup> Then Newman spoke highly of Rome, considering “how systematic and complete the Roman system is.”<sup>1744</sup>

I cannot speak against the Church of Rome, viewed in her formal character, as a true Church, since she is “built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets”, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone. Nor can I speak against her private members, numbers of whom, I trust, are God’s people, in the way to Heaven, and one with us in heart, though not in profession.<sup>1745</sup>

---

3064. Quoted from Heinrich Fries, *Fundamental Theology*, Robert J. Daly, trans. (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 570.

<sup>1737</sup> JHN to E. B. Pusey (Oriel College, 9 January 1840), *LD* 7: 206-208, at 207.

<sup>1738</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1739</sup> JHN to Thomas Mozley (10 January 1840), *LD* 7: 208-209, at 209.

<sup>1740</sup> JHN to J. F. Christie (Oriel, 13 January 1840), *LD* 7: 210.

<sup>1741</sup> JHN to H. E. Manning (Oriel, 6 January 1840), *LD* 7: 215.

<sup>1742</sup> JHN to J. R. Bloxam (Oriel, 2 March 1841), *LD* 8: 48-50, at 48.

<sup>1743</sup> JHN to J. R. Bloxam (Oriel, 23 February 1841), *LD* 8: 41-43, at 42.

<sup>1744</sup> JHN to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford (Oriel, 29 March 1841), *LD* 8: 129-144, at 134.

<sup>1745</sup> Ibid., 138.

Thus, Newman suggested an approach which could bring true unity in the Church, which is to “make ourselves more holy, more self-denying, more primitive, more worthy our high calling.”<sup>1746</sup> Newman insisted, “It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to God. If we be holy, all will go well with us.”<sup>1747</sup> Holiness was the key to Newman’s ecumenical approach:

Whatever its regimen--whatever its doctrines--whatever its worship--if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself. It will turn all accidents into good, it will supply defects, and it will gain for itself from above what is wanting.<sup>1748</sup>

Everything can be solved, if holiness takes its reign in us. The “only way” in which all “can be brought together into one is by a ‘turning of heart’ to one another.”<sup>1749</sup>

Argumentative efforts are most useful for this end under this sacred feeling; but till we try to love each other, and what is holy in each other, and wish to be all one, and mourn that we are not so, and pray that we may be so, I do not see what good can come of argument.<sup>1750</sup>

Newman’s great concern for the unity of the Church was echoed by the Second

Vatican Council:

The faithful should remember that they promote union among Christians better, that indeed they live it better, when they try to live holier lives according to the Gospel. For the closer their union with the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, the more deeply and easily will they be able to grow in mutual brotherly love. This change of heart and holiness of life, along with public and private prayer for the unity of the Christians, should be regarded as the soul of the whole ecumenical movement, and merits the name, “spiritual ecumenism.”<sup>1751</sup>

---

<sup>1746</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>1747</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1748</sup> Ibid., 143.

<sup>1749</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1750</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1751</sup> Vatican II, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, 8.

“Holiness” and “love” and “turning of heart” were the key terms of Newman’s ecumenical approach. In addition, his theology of the Trinity and Incarnation, which is very Athanasian and Cappadocian, could open a positive way in dialogue with the Orthodox Church, particularly on the Petrine ministry.

Newman simply called the doctrine of the Trinity the “doctrine of Unity.”<sup>1752</sup> It is the doctrine of the unity of God in himself. It is the doctrine of the unity of God and all creation in his economy. Thus, it is also the doctrine of the unity of the Church, for the Church is built in the model of the Holy Trinity. Newman indeed carried the unity of the Church in his heart. He insisted that the unity of the Church needs “great sacrifices of all hands.” As to doctrinal concessions, he stated, “it is useless to speak of them, till we are all in a better temper with each other.”<sup>1753</sup> Newman acknowledged that Churches have “their excellences,” but also are “injured by being so much enmity.” We need to introduce “good points” to each other.<sup>1754</sup> We need to pray together and for each other. We must “become more holy,” for “sanctity is the great note of the Church.”<sup>1755</sup>

---

<sup>1752</sup> *PPS* 6: 337.

<sup>1753</sup> JHN to Ambrose Lisle Phillipps (Oriel College, 8 April 1841), *LD* 8: 165-166, at 165.

<sup>1754</sup> JHN to Richard Westmacott (Oriel, 8 April 1841), *LD* 8: 166-167, at 166.

<sup>1755</sup> Note 2 in *LD* 8: 197.

### 5. Contribution of the Study

This investigation of Newman's Trinitarian theology in the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* from 1833 to 1843 within the context of the Oxford Movement in the Church of England is intended as a contribution to the study of Newman's theology as well as to that of the Oxford Movement.

First, this study gives a chronologically systematic view of Newman's Trinitarian theology during his time in the Oxford Movement. His Trinitarian theology was focused and developed from the immanent Trinity to the economic Trinity. The distinguishing points of his theology can be seen in what might be called a "theology of glorification" and a "theology of rest and peace." With his "theology of glorification," Newman presented the whole salvific plan of God the Trinity. Salvation is none other than the glorification of the whole creation within the glory of God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, who are glorifying one another in the immanent life and manifesting their glory in the economy. All will be drawn "from glory to glory" so that all will be one in God and "God will be all in all": Glory as communion and communion as glory. With his "theology of rest and peace," Newman emphasized that the economy of salvation was rooted in God's own self. God's own self is rest and peace, and the economy began out of rest and ended in rest.<sup>1756</sup> In other words, the economy began out of God's own self and ended in God's own self. God's purpose in the economy is none other than to give us himself and make us to be partakers of himself.

---

<sup>1756</sup> Cf. *PPS* 6: 363.



Second, this study provides a background for what was happening behind the scenes of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, especially those on the Trinity. It points out various reasons why Newman made such theological arguments and emphasis in his sermons. It presents the political environment and contemporary theological debates, within which Newman carefully and sharply formed his sermons. Newman's sermons not only presented the orthodox teachings of the Church of England regarding what a believer should hold steadfastly in order to be saved, but they were also Newman's responses to and dialogues with opponents. These sermons were a Tractarian answer to all the wrong and anti-dogmatic arguments, reasons and teachings of Liberalism. Newman's sermons were not simply spiritual readings but theological treatments on concrete issues in response to particular persons or groups of the time. Thus, the Trinitarian sermons of Newman are like those of the Fathers written against the heresies of their age. Within the context of fighting heretical teachings in the early Church, the Fathers developed their Christology and Trinitarian theology. Newman did the same in his own time.

Third, this study shows that Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* and his Trinitarian theology were *part* of the Oxford Movement. Normally Newman's sermons are regarded as his own reflections and spirituality, and have been read separately from the context of the Oxford Movement. Newman, in fact, did not give sermons just because he was the vicar of St. Mary's. For him, the pulpit of St. Mary's was the cardinal podium of the Oxford Movement. The sermons were significant theological presentations of the dogmatic teachings that Newman and his fellow Tractarians saw as essential in the apostolic renewal of

the Church of England. The Tractarians saw the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as the crucial foundation needed to establish firmly the faith of the believers upon which the whole structure of the doctrines and practices of the Church would be renewed and rejuvenated within the Apostolic Tradition.

This study also points out the significant role of the patristic teaching, particularly the influence of the Athanasian Creed and the Greek Fathers, in the theology of the Oxford Movement,<sup>1757</sup> and offers an invitation for more patristic studies, especially of Athanasius and the Cappadocians, within the Anglican context of the nineteenth century. This study highlights the significance of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* within the Oxford Movement. Some think of the *Tracts for the Times* as the most important documents of the Oxford Movement and forget the role played by Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. The sermons indeed were the "public voice" of the Oxford Movement, through which people knew about the Movement. People from scholars to shopkeepers came to St. Mary's in order to listen to the sermons, which they then discussed and complemented with the arguments in *The Tracts for the Times*. One might say *Parochial and Plain Sermons* and *Tracts for the Times* were the "two hands" of the Oxford Movement.<sup>1758</sup>

---

<sup>1757</sup> John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, 135-137.

<sup>1758</sup> R. W. Church commented, "Since 1828 this preaching had been going on at St. Mary's, growing in purpose and directness as the years went on. . . . While men were reading and talking about the Tracts, they were hearing the sermons; and in the sermons they heard the living meaning, and reason, and bearing of the Tracts. . . . The sermons created a moral atmosphere, in which man judged the questions in debate." R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement, Twelve Years, 1833-1845* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1922), 129-130. Newman was also the author of many of the *Tracts* of the Oxford Movement.

Finally, this study has connected the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* with the *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. One cannot fully understand the sermons of Newman without reading his letters and diaries. If the sermons give the reader the content of Newman's thoughts, the letters and diaries offer the context. The letters and diaries give the reader the light and environment within which to see more clearly various aspects of Newman's thoughts. Newman loved to write. Writing was a joy and a disclosure of inwardness which helped him to express not only his thoughts but himself. These sermons, letters, and diaries reflect their author; and these writings can offer the light in interpreting his other writings. Thanks to his letters and diaries, this study provides a better understanding not only of Newman's Trinitarian theology during the decade at the Oxford Movement, but also of the Oxford Movement as a whole.

One of the things that I have learned from Newman is that he always looked at the mirror of the past in order to see the present. The teachings of the Fathers and their arguments with their opponents in the fourth and fifth centuries were the precious treasure which helped Newman to deal with the problems of his nineteenth century. In the same manner, we might find solutions for our thorny issues in theology and ecumenism today.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Works of by John Henry Newman:*

Newman, John Henry. *A Letter Addressed to the Rev. R.W. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church: In Explanation of No. 90 in the Series Called the Tracts for the Times*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on His Recent Eirenicon or Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, 1900.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1903.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua and Six Sermons*. Edited by Frank M. Turner. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. Edited by David J. DeLaura. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Apologia pro Vita Sua*. Edited by Charles Kingsley. London: Longmans, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Autobiographical Writings*. Edited by Henry Tristram. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Characteristics from the Writings of John Henry Newman*. Edited by William Samuel Lilly. London: Henry S. King & Co., 1874.

\_\_\_\_\_, trans. *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril*. London: F. and J. Rivington, 1845

\_\_\_\_\_. *Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Essays Critical and Historical*. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Essays Critical and Historical*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fifteen Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lectures on Catholicism in England*. London: Birmingham, 1851.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lectures on Justification*. London: Rivington & Parker, 1838.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1837.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*. Vol. I. Anna Mozley, ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*. Vol. II. Anne Mozley, ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Loss and Gain*. Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1854.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John Henry Newman – Sermons 1824-1843*. Vol. I & II. Placid Murray, ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Meditations and Devotions of the Later Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907. Available at <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/index.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. III. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. IV. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. V. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. VI. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. VII. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Vol. VIII. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sayings of Cardinal Newman*. London: Burns & Oates, 1890.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1877.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*. Vol. I & II. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1903.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sermon Notes of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Church of the Fathers*. Francis McGrath, ed. Notre Dame: Gracewing Publishing, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Idea of a University*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. I. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. II. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. III. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. IV. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. V. Edited by Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. VI. Edited by Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. VII. Edited by Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. VIII. Edited by Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. IX. Edited by Francis J. McGrath and Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. X. Edited by Francis J. McGrath. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. XI. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. XXX. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Lives of the English Saints*. Vol. 5. London: Freemantle, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Philosophical Notebook of John Henry Newman*. Vol. I. Edited by Edward Sillem. Louvain: Nauwelaerts Publishing House, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Via Media of the Anglican Church Illustrated in Lectures, Letters and Tracts*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*, no. 2. Vol. I. London: J. G. & J. Rivington, 1840.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*, no. 11. Vol. I. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1840.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*, no. 71. Vol. III. New York: Charles Henry, 1840.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*, no. 73. Vol. III. New York: Charles Henry, 1840.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*, no. 90. New York: J. A. Sparks, 1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*. London: Pickering, 1881.

*Works by Other Authors:*

A London Merchant. *Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters*. London: R. Hunter and W. Harwood, 1817.

Abbey, Charles J. and Overton, John H. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906.

Abbot, Edwin A. *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*. Vol. II. London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.

Adam, Robert David. *The Religious Displayed*. Vol. I. London: L. B. Seeley and Son, 1823.

Allen, Joseph Henry. *Our Liberal Movement in Theology - Chiefly as Shown in Recollections of the History of Unitarianism in New England*. Boston: Robert Brothers, 1882.

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

Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

American Unitarian Association. *Tracts of the American Unitarian Association*. Vol. VII. Boston: Charles Bowen, 1834.

Anatolios, Khaled, ed. *Athanasius*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Anselm. *St. Anselm, Proslogium; Monologium: An Appendix, In Behalf of the Fool, by Gaunilon; and Cur Deus Homo*. Translated by Sidney Norton Deane. Chicago: The Opencourt Publishing Co, 1903.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae: 3a. 1-6*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Summa Theologica*. Volume 2. Part II. First Section. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Summa Theologica: Vol. 10 of 10*. Translated by Dominican Province. Forgotten Books, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The “Summa Theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Part III. First number (QQ. I.-XXVI). Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1913.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Passion of Christ: 3a. 46-52*. Edited by Richard T. A. Murphy. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.



Arnold, Matthew. "Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist." *Living Age*. Fifth Series. Vol. XIV (April-June, 1876), 67-78.

Arx, Jeffrey Paul von. *Progress and Pessimism: Religion, Politics, and History in Late Nineteenth Century Britain*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Aspland, Robert. "Review – Six Letters Addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenter." *The Monthly Repository of Theology*. Vol. XII (1817): 302-304.

Athanasius. *Letter to Serapion*. Translated by C. R. B. Shapland. *The Letters of St. Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*. London: Epworth Press, 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_. *On the Incarnation of the Word*. Translated by Archibald Robertson. London: D. Nutt, 1885.

\_\_\_\_\_. *On the Incarnation*. Edited by C. S. Lewis. Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tome or Synodal Letter to the People of Antioch*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Series. Vol. 4. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

Augustine, *Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels*. Edited by Philip Schaff. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. 1<sup>st</sup> Series. Vol. VI. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *On the Trinity*. Edited by Philip Schaff. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Vol. III. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1887.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Psalm CXXXIX*. Translated by Members of the English Church. *A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church*. Vol. VI – Expositions on the Book of Psalms 126-150. Oxford: James Parker and Rivingtons, 1857.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sermon LXVII*. Translated by Members of the English Church. *A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church*. Vol. II. Oxford: James Parker and Rivingtons, 1875.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament*. Edited by Philip Schaff. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. 1<sup>st</sup> Series. Vol. VI. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Trinity*. Translated by Stephen McKenna. *The Fathers of the Church*. Vol. 45. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963.

- Avis, Paul D. L. *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*. London: T & T Clark, 2002.
- Backus, Irena Dorota. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Barmann, Lawrence F., ed. *Newman at St. Mary's*. Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962.
- Barth, Karl. *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of John Calvin*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- Basil Caesariensis. *On the Holy Spirit*. Edited by Philip Schaff. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Series. Vol. 8. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Letters and Select Works*. London: Continuum, 1989.
- Baxter, Richard. *The Practical Works of Richard Baxter*. Vol. IV. London: George Virtue, 1838.
- Beard, John R. *Reasons Why I Am a Unitarian*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1860.
- Beard, John Rely, ed. *Unitarianism Exhibited in Its Actual Condition: Consisting of Essays by Several Unitarian Ministers and Others, Illustrative of the Rise, Progress, and Principles of Christian Anti-trinitarianism in Different Parts of the World*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1846.
- Behr, John. *The Nicene Faith*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.
- Bennett, James and Bogue, David. *The History of Dissenters: From the Revolution to the Year 1808*. Vol. II. London: Frederick Westley and A. H. Davis, 1833.
- Blanco White, Joseph. *Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy*. London: John Mardon, 1839.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White*. Edited by John Hamilton Thom. Vol. II. London: John Chapman, 1845.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Newman: His Life and Spirituality*. New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Newman's Vision of Faith*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- Brastow, Lewis O. *Representative Modern Preachers*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.

- Braaren, Carl E. and Robert W. Jenson eds. *Christian Dogmatics*. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Bremond, Henri. *The Mystery of Newman*. London: William and Norgate, 1907.
- Brewer, John Sherren. *The Athanasian Origin of the Athanasian Creed*. London: Rivingtons, 1872.
- Bricknell, William Simcox. *The Judgment of the Bishops upon Tractarian Theology*. Oxford: J. Vencent, 1845.
- Bright, William and Edward Bouverie Pusey. *Later Treatises of S. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria: With Notes, and an Appendix on S. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret*. London: J. Parker, 1881.
- Bright, William. *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898.
- Brock, M. G. and Curthoys, M. C. eds. *The History of the University of Oxford*. Vol. VI "Nineteenth-century Oxford." Part I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. *Historical Theology: An Introduction*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Browne, Edward Harold. *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal*. New York: H. B. Durand, 1865.
- Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Comforter*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Bulgakov, Sergius, Sergei Nikolaevich Bulgakov, and Boris Jakim. *The Lamb of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007.
- Burgon, John William. *Lives of Twelve Good Men*. Vol. II. London: John Murray, 1889.
- Burke, Patrick. *Reinterpreting Rahner: A Critical Study of His Major Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- Burleigh, J. H. S. ed. *Augustine's Early Writings*. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1953.
- Burnap, George W. *Popular Objections to Unitarian Christianity Considered and Answered in Seven Discourses*. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1855.
- Burnet, Gilbert. *A Defense of Natural and Revealed Religion*. Vol. 2. London: Kessinger Publishing, 2004.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1814.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Four Discourses Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Sarum*. London: Richard Chiswell, 1694.
- Burrows, Mark S. "A Historical Reconsideration of Newman and Liberalism: Newman and Mivart on Science and the Church." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987): 399-419.
- Butler, Joseph. *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*. 20<sup>th</sup> edn. New York: Newman and Ivison, 1853.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Three Sermons Upon Human Nature: With a Dissertation on the Nature of Virtue*. London: J. & J. J. Deighton and T. Stevenson, 1835.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Vol. II. Edited by John T. McNeill. Louisville – London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960.
- Cameron, Charles Richard. *Dr. Hampden's Past and Present Statements Compared*. Oxford: W. Baxter, 1836.
- Capes, J. M. "Parallel and a Contrast." *The Gentleman's Magazine*. Vol. IX (July-December, 1872): 33-44.
- Capes, J. M. "Purgatory, Heaven and Hell." *The Contemporary Review*, 22 (1873): 730-753.
- Capuchin, Zeno. *John Henry Newman: His Inner Life*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987.
- Chadwick, Owen, ed. *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. California: Stanford University Press, 1961.
- Chamberlain, Walter. *The Christian Verity Stated Being a Summary of Trinitarian Doctrine Especially Adapted from Present Times*. London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt, 1862.
- Cheetham, S. *A History of the Christian Church during the First Six Centuries*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1905.
- Church, R. W. "Newman's Parochial Sermons." *Living Age*. 4<sup>th</sup> Series. Vol. XIV (1869): 151-157.
- Clark, J. C. D. *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancient Regime*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Clarke, T. E. S., and H. C. Foxcroft. *A Life of Gilbert Burnet Bishop of Salisbury*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge: 1827-1834*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Congar, Yves M. J. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Vol. I, II, III. Translated by David Smith. New York: The Seabury Press, 1983.
- Connolly, John R. *John Henry Newman: A View of Catholic Faith for the New Millennium*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
- Conser, Walter H. Jr. *Church and Confession*. Mercer: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Contributors to the "Tract for the Times." *Plain Sermons*. Vol. I. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Plain Sermons*. Vol. IV. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1842.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Plain Sermons*. Vol. X. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1848.
- Cottle, Joseph. *Essays on Socinianism*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1850.
- Coulson, John and A. M. Allchin, eds. *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium*. London-Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- Cowling, Maurice. *Religion and Public Doctrine in Modern England*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Craig, Edward, ed., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1998.
- Cross, Arthur Lyon. *A History of England and Greater Britain*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.
- Crosthwaite, John Clarke; Edward Bouverie Pusey; Frederick Oakeley. *Modern Hagiology: An Examination of the Nature and Tendency of Some Legendary and Devotional Works Lately Published Under the Sanction of the Rev. J. H. Newman, the Rev. Dr. Pusey, and the Rev. F. Oakley*. Vol. II. London: J. W. Parker, 1846.

- Cumming, John. *Lectures on Romanism: Being Illustrations and Refutations of the Errors of Romanism and Tractarianism*. Boston: John P. Jewett and Company, 1854.
- Dale, M. "The Ritual of the English Church." *The Quarterly Review* 137 (1874): 542-586.
- Dauphinais, Michael; Barry David and Matthew Levering, eds. *Aquinas the Augustinian*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 2007.
- Dixon, Philip. 'Nice and Hot Disputes' – *The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Dorner, I. A. *History of Protestant Theology Particularly in Germany*. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A System of Christian Doctrine*. Vol. I. Translated by Alfred Cave. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1888.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *History of the Development of the Person of Christ*. Division Second. Vol. III. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *History of Protestant Theology*. Vol II. Translated by George Robson. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1871.
- Dulles, Avery. *Newman*. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Dych, William V. *Karl Ranher*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Edwards, T. C. "On the God-Man." *The Expositor*. Vol. 2, 5<sup>th</sup> series (1895): 81-92.
- Ekeh, Ono. "John Henry Newman on the Mystery of the Trinity." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 74 (2009): 202-223.
- Ellison, Robert H. *The Victorian Pulpit: Spoken and Written Sermons in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Pennsylvania: Susquehanna University Press, 1999.
- Elton, Charles Abraham. *An Appeal to Scripture and Tradition, in Defence of the Unitarian Faith*. London: R. Hunter, 1818.
- Erskine, Thomas and Charles Leslie. *Erskine's Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth and Leslie's Short Method with the Deists*. London: Mark Newman, 1823.
- Eunomius. *The Extant Works*. Translated by Richard Paul Vaggione. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

- Evans, Eric J. *The Great Reform Act of 1832*. London: Routledge, 1983.
- Fairbairn, Donald. *Eastern Orthodoxy through Western Eyes*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Fairweather, A. M., ed. *Aquinas on Nature and Grace – Selections from the Summa Theologica*. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. *Remains on the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*. Vol. I. Derby: Henry Mozley and Sons, and J. G. & F. Rivington, 1839.
- Fisher, George Park. *History of the Christian Church*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.
- Foxe, John; Stephen Reed Cattley and George Townsend. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. Vol. I. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1841.
- Froude, Richard Hurrell; John Henry Newman; John Keble and James Bowling Mozley. *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*. London: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1839.
- Gascoigne, John. *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment: Science, Religion and Politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Genovese, Eugene D. *The Mind of the Master Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- George, Timothy, ed. *John Calvin and the Church: a Prism of Reform*. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990.
- Gibson, William and Robert G. Ingram, eds. *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Gioia, Luigi. *Theological Epistemology of Augustine's De Trinitate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Gorman, Thomas Murray. *The Athanasian Creed and Modern Thought*. London: Longmans, Green, 1870.
- Graham, Donald. "Newman's Sermon on 'The Mystery of the Holy Trinity': A Response to Richard Whately?" *Newman Studies Journal*. Vol. 5, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 63-76.

- Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*. Edited by Phillip Schaff. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. 2<sup>nd</sup> series. Vol. 5. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Greig, Martin. "Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701." *The Historical Journal*. 37, 3 (1994): 569-592.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reasonableness of Christianity? Gilbert Burnet and the Trinitarian Controversy of the 1690s." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol. 44. No. 4 (October 1993): 631-651
- Grenz, Stanley James and William Carl Placher. *Essentials of Christian Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Griffin, Martin I. J. *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Vol. I. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Gritsch, Eric W. *A History of Lutheranism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Hall, Samuel. *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1906.
- Hanna, William, ed. *Letters of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen*. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1884.
- Hanson, Richard Patrick Crosland. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381 AD*. New York: Continuum, 2006.
- Harnack, Adolph. *History of Dogma*. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Vol. VII. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1900.
- Harrison, Carol. *Augustine – Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Harrold, Charles Frederick. *John Henry Newman: An Expository and Critical Study of His Mind, Thought and Art*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1966.
- Hayman, Henry. "Cardinal Newman: A Tribute from the Anglican Standpoint." *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. Vol. XLVIII (1891): 144-170.
- Henson, Hensley, ed. *Church Problems – A View of Modern Anglicanism*. London: John Murray, 1900.



- Hendrix, Scott H. *Ecclesia in Via*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- Hilary of Poitiers. *On the Trinity*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Vol. IX. New York: Parker & Company, 1902.
- Hilton, Mary. *Education and Public Doctrine in Britain, 1750-1850*. London: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Huidekoper, H. J. *The Unitarian Essayist*. Vol. I. Meadville: Thomas Atkinson, 1831.
- Humphrey, William and Humphry, William Gilson. *A Digest of the Doctrine of S. Thomas on the Incarnation: Contained in Q. I-LIX. of the Third Part of the "Summa" and Its Supplement, Q. LXIX. to End*. London: J. T. Hayes, 1868.
- Hunt, John. "Bishop Butler as a Writer on Evidences." *Contemporary View*, 22 (June-November, 1873): 903-920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Gibbings & Co., 1896.
- Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734-1984*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989.
- Jay, Elisabeth, ed. *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- John of Damascus. *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: St. Hilary of Poitiers, John of Damascus*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Series. Vol. IX. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1899.
- Jones, Gareth. *The Blackwell Companion to Modern Theology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Jones, Michael Keenan. *Toward a Christology of Christ the High Priest*. Roma: Università Gregoriana, 2006.
- Kallistos (Bishop of Diokleia). *The Orthodox Church*. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Katz, David S. *God's Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Ker, Ian Turnbull. *The Achievement of John Henry Newman*. London: Continuum, 1991.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *John Henry Newman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Newman on Being a Christian*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.
- Ker, Ian Turnbull and Terrence Merrigan, eds. *Newman and Faith*. Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 2004.
- King, Benjamin John. *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Knight, Douglas H. ed. *The Theology of John Zizioulas* Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- LaCugna, Catherine Mowry. *God for Us*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1973.
- Lapati, Americo D. *John Henry Newman*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Larsen, Timothy and Daniel J. Treier, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Lawson, Penelope and Clive S. Lewis, eds., *On the Incarnation: The Treatise De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.
- Leach, Thomas. *A Short Sketch of the Tractarian Upheaval*. London: Bemrose and Sons, 1887.
- Levering, Matthew. *Scripture and Metaphysics: Aquinas and the Renewal of Trinitarian Theology*. New York: Blackwell, 2004.
- Liddon, Henry Parry and Robert James Wilson. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*. Vol. III. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*. Vol. IV. London: Longmans, Green, 1897.
- Livingston, James C.; Francis Schüssler Fiorenza; Sarah Coakly. *Modern Christian Thought: The Twentieth Century*. Vol. II. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Livingstone, Elizabeth A., ed., *Studia Patristica*. Vol. XXIX. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Loewen, Harry. *Luther and the Radicals*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1974.

- Lohse, Bernhar. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine: From the First Century to the Present*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Lorimer, George C. *Christianity in the Nineteenth Century*. Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1900.
- Luther, Martin. *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. Edited by Timothy F Lull and William R. Russell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary of Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Classics, 1979.
- Lyon, William H. *A Study of the Sects*. Boston: Unitarian Sunday – School Society, 1892.
- Mackintosh, Hugh Ross. *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- MacMahon, John H. *Church and State in England; Its Origin and Use*. London: William Macintosh, 1873.
- Manning, Henry Edward. "England and Christendom." *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* 16 (1867): 811-835.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theories of the Church." *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review and Quarterly Record of Christian Literature* 1 (1852): 152-169.
- Martin, Brian. *John Henry Newman: His Life and His Work*. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.
- McCarthy, Justin. *A Short History of Our Own Times from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of 1880*. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly, 1886.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1990.
- McKim, Donald K. *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theological Turning Point: Major Issues in Christian Thought*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989.

Members of the University of Oxford. *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. I., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Charles Henry, 1839.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. II, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: J.G.F.& J. Rivington, 1841.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. III. London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1839.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. IV. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1840.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. V. London: J. G. & J. Rivington, 1840.

Merrigan, Terrence and Jacques Haers. *The Myriad Christ: Plurality and the Quest for Unity in Contemporary Christology*. Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Ian Turnbull Ker, eds. *Newman and the Word*. Louvain: Peeters Press, 2000.

Middleton, Robert D. *Newman at Oxford: His Religious Development*. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Newman and Bloxam*. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Milner, Benjamin Charles. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Church*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

Minton, Samuel. *Lectures on Unitarianism*. Hanley: Allbut and Son, 1847.

Moody, John. *John Henry Newman*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945.

Moore, Edward Caldwell. *An Outline of the History of Christian Thought since Kant*. Cambridge: C. Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Morley, John. *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*. London: Edward Lloyd, Limited, 1908.

Mulsow, Martin and Jan. Rohls, eds. *Socinianism and Arminianism*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005.

Murphy, Francesca Aran and Christopher Aspray, eds. *Ecumenism Today – The Universal Church in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.

Murray, Placid, ed. *John Henry Newman Sermons 1824-1843*. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Neilson, William Allan. *A History of English Literature*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.

Newman, Francis William, ed., *Phase of Faith; or, Passages from the History of My Creed*. London: Trubner & Co., 1881.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Christianity in Its Cradle*. London: Trübner, 1886.

Newman, Gerald and Leslie Ellen Brown. *Britain in the Hanoverian Age, 1714-1837: An Encyclopedia*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1997.

Nicole, Roger R.; Charles Evan Hill, and Frank A James. *The Glory of the Atonement: Biblical, Historical & Practical Perspectives*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

Noris, Thomas J. *Newman and His Theological Method*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

O'Connell, Marvin R. *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45*. London: The Macmillan Company, 1969.

O'Donnell, John Joseph. *The Mystery of the Triune God*. New York: Continuum, 1988.

Ollard, Sidney Leslie. *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1915.

Owen, John. *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1823.

Paley, William. *Natural Theology*. Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1857.

Palmer, William and John Henry Newman. *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church*. London: Kegan Paul Trench, 1882.

Parker, Kenneth and Michael J. Pahls, eds. *Authority, Dogma and History: The Role of the Oxford Movement Converts in the Papal Infallibility Debates*. Bethesda: Academica Press, 2009.

Parsons, Gerald; James Moore, and Richard John Wolffe. *Religion in Victorian Britain: Traditions*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Pattison, Robert. *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Pelikan, Jaroslav and Hilton C. Oswald, eds. *Luther's Works*. Vol. 31. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1986.

Perceval, Arthur Philip. "Puseyism" "No Popery." Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1843.

Pohle, Joseph. *The Divine Trinity – A Dogmatic Treatise*. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1912.

Porter, John Scott and Daniel Bagot. *Authentic Report of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy Between the Rev. John Scott Porter and the Rev. Daniel Bagot M. A., Held on April 14, 1834, and Three Following Days, in the Meeting House of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast: Held on April 14, 1834 . . .* London: Simms & M'Intyre, 1834.

Poynor, Thomas, “ ‘How can these Things Be?’ Newman’s Anglican Sermon on ‘The Christian Mysteries.’ ” *Newman Studies Journal*. Vol. 5, no. 1. Edited by John T. Ford. (Spring 2008): 51-62.

Prichard, Robert W. *The Nature of Salvation: Theological Consensus in the Episcopal Church, 1801-73*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Pusey, Edward Bouverie. *A Letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford on the Tendency to Romanism*. New York: J. S. Redfield, Clinton Hall, 1843.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Sermon Preached before the University*. New York: James A. Sparks, 1843.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Churches in London.” *The Church of England Quarterly Review*. Vol. II (1837): 411-449.

\_\_\_\_\_. *First Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.: In Explanation Chiefly in Regard to the Reverential Love Due to the Ever-blessed Theotokos, and the Doctrine of Her Immaculate Conception; with an Analysis of Cardinal de Turrecremata’s Work on the Immaculate Conception*. London: J. Parker & Co., 1869.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford*. New York: J. S. Redfield, 1843.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Tract 18” in *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. I. by Members of the University of Oxford. London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1839.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Tract 81.” Members of the University of Oxford. *Tracts for the Times*. Vol. V. London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1840.

Quasten, Johnnes. *Patrology*. Vol. III. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1960.

Rahner, Karl. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. Translated by William V. Dych. New York: The Seabury Press, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Trinity*. Translated by Joseph Doncell. New York: Crossroad, 1997.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theological Investigation*. Vol. IV. Translated by Kevin Smyth. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Rainy, Robert. "Cardinal Newman." *The Expositor*. Vol. VI (1892): 34-48.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. "The Holy Spirit as Communio: Concerning the Relationship of Pneumatology and Spirituality in Augustine." *Communio* 25 (Summer 1998): 324-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Introduction to Christianity*. Translated by J. R. Foster. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church as Communion*. New York: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- Reid, W. Stanford. "The Ecumenism of John Calvin." *Westminster Theological Journal* 11, no. 1 (November 1948): 33-42.
- Rickaby, Joseph John. *An Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914, republished by BiblioBazaar, LLC, 2008.
- Rivington, Messrs. *A Classified Catalogue of Books*. London: Rivington, 1880.
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. I "The Apostolic Fathers – Justin Martyr – Irenaeus." New York: Charles Scribner's sons, 1903.
- Robertson, James C. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. I. London: John Murray, 1874.
- Routh, H. V. *Towards the Twentieth Century: Essays in the Spiritual History of the Nineteenth*, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1977.
- Sarolea, Charles. *Cardinal Newman and His Influence on Religious Life and Thought*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. *A Religious Encyclopedia: Or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology*. Vol. III. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1889.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *St. Augustine the Writings Against the Manicheans and Against the Donatists: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Part 4. New York: Kessinger Publishing, 2004.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1878.
- Sencourt, Robert. *The Life of Newman*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1948.
- Shea, Victor and William Whitla. *Essays and Reviews: The 1860 Text and Its Reading*. Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2000.
- Shuttleworth, Philip N. *No Tradition but Scripture*. Philadelphia: Hooker & Agnew, 1841.
- Sparks, Jared and Francis William Pitt Greenwood. *The Unitarian Miscellany and Christian Monitor*. Vol. I. Baltimore: Baltimore Unitarian Book Society, 1822.
- Sparks, Jared. *An Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines*. Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823.
- Spence-Jones, Henry Donald Maurice. *The Church of England, a History for the People*. Vol. IV "the Anglican Church". London: Cassell and Company, Limited, 1898.
- Sproul, R. C. *Justified by Faith Alone*. Illinois: Crossway Books, 1999.
- Standish, Colin and Russell R. Standish. *Evangelical Dilemma*. Virginia: Hartland Publications, 1997.
- Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn. *The Athanasian Creed*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1871.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D.* London: B. Fellows, 1852.
- Stannus, Hugh H. *A History of the Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Christian Church*. London: Christian Life Publishing Company, 1882.
- Stephens, William Richard Wood and Williams Hunt, eds. *History of the English Church*. Vol. VIII. London: Macmillan, 1910.
- Stevenson, Richard Taylor. *John Calvin: The Statesman*. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1907.
- Storr, Vernon Faithfull. *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913.
- Stoughton, John. *Reminiscences of Congregationalism Fifty Years Ago*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. I. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. III. Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1909.
- Sugg, Joyce. *John Henry Newman: Snapdragon in the Wall*. Trowbridge, Wiltshire, UK: Gracewing Publishing, 2001.
- Swainson, Charles Anthony and Walter Farquhar Hook. *“The Athanasian Creed” and Its Usage in the English Church: An Investigation as the Original Object of the Creed and the Growth of Prevailing Misconception Regarding It*. London: Rivington, 1870.
- Tierney, Michael, ed. *A Tribute to Newman: Essays on Aspects of His Life and Thought*. Dublin-Belfast-Cork: Browne and Nolan, 1945.
- Torrance, Thomas F. *The Christian Doctrine of God*. New York: T & T Clark, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Trinitarian Perspectives towards Doctrinal Agreement*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- The Birmingham Oratory, ed. *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others ... 1839-1845*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1917.
- The Church of England. *The Book of Common Prayer*. New York: New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, 1844.
- The Late Lord Acton; A. W. Ward; G. W. Prothero; Stanley Leathes, eds. *The Cambridge Modern History*. Vol. XI. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.
- Thomas, Stephen. *Newman and Heresy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Trevor, Meriol. *Newman’s Journey*. Great Britain: Collins & World, 1974.
- Trilling, Lionel. *Matthew Arnold*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1974.
- Turner, Frank M. *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Vaiss, Paul, ed. *From Oxford to the People*. Trowbridge, Wiltshire, UK: Gracewing, 1996.
- VanderWilt, Jeffrey Thomas. *A Church Without Borders: The Eucharist and the Church in Ecumenical Perspective*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Vandeveldt, Antoon, ed. *Gifts and Interests*. Louvain, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 2000.
- Waddington, Mossie May. *The Development of British Thought from 1820 to 1890*. Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1919.

- Wakefield, Gordon S. *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*. Westminster: John Knox Press, 1983.
- Waller, Alfred Rayney and G. H. S. Barrow. *John Henry Cardinal Newman*. Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1901.
- Walpole, Spencer. *The History of Twenty-Five Years: 1876-1880*. Vol. IV. London: Longmans, Green, 1908.
- Walgrave, J.-H. *Newman the Theologian*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960.
- Walsh, Walter. *The History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England 1833-1864*. London: James Nisbet, 1900.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1899.
- Ward, Adolphus William and Alfred Rayney Waller, eds. *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Vol. XII – the Nineteenth Century. England: Cambridge University Press, 1916.
- Ward, Wilfrid Philip. *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Witnesses to the Unseen, and Other Essays*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Problems and Persons*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Life of John Henry Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.
- Wardlaw, Ralph. *Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, & Green, 1828.
- Weinandy, Thomas G. *Athanasius*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2007.
- Whately, Elizabeth Jane. *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., Late Archbishop of Dublin*. London: Longmans, Green, 1866.
- Whately, Richard. *Elements of Logic*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sermons on Various Subjects*. London: John W. Parker, West Strand, 1849.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature*. London: B. Fellowes, Ludgate Street, 1830.
- Wheeler, Michael. *Heaven, Hell and the Victorians*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Wilberforce, Henry. "F. Newman's Oxford Parochial Sermons." *Dublin Review* 12 (1869): 309-330.
- Willey, Basil. *Nineteenth Century Studies*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1968.
- Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Wilson, John. *Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism*. London: Chapman, Brothers, 1846.
- Wiseman, Nicholas Patrick, ed. *The Dublin Review* 82 (1878): 208-210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*. Vol. I. Baltimore: John Murphy, 1846.
- Wright, Thomas. "Newman and Campion: A Comparison and Contrast." *The Month – A Catholic Magazine*. Vol. 11 (January to June, 1908): 78-82.
- Yates, James. *A Vindication of Unitarianism*. London: Edward T. Whitfield, 1850.
- Young, B. W. *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Young, Frances Margaret; M. Edwards and P. Parvis, eds. *Studia Patristica: Orientalia, Clement, Origen, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Chrysostom*, Vol. XLI. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2006.
- Zizioulas, John D.. "Recent Discussions on Primacy in Orthodox Theology" in *The Petrine Ministry*. Edited by Cardinal Walter Kasper. New York: The Newman Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Being as Communion*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Communion & Otherness*. Paul McPartlan, ed. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.

---

. “Primacy in the Church: An Orthodox Approach” in *Petrine Ministry and the Unity of the Church*. Edited by James F. Puglisi. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999.