

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

John Henry Newman's *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*: A Contextual
History and Ecclesiological Analysis

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Theology and Religious Studies
Of The Catholic University of America
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree
Doctor of Sacred Theology

©

Copyright

All Rights Reserved

By

Joseph G. Elamparayil

Washington, D.C.

2012

John Henry Newman's *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*: A
Contextual History and Ecclesiological Analysis

Joseph G. Elamparayil, S.T.D.

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

In order to provide an ecclesiological foundation for the Oxford Movement (a reform movement within the Church of England), John Henry Newman (1801-1890) gave a series of lectures in 1834 and 1836 in the Adam de Brome Chapel of St. Mary's Church, Oxford. His presentations were later published as *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism* (1836¹; 1837²). The third edition of the *Prophetical Office* was published in 1877 with revisions, notes and a new Preface.

This dissertation provides a contextual history and an ecclesiological analysis of Newman's *Prophetical Office*. The first part of this study examines the historical background of the *Prophetical Office*, beginning with Newman's early ideas of the Church, which he learned from his study of the Fathers of the Church and the Arian controversy. Next is an account of the impressions of the Church that Newman derived from his first encounters with the churches of Greece and Rome during his Mediterranean voyage (1832-1833) and his ecclesiological reflections in his four-part essay, "Home Thoughts Abroad." This dissertation then examines the *Tracts for the Times* that Newman wrote on ecclesiological topics during the Oxford Movement (1833-1837) and also discusses the influence on his ecclesiology of his discussion with both a Roman

Catholic opponent, Abbé Jean-Nicolas Jager (1790-1868), and an Anglican friend, Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836).

The second part of this study is an ecclesiological analysis of the fourteen lectures of the *Prophetical Office*, along with the revisions, notes and new Preface that Newman added in 1877. This analysis, which examines the characteristics and principal themes of Newman's theological thought, shows that Newman's *Prophetical Office* represents a comprehensive ecclesiology.

In sum, this dissertation provides a contextual history as well as an ecclesiological analysis of Newman's *Prophetical Office*, which was his "major constructive work in ecclesiology" yet which until now has received insufficient attention and recognition.

This dissertation by Joseph G. Elamparayil fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Systematic Theology approved by John T. Ford, C.S.C., S.T.D., as Director, and by John P. Galvin, Dr. Theol., and James Wiseman, O.S.B., S.T.D., as Readers.

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

John P. Galvin, Dr. Theol., Reader

James Wiseman, O.S.B., S.T.D., Reader

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: NEWMAN’S INITIAL VIEW OF THE CHURCH.....	8
1. Newman’s Formative Years	8
2. Newman’s Study of the Arians	19
3. A Summary of Newman’s Initial View of the Church	34
CHAPTER TWO: NEWMAN’S MEDITERRANEAN VOYAGE: ENCOUNTERING OTHER CHURCHES	37
1. In the Footsteps of the Apostles and Fathers	39
2. The Greek Church.....	41
3. The Irish Church Bill	42
4. The Church of Rome.....	47
A. An Apocalyptic Rome	49
B. Classical Rome	52
C. Religious Rome	53
5. Newman’s Return to Sicily.....	62
6. A Summary: Encountering Real Churches	64
CHAPTER THREE: AN ECCLESIOLOGICAL CONVERSION ABROAD.....	66
1. An Ecclesiological Dialogue in Rome	66
2. Towards an Ecclesiological Debate	75
3. A Movement of the Friends of the Church	82
4. A Summary: Ecclesiological Conversion and Movement	93
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CHURCH IN NEWMAN’S TRACTS.....	95
1. The Visible Church	96
A. Apostolic Foundation of the Church	103
B. The Role of Bishops	107
C. Rejection of the Pope.....	112

D. Church Reform	118
2. The Anglican Church as <i>Via Media</i>	119
A. The Problem: Popish or Protestant?	120
B. The Answer: The Anglican Church as <i>Via Media</i>	122
3. A Summary: The Church in Newman's <i>Tracts</i>	128

CHAPTER FIVE: NEWMAN-JAGER CONTROVERSY ON CHURCH

AUTHORITY 131

1. Context of the Controversy	132
2. Correspondence between Newman and Jager.....	135
A. Church, Scripture and Tradition	137
B. Infallibility of the Church	140
C. Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Dogmas	143
D. The Development of Doctrines.....	150
E. Apostolic and Prophetic Traditions	153
F. Scripture as the Rule of Faith	161
3. The Jager-Newman Controversy and the <i>Prophetical Office</i>	167
4. A Summary: The Authority of Church in Newman-Jager Controversy	169

CHAPTER SIX: THE CHURCH IN FROUDE-NEWMAN'S

CORRESPONDENCE 171

1. Newman and Froude as Fellows and Co-Travelers	173
2. Leaders of the Movement for the Church	177
A. The Doctrine of the Eucharist.....	181
B. Church and State.....	183
C. Apostolic Succession.....	187
D. Growing Love for Roman Catholicism	188
3. Froude's Critique of the Newman-Jager Controversy	192
4. Froude's <i>Remains</i>	203
5. Froude and Newman's <i>Prophetical Office</i>	205
6. Froude's Critique of Newman's Ecclesiology: A Summary	206

**CHAPTER SEVEN: THE VIA MEDIA BETWEEN INFALLIBILITY AND
PRIVATE JUDGMENT..... 209**

1. The Authority of the Church.....	210
2. Protestant and Roman Errors	218
3. Roman Neglect of Antiquity	224
4. The Doctrine of Infallibility.....	230
5. The Use of Private Judgment.....	242
6. The Abuse of Private Judgment.....	250
7. The Indefectibility of the Church.....	258
8. The <i>Via Media</i> between Infallibility and Private Judgment: A Summary	269

**CHAPTER EIGHT: THE *VIA MEDIA* BETWEEN SCRIPTURE AND
TRADITION 272**

1. Creed as the Essentials of the Gospel	272
2. Objections to the Creed.....	279
3. Scripture: Record of Faith and Document of Proof	288
4. Scripture as Jesus' Teaching and the Sole Canon of Faith	297
5. Scripture as the Document of Proof in the Early Church	301
6. The Fortunes of the Church	302
7. The <i>Via Media</i> between Scripture and Tradition: A Summary	306

**CHAPTER NINE: PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION OF THE
PROPHETICAL OFFICE – 1877 309**

1. The Aftermath of the Lectures on the Prophetical Office.....	309
2. The Collapse of Newman's <i>Via Media</i>	320
3. 1877 Preface to Third Edition.....	322
A. Newman's Review of the Lectures.....	324
B. The Main Elements of the Lectures.....	326
4. Prophetical, Regal and Priestly Church: A New Ecclesiology	331
5. The Three Offices of the Church	334
6. The Principle of Economy	339
7. 1877 Preface: A Summary	349

CHAPTER TEN: THE <i>PROPHETICAL OFFICE</i> AND THE 1877 PREFACE: A COMPREHENSIVE ECCLESIOLOGY	353
1. The Sources of Newman’s Ecclesiology	353
2. The Ecclesiology of the <i>Prophetical Office</i> and 1877 Preface	362
A. The Prophetical Office of the Church.....	362
B. The Reception of the <i>Prophetical Office</i>	377
C. The Priestly and Regal Offices of the Church.....	379
D. Newman’s Comprehensive Ecclesiology	381
3. The Characteristics of the <i>Via Media</i> ’s Ecclesiology	390
4. The Principal Themes of the <i>Prophetical Office</i>	397
5. The Significance of the <i>Prophetical Office</i> in Newman’s Theology.....	411
6. The Relevance of Via Media Ecclesiology Today	414
GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	418
BIBLIOGRAPHY	430

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to many people without whose assistance and prayers this dissertation would not have been completed. First of all, I am most indebted to the sagacious guidance of Dr. John T. Ford, C.S.C., S.T.D., my director, who introduced me to John Henry Newman and has spent considerable time and energy in helping me from the very first stage of this dissertation to its completion. I express my profound gratitude to him in appreciation of everything he has done for me. I thank sincerely my two readers, Dr. John P. Galvin, Dr. Theol. and Dr. James Wiseman O.S.B., S.T.D. for their prompt and careful reading and helpful suggestions.

A word of thanks to the School of Theology and Religious Studies of The Catholic University of America and to Rev. Patrick L. Posey, his associates, staff, and the people of St. Francis de Sales, Purcellville and St. James, Falls Church, Virginia for their tremendous love and generosity in providing residence and funding for my studies. I also thank both my American and Indian American friends who have been supportive of me in one or another way during my stay and studies in America.

I extend my thanks to my former provincial, Rev. Fr. Augustine Valummel, OCD, my present provincial, Rev. Fr. Sebastian Koodappattu, OCD and all the friars of my community of the Discalced Carmelites of Malabar Province, India for their support and sacrifice for me throughout these years of my studies. Finally, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, George and Thresamma Elamparayil, my sister and brothers, and their families for their unceasing love and encouragement.

INTRODUCTION

John Henry Newman (1801-1890) is considered one of the most distinguished writers of the 19th century. As an Anglican until 1845 and subsequently as a Roman Catholic until his death, he discussed and defended the Church both in words and deeds. In 1833, in an effort to renew the Church of England, Newman, along with Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836), John Keble (1792-1866) and Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882), helped begin the “Oxford Movement,” which also became known as the “Tractarian Movement” after a series of *Tracts for the Times* written by Newman and his colleagues. Besides these tracts, Newman also promoted the Movement through his articles, sermons, poems and lectures. In a series of fourteen lectures delivered as part of the Movement, Newman expounded his view that the Church of England was neither Protestant nor Roman, but a *via media* (middle way) which balances catholic unity—through the historic episcopate—and doctrinal comprehensiveness—through the prophetic tradition in keeping with the spirit of the patristic period.¹ To some of his contemporaries, however, this position was implicitly, if not avowedly, Roman Catholic.

While subsequently studying the Monophysite controversy, Newman concluded that Protestants were analogous to Arians and Anglicans analogous to semi-Arians, but “Rome was where she now is.”² This historical comparison led him to conclude that the

¹ When referring to the “middle way” in generic terms, *via media* will be in lower case; when referring to John Henry Newman’s book, published as *Via Media*, upper case will be used; hereafter reference to Newman will be abbreviated: JHN.

² JHN, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua Being: A History of His Religious Opinions*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/apologia65/chapter3.html>, 114; hereafter cited: *Apologia*.

Roman Catholic Church is the authentic representative of the Church of the Apostles. In 1845, he left the Church of England and was received into the Roman Catholic Church. Named a Cardinal in 1879 by Pope Leo XIII, Newman continued various ministries until his death at the age of 89 in 1890. He was beatified on 19 September 2010, at Cofton Park, Birmingham, by Pope Benedict XVI.

While reflecting on his view of an Anglican *via media*, he was challenged both by his Anglican friend, Richard Hurrell Froude, and by a Roman Catholic opponent, Abbé Jean-Nicolas Jager (1790-1868), a professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of Paris. Newman sought to find a *via media* between what he regarded as Protestant doctrinal diminutions and Roman Catholic dogmatic deviations. His view of the Church of England as a *via media* was first outlined in 1834 in two *Tracts* (38 and 41) and then received detailed treatment in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*.³

Ironically the *Prophetical Office* was received in print both as a “best seller”⁴ and as a “heretical work.”⁵ Although Newman theorized about an Anglican *via media*, he could not maintain his confidence that the Anglican Church was the *via media*. However, these lectures, though not a comprehensive theology of the Church, were a serious

³ Newman published the first two editions in 1837 and 1838 and the third edition in 1877 with annotations and a new preface; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/viamedia/volume1/index.html>. See also Footnote 2, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume 6. Edited by Gerard Tracy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 3; hereafter cited: *LD* and also Footnote 2, *LD* 6: 199.

⁴ JHN to John Keble (Oriel, 31 March 1837), *LD* 6: 50-51, at 51, 61. See also Footnote 1, *LD* 6: 63.

⁵ The *Record* (15 Feb. 1838) anathematized the *Prophetical Office*: “This is an heretical work.” See Footnote 1, *LD* 6: 210 and also Footnote 2, *LD* 6: 77.

discussion of a number of ecclesiological topics such as infallibility, private judgment, indefectibility, Scripture and Tradition.⁶ Although Newman later acknowledged that his *Prophetical Office* had “come to pieces,” he still considered it one of his five major works.⁷ In fact, it was a deliberate attempt to construct a theology of the Church.

Newman revisited these ecclesiological issues in depth in his later writings and in 1877, he republished the *Prophetical Office* in *Via Media, Volume I*, with a new Preface and additional notes.⁸ *Via Media I* remains an unparalleled work of both Anglican and Catholic ecclesiology. Although there have been several studies on Newman’s understanding of the Church, to date the *Prophetical Office* has not been given sufficient consideration. Accordingly, this study examines the *Prophetical Office* in terms of its historical context and ecclesiological significance.

The first part of this study examines—though not always in a chronological order—the contextual history of the *Prophetical Office* in light of Newman’s letters, diaries, sermons and other writings (1833-1837). Why did Newman write these lectures?

⁶ Newman wrote: “My new book . . . treats of Romanism’s neglect of the Father; of Infallibility; of Private Judgment; of the Indefectibility of the Church; of Fundamentals of Faith, and of Scripture as its foundation.” See JHN to Miss M. R. Giberne (Oriel College, 13 January 1837) *LD* 6: 13.

⁷ On 18 February 1870, Newman wrote to Giberne: “I have done five constructive works in my life, and this is the hardest . . . my *Prophetical Office*, which has come to pieces . . .” (*LD* 25: 34). In a letter to Edward Bellasis (1870), Newman numbered his chief works as five: the *Prophetical Office of the Church*, *The Lectures on Justification*, the *Essay on Development*, the *Idea of a University* and the *Grammar of Assent*. Though the *Prophetical Office* had “come to pieces,” it is still included among those “(good or bad) five constructive books.” See Halbert D. Weidner, editor, *Via Media of the Anglican Church by John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), xiii; hereafter cited: Weidner, *Via Media*.

⁸ See *LD* 28: 182.

What was their importance for the Oxford Movement? Since numerous biographical writings on Newman exist, the first chapter of this study only skims through his early ideas about the Church and focuses on the way his reading of the Fathers, especially his study of the Arian heresy, became a milestone in his ecclesiological formation.

The second chapter examines how Newman's Mediterranean voyage (1832-1833) turned out to be an important event in his life by bringing him into firsthand contact with the concrete realities of the churches of Greece and Rome. How did the experiences of visiting these Mediterranean churches impact his love and understanding of the Church? Examining Newman's letters written during this voyage, along with his article, "Home Thoughts Abroad," and Froude's *Remains*, provides a window into Newman's ecclesial thoughts at that time.

The third chapter analyzes Newman's four-part essay, "Home Thoughts Abroad," in which he used the context of his visit to Rome to publish his reflections about the political and religious events taking place in England. The "Thoughts" take the form of an imaginary discussion about the Church and the need to plan for a reform movement within the Church of England. In retrospect, these "Thoughts" can be seen as reflecting his ecclesiological principles at the beginning of the Oxford Movement.

Newman's thinking about the Church during the period—1833-1837—is discernible in the many tracts and letters that he wrote, as well as the sermons that he preached. Two aspects of his ecclesiology are particularly evident during this period: first, his emphasis on the visible apostolic Church in general and Church reform in particular; second, his view of the Church of England as a *via media* between

Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. The fourth chapter discusses the tracts with ecclesiological themes that Newman wrote at this time.

Aware of what was happening in Oxford, a French Dominican, Abbé Jager, entered into correspondence with the Tractarians, especially with Newman. This correspondence or controversy between Newman and Jager appeared in print from 25 December 1834 to the spring of 1836 during the early period of the Oxford Movement. To counter Jager's arguments, Newman formulated positions which ultimately became the nucleus of the *Prophetical Office*. The fifth chapter explores this controversy that backgrounded his *Prophetical Office*.

It was Hurrell Froude who guided Newman during his controversy with Jager. Froude's critique helped Newman to re-evaluate his positions and to formulate an ecclesiology that became the substance of the *Prophetical Office*. Chapter six is an examination of the theological correspondence between Newman and Froude. Newman subsequently summarized his indebtedness to Froude: "His opinions arrested and influenced me, even when they did not gain my assent."⁹

The second part of this study, the last four chapters, examines and analyzes the major ecclesiological themes of Newman's fourteen lectures of the *Prophetical Office*. These lectures were delivered on weekdays between 1834 and 1836 in the Adam de Brome Chapel of St. Mary's Church, Oxford.¹⁰ Through these lectures, Newman intended to formulate an impartial view of the true Church Catholic with a firmer

⁹ *Apologia*, 24.

¹⁰ Newman began a series of sermons on 23 April 1834.

adherence to the infallible rule of faith, that is, the Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Church Catholic. Accordingly, chapter seven explores the first eight lectures which Newman dedicated to expounding a *via media* theory of the authority of the prophetic office vis-à-vis the Protestant (private judgment) and the Roman Catholic (infallibility) understandings. Chapter eight treats Newman's next five lectures on a *via media* theory of the Rule of Faith and the fourteenth and last lecture on the Fortunes of the Church.

To explain the rule of faith in terms of his *via media*, Newman dedicated lectures nine to fourteen to a discussion of the Creed, the Gospel, Scripture, Tradition, and the Church. Following the Anglican Divines and the Church Fathers, Newman argued that the Church should adhere to a double rule of faith, Scripture and Catholic Tradition, without devaluing the Scripture, the law of Christ and the sole Canon of Faith.

Newman's effort to discuss and to formulate an intelligible ecclesiology did not end with lectures on the *Prophetic Office*. In later years, both as an Anglican and as a Roman Catholic, he continued to discuss the topics of these lectures in a number of essays, tracts and controversies. In 1877, as part of the re-publication of his Anglican writings, he drafted a Preface to the third edition of his *Prophetic Office*. In this Preface, Newman brought his ecclesiology to completion by several revisions, retractions and additions. The ninth chapter of this study provides an overview of the publication of these lectures and discusses in detail the 1877 Preface which contains not only a comprehensive ecclesiology but also an ecclesiology related to his view of religion.

The tenth and final chapter recaps the sources that helped Newman formulate the ecclesiology of his *Prophetic Office* and its 1877 Preface. In addition, this chapter

analyzes Newman's comprehensive ecclesiology and evaluates it by examining its characteristics and the major themes of the lectures with examples of his revisiting the themes in later writings. This topological study of the lectures reveals both how pivotal the *Prophetical Office* was for Newman's further theological contributions and how relevant it is for theologians today.

In summary, this study provides a detailed theological treatment of Newman's *Prophetical Office* in light of its contextual history. It illustrates the major characteristics of his ecclesiology by collecting the themes of his lectures on the prophetic office and by examining his revisiting of these issues in later writings, especially in his 1877 Preface. Thus, it reveals how important the *Prophetical Office* is among Newman's writings—especially in regard to his formulation of a comprehensive ecclesiology.

CHAPTER ONE: NEWMAN'S INITIAL VIEW OF THE CHURCH

Biographies of John Henry Newman abound, and this study is not another one. Rather, it focuses on the development of Newman's views about the nature of the Church, and discusses how Newman's reading of the Fathers—especially his study of the Arian controversy of the fourth century—was a milestone in his ecclesiological formation. It will show that, in the first three decades of his life, Newman gradually developed his view about the Church from dialogue with his contemporaries and his reading of the Fathers of the Church.

1. Newman's Formative Years

John Henry Newman, the oldest of the six children of John Newman, a London banker, and Jemima Fourdrinier of French Huguenot descent,¹ was born on Saturday, 21 February 1801, at 80 Old Broad Street, London, England. His early religious training was in “the national religion of England” or “Bible Religion,” which “consists, not in rites or creeds, but mainly in having the Bible read in the Church, in the family, and in private.”² His parents were members of the Church of England. They were not

¹ John Newman (1767-1824) and Jemima Fourdrinier (1772-1836) had six children: John Henry Newman (1801-1890) was the eldest and Mary (1809-1828) the youngest; in between came Charles (1802-1884), Harriett (1803-1852), Francis (1805-1897), and Jemima (1808-1879). See Brian Martin, *John Henry Newman: His Life and Work* (New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990), 10.

² Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 1-4; hereafter cited: Ker, *Biography*.

influenced by the evangelical element which sought to reverse the existing ecclesiastical indifference, worldliness, and absence of spiritual leadership.³

On 1 May 1808, at the age of seven, the young John Henry Newman was sent to a private boarding school in Ealing run by Dr. Nicholas. In the autumn of 1816, Newman experienced his first intellectual “conversion”⁴—one that was influenced by Reverend Walter Mayers, one of the classical masters of the school. Through his conversations with Mayers, as well as listening to his sermons and reading evangelical books, Newman “fell under the influence of a definite Creed, and received into his intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God’s mercy, have never effaced or obscured.”⁵ Mayers also

³ John R. H. Moorman distinguished three groups within the Church of England on the eve of the 19th century: 1) the Evangelicals, who were noted for their religious enthusiasm; 2) the High Church Party, which is identified with ecclesiasticism; and 3) the Liberals, who advocated extensive ecclesiastical reform. The Evangelicals were further divided into the followers of John Wesley (1703-1791), an Anglican clergyman whose efforts to reform the Church of England led to the Methodist movement, and Evangelicals of a Calvinist proclivity. The High (and Dry) Church Party, which stressed the doctrine of the “one Holy Catholic Church” was the precursor of the Oxford Movement of the 1830’s and 1840’s. The Liberals or Latitudinarians, who de-emphasized established creeds, formularies, and liturgical practices, served to prepare the way for the nineteenth century’s state-church reform proposals. See John R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967), 293-319.

⁴ Newman was afflicted by the first of the “three great illnesses” of his life: “The first keen, terrible one, when I was a boy of fifteen, and it made me a Christian—with experience before and after, awful and known only to God. My second, not painful, but tedious and shattering, was that which I had in 1827, when I was one of the Examining Masters, and it too broke me off from an incipient liberalism, and determined my religious course. The third was in 1833, when I was in Sicily, before the commencement of the Oxford Movement.” See John Henry Newman, *Autobiographical Writings*, edited with introduction by Henry Tristram of the Oratory (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1957), 119-120; hereafter cited: *AW*. At the end of his life Newman confessed that he found it difficult to realize or imagine the identity of the boy before and after August 1816; as he looked back over seventy years, he could only see another person. See Ker, *Biography*, 3.

⁵ Ker, *Biography*, 4.

introduced him to evangelical writings particularly imbued with the moderate Calvinism of Thomas Scott.⁶ Newman admired Scott's "unworldliness", "his resolute opposition to Antinomianism", and "his doctrine, *Holiness rather than peace, and Growth the only evidence of life.*"⁷ Newman mentioned two other works that also left a deep impression on him in the autumn of 1816:

I read Joseph Milner's *Church History*, and was nothing short of enamored of the long extracts from St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the other Fathers which I found there. I read them as being the religion of the primitive Christians: but simultaneously with Milner I read Newton *On the Prophecies*, and in consequence became most firmly convinced that the Pope was the Antichrist predicted by Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John. My imagination was stained by the effects of this doctrine up to the year 1843; it had been obliterated from my reason and judgment at an earlier date; but the thought remained upon me as a sort of false conscience.⁸

Newman left Ealing School on 21 December 1816, and then enrolled in Trinity College, Oxford. He began his residency there in June of the following year. In 1818, he and one of his first friends at Trinity College, John William Bowden,⁹ wrote a verse "romance" titled *St. Bartholomew's Eve*, which was based on the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre.¹⁰ Newman claimed responsibility for the theology of the poem, which was strongly anti-Catholic.¹¹ The pair had to rush the story to a conclusion in order to publish

⁶ Reverend Thomas Scott (1747-1821) described his conversion to evangelical Christianity in his spiritual autobiography, *The Force of Truth* (1779). From Scott, Newman obtained the phrase, "Growth the only evidence of life." See *Apologia*. 5.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid., 7.

⁹ Bowden (1798-1844) later became a zealous Tractarian Layman.

¹⁰ On 24 August 1572, the feast of St. Bartholomew, under the instigation of Queen Catherine de' Medici (1519-1589), many Huguenot (Protestant) leaders were assassinated in Paris and subsequently in other cities.

¹¹ AW, 41-44.

a periodical called *The Undergraduate*, which sold well. However, to his great disgust, Newman's association with the publication soon became public.¹²

Apart from these intellectual and literary diversions, both Newman and Bowden undertook a heavy course of reading.¹³ Newman soon achieved a reputation as an excellent student; however, as a result of exhaustion from overwork, he failed to do well in the 1820 examinations and received his bachelor's degree without distinction. He believed that the failure was best for him and also felt that God had given him this trial. He already knew he wanted to go into the Church. Since he had won a nine-year scholarship at Trinity College in 1818, he returned to Oxford in February 1821. By November, he had conceived the audacious idea of standing for a fellowship at the prestigious Oriel College. After a lengthy examination, he was elected a fellow of Oriel College on 12 April 1822.¹⁴

As a fellow of Oriel, Newman came into contact with Dr. Charles Lloyd, the Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, and Richard Whately, another fellow of Oriel and original thinker. Whately and Lloyd spoke scornfully of each other and were diametrically opposite in their intellectual and academic viewpoints; they

¹² Both Bowden and Newman were behind the publication of *The Undergraduate*. Newman's name, however, got out as "the author of the *Undergraduate*" (AW, 41). Newman mentioned these two publications in a letter to his father on 2 February 1819, LD 1: 61.

¹³ From 1819 to 1820, Newman "read nearly at the rate of nine hours a day"; during 20 of the 24 weeks immediately preceding his examination, he averaged more than twelve hours a day (AW, 46).

¹⁴ AW, 63-64.

represented respectively the latitudinarian and the high-and-dry schools of theology.¹⁵

Newman also made friends with John Keble, Edward Pusey, and Richard Hurrell Froude, also Fellows of Oriel, who left lasting impressions on his mind.¹⁶

It was from William James, an Oriel Fellow (1809-1823),¹⁷ that Newman learned the dogma of apostolic succession—that the Church enjoys a continuity of life, teaching authority, and ministry with the Church of the Apostles.¹⁸ Newman recalled: “It is with pleasure that I pay here a tribute to the memory of the Rev. William James, then fellow of

¹⁵ On one side was Dr. Charles Lloyd (1784-1829) of Christ Church of the high-and-dry school, who laid great stress on a doctrinal standard, authoritative and traditional teaching, and ecclesiastical history (AW, 69-70). On the other side was Richard Whately (1787-1863), of Oriel College, who looked down on both high and low Church, calling the two parties respectively Sadducees and Pharisees; the members of Oriel College were also known as “Noetics”—who were neither high Church nor low Church, but a new school, or, as their enemies would say, a *clique*, which was characterized by its spirit of moderation and comprehension: the principal “Noetics” were: Edward Copleston (1776-1849), Fellow of Oriel (1795-1818) and Provost (1818-1828); John Davison (1777-1834), Fellow from 1800; Edward Hawkins (1789-1882), Fellow (1813-1828) and Provost (1828-1882); and Thomas Arnold (1789-1843), Fellow from 1815. See Newman, AW, 73.

¹⁶ John Keble (1792-1866), was an Oriel Fellow from 1811 and University Professor of Poetry (1831-1841); Edward Pusey (1800-1882) became an Oriel Fellow in 1823; and Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836), a pupil of Keble and Fellow, became an Oriel Fellow in 1826. Newman’s testimony to the influence of the Oriel’s Fellows on him, together with his shift from the Liberal tendencies of the Oriel Noetics to the High Church principle is found in *Apologia*, 19-33. Also see Marvin R. O’Connell, *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 64-103.

¹⁷ William James (1787-1861) entered Oriel College in 1803 and was a Fellow 1809-1837, but left the College in 1823 to become Vicar of Cobham Surrey; subsequently, he was Rector of Bilton, Warwickshire, from 1853 until his death. From him, Newman learned the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in 1823. See LD 1: 335.

¹⁸ Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and His Age* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990), 89.

Oriel; who, about the year 1823, taught me the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, in the course of a walk, I think, round Christ Church meadow....”¹⁹

Newman was ordained a deacon of the Church of England on 13 June 1824, by Dr. Edward Legge (1767-1827), Bishop of Oxford (1816-1827). Newman accepted the curacy of St. Clements, Oxford, where he underwent a great change in his religious opinions. Because of his parochial duties, he had to stay in Oxford during vacation time and happened to be in the company of Dr. Edward Hawkins, then Vicar of St. Mary’s, the University Church. Newman learned intellectual rigor from Hawkins, “a man of most exact mind: He was the first who taught me to weigh my words, and to be cautious in my statements.”²⁰

Theologically, he was influenced by Hawkins’ doctrine of Tradition, specifically “that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church; for instance to the Catechism, and to the Creeds.”²¹ In addition, Hawkins initiated the process of liberating Newman from his evangelical doctrines such as the distinction between “nominal” Christians and “real” Christians.²² Other factors that led Newman to abandon his evangelical stance were his work in the parish and his “imaginative

¹⁹ *Apologia*, 10.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

²² *AW*, 77-78.

devotion” to the Fathers of the Church,²³ along with his reading of Joseph Butler’s classic *Analogy of Religion* (1736).²⁴

On Sunday, 29 May 1825, Newman was ordained an Anglican priest in Christ Church Cathedral by Bishop Legge. Newman was also appointed vice-principal and tutor at St. Alban’s Hall, a position which brought him directly under the influence of one of the Oriel leaders, Richard Whately, who was then the principal. Though Newman was close to both Charles Lloyd and Whately, it was Whately who exerted the real intellectual influence on Newman by teaching him how to think for himself.²⁵

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

²³ Ker (*Biography*, 22) has pointed out: “The ‘teaching of facts’ also played an important part: Newman found from working in a parish that Evangelicalism did not ‘work’, that ‘it was unreal’, and ‘not a key to the phenomenon of human nature, as they occur in the world.’” Newman, describing himself in the third person, later stated: “. . . the ancient Fathers saved him from the danger that threatened him. An imaginative devotion to them and to their times had been the permanent effect upon him of reading at School an account of them and extracts from their work in Joseph Milner’s *Church History*, and even when he now and then allowed himself as in 1825 in criticism of them, the first centuries were his *beau idéal* of Christianity” (AW, 83).

²⁴ The idea of analogy influenced Newman both as an intellectual principle and as a mode of argument; in his *Apologia*, 10-11, he pointed out the religious significance of “the very idea of an analogy between the separate works of God leads to the conclusion that the system which is of less importance is economically or sacramentally connected with the more momentous system, and of this conclusion the theory, to which I was inclined as a boy, viz. the unreality of material phenomena, is an ultimate resolution. At this time I did not make the distinction between matter itself and its phenomena, which is so necessary and so obvious in discussing the subject. Secondly, Butler’s doctrine that Probability is the guide of life, led me, at least under the teaching to which a few years later I was introduced, to the question of the logical cogency of Faith, on which I have written so much. Thus to Butler I trace those two principles of my teaching, which have led to a charge against me both of fancifulness and of skepticism.”

²⁵ AW, 69-71.

know, on this point alone, he and Hurrell Froude intimately sympathized, though Froude's development of opinion here was of a later date.²⁶

Newman accepted the invitation to become a tutor of Oriel College on 20 January 1826, and consequently resigned his position at St. Alban Hall. On 31 March, both Robert Isaac Wilberforce and Richard Hurrell Froude were elected fellows of Oriel.²⁷ For them, the tutorship was a spiritual undertaking, not merely a secular office.²⁸ Meanwhile, Newman finished writing two essays for *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*. His essay on the "Life of Apollonius Tyanaeus" was completed in March and his essay on the "Miracles of Scripture" was sent off for publication in April. He also preached his first university sermon in July; he was indeed beginning to be known.²⁹ In May, he described to his sister Jemima a new project: "to trace the sources from which the corruptions of the Church, principally the Romish, have been derived."³⁰ He realized that such a project would require a reading of all the Fathers systematically.

The following November, Copleston was appointed Bishop of Llanddaff and so Oriel had to elect a new Provost. There were two candidates: Hawkins and Keble. Newman preferred Hawkins and successfully advocated Hawkins' election.³¹ Newman,

²⁶ *Apologia*, 10: "On looking back, he found that one momentous truth of Revelation, he had learned from Dr. Whately, and that was the idea of the Christian Church, as a divine appointment, and as a substantive visible body, independent of the State, and endowed with rights, prerogatives, and powers of its own." See also AW, 69 and O'Connell, *Oxford Conspirators*, 70-79.

²⁷ JHN to Mrs. Newman (31 March 1826), *LD* 1: 281-282.

²⁸ JHN to Harriett (21 March 1826), *LD* 1: 280-281.

²⁹ *Apologia*, 16.

³⁰ JHN to Jemima Newman (Oriel College, 1 May 1826), *LD* 1: 285.

³¹ Newman knew Hawkins much better and took into consideration that Hawkins had the reputation of being a strict disciplinarian. At the end of January 1828, Hawkins

in turn, was appointed to succeed Hawkins as Vicar of St. Mary's, the university church. His responsibilities then included the small village of Littlemore, three miles from Oxford. Meanwhile, Froude along with Keble, who left Oxford in 1826, was increasingly becoming Newman's source of knowledge for High Church doctrines. Keble's book, *The Christian Year*, published anonymously in June 1827, reminded Newman of the "two main intellectual truths" which he had already learned from Butler: "first, the sacramental idea that material phenomena are both the types and the instruments of real things unseen, and second, the view that it is not merely probability which makes us intellectually certain in religious matters, but probability as it is put to account by faith and love."³²

Newman started reading the Church Fathers chronologically beginning with the Apostolic Fathers in July 1828. This reading rekindled his early devotion towards the Fathers and led him "out of the shadows of liberalism which had hung over his course."³³ At the end of September 1828, he began writing an essay, "Poetry, with Reference to Aristotle's Poetics," which was published the following January in the *London Review*. In this essay, he proposed that revealed religion should be poetical and a poetical view of things is a Christian duty.³⁴

was elected Provost. Newman defended his vote for Hawkins: "you know we are not electing an Angel, but a Provost." Keble had 'fought shy' of Newman because of the marks which Newman bore upon himself of the evangelical and liberal schools. See Ker, *Biography*, 31.

³² Ibid., 31.

³³ *Apologia*, 25.

³⁴ "He Platonized Aristotle's definition of poetry as 'representation of the ideal', and insisted not only that a 'right moral state of heart is the . . . condition of a poetical

On 9 March 1829, Newman was elected joint secretary of the Oxford association of the Church Missionary Society, which was established in 1799. He lodged a formal protest about the doctrine of certain sermons preached in aid of the evangelical-oriented society. He followed this up in February 1830 with a pamphlet, *Suggestions in behalf of the Church Missionary Society*, which was printed and circulated privately among the members of the university. He intended to enlarge the circle of subscribers to the Society and to direct and strengthen the influence of the university and of the Anglican hierarchy upon it. However, because of his objection to evangelical language, he was not re-elected secretary at the next annual meeting.

Another indicator of his self-distancing from Evangelicals occurred on 8 June 1830, when he withdrew his membership in the British and Foreign Bible Society, which had been established in 1804.³⁵ He later explained his ecclesiological reservations to Simeon Lloyd Pope:

If it were recognized, e.g., that the Church were the divinely-sanctioned system, or that dissent was per se an evil, or that reading the Bible is not (ordinarily) sufficient for salvation, there would be something for Churchmen to cling to—whereas by coming *on common ground* with Dissenters, they seem to come on *middle ground* . . . and to allow that they ought to concede *as well* as Dissenters . . . 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.³⁶

mind', but that there was a 'connexion between want of the religious principle and want of poetical feeling.' He welcomed the corollary that 'Revealed Religion should be especially poetical' and that 'a poetical view of things' was a Christian duty." See Ker *Biography*, 31-32.

³⁵ Ibid., 36.

³⁶ JHN to Pope (15 August 1830), *LD* 2: 264-265 at 265. See Ker, *Biography*, 37.

Newman's basic objection to the Bible Society was symptomatic: His basic objection was to the tendency of the age towards Liberalism. Religion has to be enforced by authority of some kind, since moral trust is not acceptable to man's heart. He believed that it was the divinely instituted Church which was the legitimate enforcement of Christian truth.³⁷

Newman served as the university select preacher in 1831 and in 1832. In the latter year, due to a disagreement with Hawkins, Newman resigned his post as a tutor of Oriel. The disagreement with Hawkins began with Newman's campaign against the re-election of Sir Robert Peel as Member of Parliament for Oxford.³⁸ Hawkins canvassed energetically for Peel, who was defeated. In contrast, Newman's emphasis on the value of the Church's independence of the State reflected his growing friendship with Froude, who "delighted in the notion of a hierarchical system, of sacerdotal power, and of full ecclesiastical liberty."³⁹

This political dispute merged into an academic one about the nature of the office of college tutor.⁴⁰ Newman insisted on the essentially pastoral nature of the tutorship.

³⁷ Ker, *Biography*, 37.

³⁸ The fear of civil war in Ireland had led to a dramatic shift of policy on the part of the Tory government; Sir Robert Peel, who was Member of Parliament for Oxford, was a leading member. Newman claimed indifference about the petition in favor of emancipation as a political rather than religious question, even if it was "the symptom of a systematic hatred to our Church borne by Romanists, Sectarians, Liberals and Infidels." Newman's objection was chiefly to Peel, who as the representative of the University suddenly changed his mind about Emancipation on political grounds not religious: "It is not pro dignitate nostrâ, to have a Rat [for] our member." See O'Connell, *Oxford Conspirators*, 72-73.

³⁹ Ker, *Biography*, 34.

⁴⁰ Newman was not interested in taking part in a heartless system of law, in which the good and promising were sacrificed to the worthless or uninteresting. Hawkins for his part had no sympathy for a principle which in his view meant sacrificing the many to

Both Froude and Wilberforce shared Newman's view of the tutorship. This was unacceptable to Hawkins, who, in mid-June 1830, decided that he would relieve Newman, Froude, and Wilberforce of their tutorships simply by not assigning them additional pupils. As their current students graduated, the tutors were gradually left without students. This incident cemented Newman's friendship with Froude, and also enabled him to get on with his reading of the Fathers.

2. Newman's Study of the Arians

In March 1831, Hugh James Rose, co-editor with William Rowe Lyall (1788-1857) of the *Theological Library*, invited Newman to write a history of Church councils for the series. Newman agreed to undertake the project. He began the book in June and wrote about this new project to Froude on August 10:

I have nothing to say, except that my work opens a grand and most interesting field to me – but how I shall ever be able to make one assertion, much less write one page I cannot tell – any one pure categorical would need an age of reading and research – I shall confine myself to hypotheticals.⁴¹

Newman initially expressed his elaborate plan for the new project.⁴² However, he later promised Rose that he would be content with the plan which Rose suggested as

the few and governing not by intelligible rules and their impartial application but by a system of mere personal influence and favoritism. See *AW*, 96-107.

⁴¹ JHN to Froude (10 August 1831), *LD* 2: 347-348, at 348.

⁴² Newman wrote: "For the last six weeks I have given some time to the examination of my materials – and am of opinion that I shall best answer the object of making an useful work by giving a *connected* history of the Councils – i.e. not taking them as isolated, but introducing so much of Church History as will illustrate and account for them. . . . What light would be thrown on the Nicene Confession *merely* by explaining it article by article? to understand it, it must be prefaced by a sketch of the rise of the Arian heresy, the words introduced by Arius, his perversions of the hitherto orthodox

necessary for publication, and “which in itself involves many important subjects and requires much thought and reading.”⁴³ While working on the history of the Councils, Newman received a very valuable gift of 36 volumes of the Fathers from his friends and pupils,⁴⁴ and wrote to his mother about the gift: “Altogether now I am set up in the Patristical line – should I be blessed with health and ability to make use of them.”⁴⁵

In the first chapter of *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, Newman established a connection between the Arian heretical party and the school of Antioch on the historical evidence that “during the interval between the Nicene Council and the death of Constantius (A.D. 325-361), Antioch is the metropolis of the heretical, as Alexandria of the orthodox party.”⁴⁶ For Newman, the individuals involved in the heretical teaching were but symptoms of a corrupted state of the Church: “The history of the times gives us sufficient evidence of the luxuriousness of Antioch; and it need scarcely be said, that coldness in faith is the sure consequence of relaxation of morals.”⁴⁷

terms, the necessity of new and clearer tests etc.” See JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriental College, 24 August 1831), *LD* 2: 352-353, at 352.

⁴³ JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriental College, 12 September 1831), *LD* 2: 358-359.

⁴⁴ Newman received the volumes of the Fathers on Monday, 23 October 1831; these volumes were additions to the set of the Fathers which Pusey had brought him from Germany in October 1827; see *LD* 2: 30. “They are so fine in their outsides as to put my former ones to shame – and the editions are the best.” See *LD* 2: 368.

⁴⁵ JHN to Mrs. Newman (Oriental College, 24 October 1831), *LD* 2: 368-369.

⁴⁶ “At Antioch, the heresy recommenced its attack upon the Church after the decision at Nicæa. In a Council held at Antioch, it first showed itself in the shape of Semi-Arianism, when Lucian’s creed was produced. There, too, in this and subsequent Councils, negotiations on the doctrine in dispute were conducted with the Western Church. At Antioch, lastly, and at Tyre, a suffragan see, the sentence of condemnation was pronounced upon Athanasius.” See JHN, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/>, 8-9; hereafter cited: *Arians*.

⁴⁷ *Arians*, 10-11.

The presence of Judaism in the Church of Antioch, for Newman, also had its bearing upon the rise of Arianism. In addition, the schools of the Sophists were the places where the heretical exponents were educated. The Sophist teachers acknowledged Aristotle as their principal authority and “rested their cause on their dialectical skill, and not on the testimony of the early Church.”⁴⁸ As Ephiphanius said: “Aiming to exhibit the Divine Nature by means of Aristotelic Syllogisms and geometrical data, [the Arians] are thence led on to declare that Christ cannot be derived from God.”⁴⁹

While the absence of an adequate creed contributed to fostering the spread of heretics, the Church was naturally unwilling to have recourse to novel views. However, an authoritative creed was imposed upon those whom the Church invested with the office of teaching. When confessions of faith did not exist, the mysteries of divine truth, instead of being exposed to the gaze of the profane and uninstructed, were kept hidden faithfully in the heart of the Church:⁵⁰ “This self-restraint and abstinence, practiced at least partially, by the Primitive Church in the publication of the most sacred doctrines of our religion, is termed, in theological language, the *Disciplina Arcani*;”⁵¹

⁴⁸ Ibid., 30-31.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 35. Newman also learned: “But far greater was the evil, when men destitute of religious seriousness and earnestness engaged in the like theological discussions, not with any definite ecclesiastical object, but as a mere trial of skill, or as a literary recreation; regardless of the mischief thus done to the simplicity of Christian morals, and the evil encouragement given to fallacious reasonings and sceptical views” (ibid., 32).

⁵⁰ Ibid., 35-37.

⁵¹ See ibid., 49-50. For Newman the *Disciplina Arcani* had a real existence in the early Church (ibid., 41-54); he also concluded that the secret tradition soon ceased to exist even in theory by the introduction of forms of symbols or creeds of the early Councils because of the successive innovations of heretics (ibid., 55).

Newman seemed intrigued by the doctrine of “reserve” and took great care to describe it as he found it in the pre-Nicene Church.⁵² He, however, tried to prevent misconceptions of its principle and limits:

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.⁵³

Because of the insufficiency of the private study of Holy Scripture for arriving at the exact and entire truth which Scripture really contains, inquirers and neophytes were in need of “the teaching of the Church as a key to the collection of passages which related to the mysteries of the Gospel, passages which are obscure from the necessity of combining and receiving them all.”⁵⁴ Thus, for Newman, “the great duty of the Christian teacher was to unfold the sacred truths in due order, and not prematurely to insist on the difficulties, or to apply the promises of the Gospel; and if others erred in this respect, still it remained a duty to him.”⁵⁵

Newman also found out that salutary doctrines were “not put forward as the arbitrary determination of individuals, as the word of man, but rather as apostolical legacy, preserved and dispensed by the Church.”⁵⁶ The doctrine of salvation was first

⁵² According to Marvin R. O’Connell, *Oxford Conspirators*, 118, “[n]othing was to be more central to the whole idea of the Oxford Movement, and nothing was to cause the Movement more difficulty in winning acceptance than this notion.”

⁵³ *Arians*, 50.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

proclaimed by the Apostles and then delivered in Scripture as a basis and pillar of faith. Therefore, an Apostolic Tradition is preserved in the Church; however, he argued that the acceptance of “Tradition in the slightest degree disparages the sovereign authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as a record of the truth.”⁵⁷ It is by Tradition that the Church interprets and harmonizes the statements of Scripture.

Newman also noticed that the Fathers often used the “Allegorical method”⁵⁸ as the means by which the *Disciplina Arcani* was observed. This method of writing was the national peculiarity of the literature in which the Alexandrian Church was educated. Being the sublimest of all subjects, Divine Wisdom cannot be communicated just by one instance of the operation of a general principle of our nature.⁵⁹

No prophet ends his subject: his brethren after him renew, enlarge, transfigure, or reconstruct it; so that the Bible, though various in its parts, forms a whole, grounded on a few distinct doctrinal principles discernible throughout it; and is in consequence intelligible indeed in its general drift, but obscure in its text; and even tempts the student, if I may so speak, to a lax and disrespectful interpretation

⁵⁷ Ibid., 55.

⁵⁸ Newman wrote: “The word allegorizing must here be understood in a wide signification; as including in its meaning, not only the representation of truths, under a foreign, though analogous exterior, after the manner of our Lord’s parables, but the practice of generalizing facts into principles, of adumbrating greater truths under the image of lesser, of implying the consequences or the basis of doctrines in their correlatives, and altogether those instances of thinking, reasoning, and teaching, which depend upon the use of propositions which are abstruse, and of connexions which are obscure, and which, in the case of uninspired authors, we consider profound, or poetical, or enthusiastic, or illogical, according to our opinion of those by whom they are exhibited” (ibid., 56).

⁵⁹ Newman wrote: “When the mind is occupied by some vast and awful subject of contemplation, it is prompted to give utterance to its feelings in a figurative style; for ordinary words will not convey the admiration, nor literal words the reverence which possesses it; . . .” (ibid., 57-58).

of it. History is made the external garb of prophecy, and persons and facts become the figures of heavenly things.⁶⁰

In regard to the *Disciplina Arcani*, another mode of arguing that was used by the Fathers, especially the Alexandrians, was the “Economical” (*kat’ oikonomian*) method of accommodation to the feelings and prejudices of the audience by leading them to the reception of a novel or unacceptable doctrine.⁶¹ In effect, teachers concealed the truth until the time when they felt that their students were prepared for it; obviously, such a pedagogical practice of the Economy could lead to abuses by unscrupulous teachers.⁶² The method of Economy was sometimes parallel with “dispensation” and used in contrast to *theologia*:

Thus it is applied by the Fathers, to 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.⁶³

Newman also noticed that the only danger to which the Alexandrian doctrine was exposed was that of its confusing the Scripture Dispensations with that of Natural Religion or Dispensation of Paganism as if they were of equal authority:

. . . Revelation, properly speaking, is an universal, not a local gift; and the distinction between the state of Israelites formerly and Christians now, and that of the heathen, is, not that we can, and they cannot attain to future blessedness, but that the Church of God ever has had, and the rest of mankind never have had, authoritative documents of truth, and appointed channels of communication with

⁶⁰ Ibid., 58.

⁶¹ Newman mentioned many instances of Economical concealment of the full truth by the Apostles and Fathers; for example: “The Economy is certainly sanctioned by St. Paul in his own conduct. To the Jews he became as a Jew, and as without the Law to the heathen . . .” (ibid., 65-66).

⁶² Ibid., 73.

⁶³ Ibid., 74.

Him. The word and the Sacraments are the characteristic of the elect people of God; but all men have had more or less the guidance of Tradition, in addition to those internal notions of right and wrong which the Spirit has put into the heart of each individual.⁶⁴

For Newman, Economy can be employed towards a heathen unbeliever but not towards those who have been once enlightened, and have fallen away.⁶⁵ The knowledge of Christian mysteries was, in the first ages of Christianity, accounted a privilege to be eagerly coveted. The early Church regarded the very knowledge of the truth as a fearful privilege reserved for those who were baptized, and in no sense a matter of hesitation and dispute.⁶⁶ While editing his work, he shared this finding with Rose:

The truth is, I had a theory, which for prudence sake I withdrew – and but unmeaning fragments remain – it seems to me that we cannot form an idea of personality except as viewed in action, passion, relations etc – ideas inconsistent with the true notion of the Supreme Being – An infinite immutable Mind cannot be realized as a Person – My conclusion is, that it is as difficult to conceive God one person as Three, the difficulty being deeper than people suppose. The Personality of God, in our *notion* of personality, is a *mystery*. And in my own mind, I think it clear that the whole is an Economy...⁶⁷

Newman found that the doctrines of Christian mysteries were primarily the subject of Apostolic Tradition and that the Church is the custodian and dispenser of the deposit of these doctrines:

⁶⁴ Ibid., 80.

⁶⁵ Newman wrote: “But in truth, the mind never can resemble a blank paper, in its freedom from impressions and prejudices. Infidelity is a positive, not a negative state; it is a state of profaneness, pride, and selfishness; and he who believes a little, but encompasses that little with the inventions of men, is undeniably in a better condition than he who blots out from his mind both the human inventions, and that portion of truth which was concealed in them” (ibid., 85).

⁶⁶ Newman referred to Tertullian’s exposition of the misuses of Christian doctrines by heretical and philosophical sects (ibid., 138).

⁶⁷ JHN to Hugh James Rose (Brighton, 16 August 1832), *LD* 3: 78-79.

These doctrines were the subject of an Apostolical Tradition; they were the very truths which had been lately revealed to mankind. They had been committed to the Church's keeping, and were dispensed by her to those who sought them, as a favour. They were facts, not opinions. To come to the Church was all one with expressing a readiness to receive her teaching; to hesitate to believe, after coming for the sake of believing, would be an inconsistency too rare to require a special provision against the chance of it.⁶⁸

Considering the obscurities of Scripture, Newman believed that in the primitive age, the Apostolic Tradition or the Creed was the chief source of instruction. While the baptized members of the Church had the privilege of comparing the written and the oral tradition, the systematic knowledge was withheld from those who were not baptized. The knowledge of Christian doctrines was considered by the Fathers a privilege and so reserved for those who were baptized.⁶⁹ For Newman, “an assent to the text of the Scripture alone is not sufficient for the purposes of Christian fellowship.”⁷⁰

Scripture being unsystematic, and the faith which it propounds being scattered through its documents, and understood only when they are viewed as a whole, the Creeds aim at concentrating its general spirit, so as to give security to the Church, as far as may be, that its members take that definite view of that faith which alone is the true one.⁷¹

Consequently, it is the duty of the Church that is the pillar and ground of truth to interrogate, to collect the sense of Scripture and to promulgate it in such form as is best suited.⁷² For Newman, the office of preserving the faith is not only a duty of the authorities of the Church but also of individual Christians:

⁶⁸ Ibid., 134.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 134-135.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 146.

⁷¹ Ibid., 147.

⁷² Ibid., 148.

And, though the discharge of this office is the most momentous and fearful that can come upon mortal man, and never to be undertaken except by the collective illumination of the Heads of the Church, yet, when innovations arise, they must discharge it to the best of their ability; and whether they succeed or fail . . . as in all other acts of duty, the obligation itself to protect the Faith remaining unquestionable.⁷³

While observing the “unscriptural character” of the arguments of the Arians, Newman found the traditional system of theology consistent with, but independent of Scripture in the Church from the Apostolic age:⁷⁴

The Catholics, on the other hand, pursued the intellectual investigation of the doctrine, under the guidance of Scripture and Tradition, merely as far as some immediate necessity called for it; and cared little, though one mode of expression seemed inconsistent with another. Thus, they developed the notion of “*substance*” against the Pantheists, of the “*Hypostatic Word*” against the Sabellians, of the “*Internal Word*” to meet the imputation of Ditheism; still they did not use these formulæ for any thing beyond shadows of sacred truth, symbols witnessing against the speculations into which the unbridled intellect fell.⁷⁵

Narrating the consequences of the Nicene Council, Newman marked out the characteristics of the Church in principle vis à vis the secular faction of Eusebians such as the “Christian Church, as being a visible society, is necessarily a political power or party,” its priority “in existence to the civil institutions with which it is surrounded, and from its latent divinity formidable and influential, even to the end of time,” and its “grant of permanency” and “indestructibility.”⁷⁶

Thus the Ecclesiastical Body is a divinely-appointed means, towards realizing the great evangelical blessings. Christians depart from their duty, or become in an offensive sense political, not when they act as members of one community, but

⁷³ Ibid., 149.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 220.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 221-222.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 257.

when they do so for temporal ends or in an illegal manner; not when they assume the attitude of a party, but when they split into many.⁷⁷

As Newman progressed in his study of Arianism, he became deeply convinced of the existence and role of the Church as a divinely instituted visible society. As a visible society formed from above to the end of time, the Church has to interfere and confront the World by being ready to “suffer for the truth, and remind men of it, by inflicting on them the task of persecution.”⁷⁸

However, Newman was disturbed to find the historical fact that at times, even the Episcopal Order failed to remind the monarch that there is a visible Power in the world, divinely founded and protected, which is superior to their own power.⁷⁹ Accordingly, he respected the great witness of Orthodox champions of Faith like Hosius and Athanasius who took an uncompromising stand against monarchs.⁸⁰ He was amazed to find that at times that Divine providence made use of error as a preparation for truth.⁸¹ Examining Sabellianism, he found that often the “Roman Church, even then celebrated for its vigilant, perhaps its over earnest exactness, in matters of doctrine and discipline, was made the arbiter of the controversy.”⁸²

⁷⁷ Ibid., 257-258.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 258-259.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 264.

⁸⁰ Newman referred to Hosius, who dared to admonish the Emperor, anathematized the Arians and did not subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius (ibid., 325).

⁸¹ “This part of the history affords a striking illustration, not only of the gradual influence of truth over error, but of the remarkable manner in which Divine Providence makes use of error itself as a preparation for truth; that is, employing the lighter forms of it in sweeping away those of a more offensive nature” (ibid., 377).

⁸² Ibid., 126.

In the struggles of the Church in the fourth century, Newman saw an idealized picture of the state of his own Church as though in a mirror.⁸³ His study was a theological apologetics against the rationalist and liberal enemies of the Church of his day. He could not but compare unfavorably the divided and threatened Church of England with the fresh vigorous power of the first centuries: “The domination of heresy, however prolonged, is but one stage in its existence; it ever hastens to an end, and that end is the triumph of the Truth.”⁸⁴ Accordingly, he admonished his contemporaries:

And so of the present perils, with which our branch of the Church is beset, as they bear a marked resemblance to those of the fourth century, so are the lessons, which we gain from that ancient time, especially cheering and edifying to Christians of the present day Meanwhile, we may take comfort in reflecting, that, though the present tyranny has more of insult, it has hitherto had less of scandal, than attended the ascendancy of Arianism; we may rejoice in the piety, prudence, and varied graces of our Spiritual Rulers; and may rest in the confidence, that, should the hand of Satan press us sore, our Athanasius and Basil will be given us in their destined season, to break the bonds of the Oppressor, and let the captives go free.⁸⁵

Newman was concerned that his country was deeply infected with a cold indifferent spirit of liberalism; as he wrote to his aunt Elizabeth: “To neglect personal religion (with some other ministries) is bad enough – but, to become a public instrument in overthrowing the truth, not even to have the fear of God before their eyes, is wretched indeed.”⁸⁶ Three decades later he wrote:

While I was engaged in writing my work upon the Arians, great events were happening at home and abroad, which brought out into form and passionate expression the various beliefs which had so gradually been winning their way into

⁸³ Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 90.

⁸⁴ *Arians*, 393.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 393-394.

⁸⁶ JHN to Elizabeth Newman (Tunbridge Wells, 24 August 1832), *LD* 3: 80-81.

my mind. . . . The vital question was, how were we to keep the Church from being liberalized? . . . There was need of a second reformation.⁸⁷

On 3 July 1832, Newman sent part of his manuscript to Rose, one of the two editors of the Theological Library who had commissioned the work. The book was completed on July 31. He wrote to Rose: "I am anxious about the length of the whole volume, which, I fear, will exceed Rivington's limits."⁸⁸ In a letter to R. F. Wilson, he also wrote about his book:

As to the *facts*, though I have been very diligent in attempting accuracy, I am prepared for some floors – if men take the trouble to look for them – But my book is not of that interesting nature, which provokes notice, favourable or otherwise. My difficulties of style did not extend beyond the first twenty pages – After that, I grew quite flowing.⁸⁹

He also wrote to Henry Wilberforce: "So I think myself tolerably secure of being safe so far as opinions go – as to facts, there I stand on my own ground – and, tho' I have striven to be accurate, anticipate a certain number of blunders in my book as a matter of course."⁹⁰

Towards the end of October, Newman heard from Rose that his co-editor, Archdeacon William Rowe Lyall (1788-1857), thought the book unsuitable for the Theological Library. Nonetheless, after carefully reading Newman's manuscript, Lyall expressed his admiration of the high qualities of the work:

It is full of learning, and the tone and spirit in which it is written are excellent – the style also I like particularly: it is thoroughly *English*, and in many places strikingly good The present Volume is a history of Arianism – and presupposes so much

⁸⁷ *Apologia*, 30-31.

⁸⁸ JHN to Hugh James Rose (7 Marine Place, 8 August 1832), *LD* 3: 77.

⁸⁹ JHN to R. F. Wilson (Tunbridge Wells, 20 August 1832), *LD* 3: 79-80, at 80.

⁹⁰ JHN to Henry Wilberforce (Tunbridge Wells, 27 August 1832), *LD* 3: 83-84.

knowledge on the part of his readers that it is adapted only to a select class of students.⁹¹

Lyall also observed that Newman's views on Tradition seemed more favorable to Romanist writers than to the readers of the Theological Library:

If Mr Newman's work shall be published in the Theological Library, there are several parts that will require consideration – particularly in those places where he speaks of the *disciplina arcani* – I do not pretend to make my opinion the rule – but Mr Newman's notions about tradition appear to me directly adverse to that which Protestant writers of our own church have contended for – according to them a 'secret tradition' is no tradition at all – *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, is the very definition of authentic tradition. Mr Newman's views seem to me more favorable to the Romanist writers than I should like to put forward in the *Theological Library* – There are also several other passages and expressions which made my hyperorthodox nerves *wince* – a little – and which we must talk about hereafter if Mr Newman's book is published with *our names* appended.⁹²

For Lyall, "[t]he present system of Orthodox Christianity is grounded upon Scripture under the sanction and continued authority which is furnished by *Tradition*, of which the Councils are the authentic organs."⁹³ Through a History of the Councils, Lyall wanted to answer the question: "[W]hat is the proper province and the true value of *human authority* in the matter of Divine Revelation?"⁹⁴

According to Sheridan Gilley, though Newman's notion of *Disciplina Arcani* was disliked by Lyall, it harmonized with the High Church principles that Newman had derived from Hawkins.⁹⁵ It was for the Church to teach, especially in the creeds, and for the Bible to prove its teaching. The "economical method," that is, of accommodation to

⁹¹ William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose (19 October 1832), *LD* 3: 104-105.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 105.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 89.

the feelings and prejudice of the hearer, in leading him to the reception of a novel or unacceptable doctrine, had been not merely the method of St. Paul, but of the incarnate God himself.

In another letter to Newman, Lyall further mentioned a few minor concerns about his work;⁹⁶ however, there was no question about the distinction of Newman's work. Like Lyall, Rose also indicated to Newman his admiration of the work: "Believe me, that I am not speaking the language of idle flattery when I express my firm conviction that such learning, such principle, and such writing as are exhibited in it, *must* place you at once very high among the writers of this age."⁹⁷ Both Lyall and Rose thought the book should be published, and on November 6, Newman heard that Rivington had agreed to its separate publication.

When *Arians* was published on 5 November 1833, Rose reviewed it very favorably, but with some criticism of the treatment of the *disciplina arcani* in the *British Magazine* for January, 1834: "Here is a book of a kind which it does the heart good to see in such dark and low-minded days as these – the book of a scholar, of a deeply read divine, of a gentlemen, of a man of refined taste, of a man of lofty and unshaken principle; above all, of a Christian."⁹⁸

Though the study of the Fathers was a distinctive feature of Anglican theology, few Anglicans had ever studied them with Newman's intensity and passion. What really attracted Newman in his study of the *Arians* was the great Church of Alexandria, the

⁹⁶ Lyall to JHN (Fairsted, 9 November 1832), *LD* 3: 113.

⁹⁷ Hugh James Rose to JHN (Harwich, 21 October 1832), *LD* 3: 104.

⁹⁸ See *LD* 4: 156, footnote 1.

historical center of teaching in those times. The broad philosophy of Clement and Origen, the Alexandrian Fathers, carried him away “like music to his inward ear”; they convinced Newman of many ideas he had cherished for a long time:

These were based on the mystical or sacramental principle, and spoke of the various Economies or Dispensations of the Eternal. I understood these passages to mean that the exterior world, physical and historical, was but the manifestation to our senses of realities greater than itself. Nature was a parable: Scripture was an allegory: pagan literature, philosophy, and mythology, properly understood, were but a preparation for the Gospel.⁹⁹

The study of Arianism reinforced the philosophical principles that Newman had cherished and continued to cherish. As he acknowledged, the study broached various themes such as the sacramentality of the universe, the concept of Revelation, Scripture, oral tradition as a supplement to Scripture, the *disciplina arcani* and the role of theology. Another important fact that he recognized was the existence and role of the Church as a visible institution. In discovering the great Church of Alexandria, he found the foundational principles of his ecclesiology: “The visible world still remains without its divine interpretation; Holy Church in her sacraments and her hierarchical appointments, will remain, even to the end of the world, after all but a symbol of those heavenly facts which fill eternity.”¹⁰⁰

Though Newman later considered his *Arians* as “just the most imperfect work that was ever composed,” he always held the substance of what he had written and thought it had “good point in it, and in parts some originality.”¹⁰¹ According to Meriol Trevor,

⁹⁹ *Apologia*, 26-27.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁰¹ See *LD* 23: 46; also *LD* 28: 172, and *LD* 30: 105 and 240.

Newman's study of Arianism was a turning point in his life without his fully realizing the implications of his views: "The image of the Church emerged powerfully from his study of these early conflicts—and it was quite as much an historical as a theological study."¹⁰²

Both Newman's methodology and his theology of revelation, scripture, tradition, and the Church began to emerge from this study of the fourth-century Church. As Gilley observed: "None, however, contains so many of [Newman's] characteristics ideas."¹⁰³

Newman was fascinated by the methods and examples that the Fathers of the fourth-century used in interpreting Christian mysteries. The underpinning nexus between the themes of revelation, scripture, tradition and the Church surfaced throughout this study. In contemporary theological language, a "high" and "descending" ecclesiology enshrined itself in Newman's thought through his idealized image of the great Alexandrian Church.

3. A Summary of Newman's Initial View of the Church

The first two decades of Newman's life were overshadowed by evangelicalism. This was due in part to his family but especially due to the environment of Ealing school. Through this evangelical influence, he became not only familiar with Scripture but also with an anti-Roman Catholic sentiment. However, he also became convinced of the need for a definitive creed or dogma in religion. By reading Church History, he began to be influenced by the Fathers of the Church.

As he began his studies at Trinity College (1816) and later as a Fellow of Oriel College (1822), his intellectual and theological horizon widened to embrace various

¹⁰² Meriol Trevor, *Newman: The Pillar of the Cloud* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1962), 108.

¹⁰³ Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 89.

views about the Church: the dogma of Apostolic Succession, the doctrine of Tradition, the inevitability of the Visible and substantive body of the Church, the necessity of the independence of the Church, an anti-Erastian view of Church polity, etc. His parish ministry and his reading of the Church Fathers and Butler's *Analogy of Religion* re-enforced these ecclesiological ideas and moved him away from evangelicalism. In this period of his life, Newman definitely experienced an intellectual and religious formation that acquainted him with a number of currents of thought. Overall, however, his intellectual and religious formation shifted from evangelicalism through liberalism to High Church Anglicanism.¹⁰⁴

When Newman started his reading of the Church Fathers, especially his study of the Arians of the fourth century, he was, in fact, beginning to see himself in an ecclesiological mirror. Recalling the corruption and luxuriousness of Antioch, the birth-place of Arianism, he began to see how the Church of England, like Antioch, could also become a source of heresies. In the struggles of the fourth century Church, he began to see how the Church adopted different means to preserve and teach the true deposit of Faith.

Newman was fascinated by the early Church's use of teaching methods such as *Disciplina Arcani* (Doctrinal Reserve), *kat' oikonomous* (Economical Method) of accommodation, *theologia* (Theology) and Allegorical Method. These theological discoveries, along with finding that even the errors and corruptions in teaching can in the

¹⁰⁴ Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 47-79, had interpreted Newman through periods of evangelicalism, liberalism and High Church Anglicanism.

end become an opportunity for growth, led Newman to embrace a broad outlook in his ecclesiology. Most important, with his study of Arianism, Newman became certain that the visible Church is the custodian and dispenser of the doctrines of Faith, and both Apostolic Tradition and Scripture should be used in Church teaching.

CHAPTER TWO: NEWMAN'S MEDITERRANEAN VOYAGE: ENCOUNTERING OTHER CHURCHES

In September 1832, Newman was invited by his good friend and Oriel College colleague, Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836), and Richard's father, Robert Hurrell Froude (1771?-1859) to accompany them on a voyage to the Mediterranean.¹ The two were planning the trip for the sake of the younger man's health.² The invitation 'quite unsettled' Newman who wrote of the attraction he felt at the proposal but worried about the impediments on the way.³ "The thought of travelling in such company was 'very tempting', and he did not know when he would be so free again."⁴ Newman eventually persuaded himself that the voyage would be doubly beneficial: It would bring him into contact with many places mentioned in the Greek and Latin classics that he loved and taught and would give him the opportunity of following in the footsteps of St. Paul. So, after initial hesitation, on 15 October, he decided to make the trip.⁵ On 8 December 1832, Newman and the Froudes sailed from England to the Mediterranean on board the packet ship *Hermes*.⁶

Newman's Mediterranean voyage (1832-1833) proved to be an important event in his life. His voyage brought him into first-hand contact with the concrete realities of the

¹ Robert Hurrell Froude (1771?-1859) was the Archdeacon of Totness. See Ker, *Biography*, 46.

² Richard H. Froude to JHN (9 September 1832), *LD* 3: 92.

³ JHN to R. H. Froude (Oriel College, 13 September 1832), *LD* 3: 93.

⁴ Ker, *Biography*, 47; later Newman came to see this vacation as benefiting his health, as well as enlarging his usefulness and increasing his influence (56).

⁵ See Diary entry, Monday, 15 October 1832, in *LD* 3: 101.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 55.

churches of Greece and Rome. How did the experiences of visiting the churches on the Mediterranean impact Newman's love and understanding of the Church? Examining Newman's letters written during this voyage, his article, "Home Thoughts Abroad," and Froude's *Remains* provide a window into Newman's ecclesial feelings and ecclesiological thoughts at this time.

The mingled tedium and excitement of the voyage spurred Newman not only to write long descriptive letters to his family and friends, but also to "verse making." The themes of these verses were usually religious, such as a pervasive awareness of sin and guilt, an honest fear of death, and a sense of an embattled soul encompassed by trials. A set of verses that he sent to his sister Jemima concerned the evil of private judgment.⁷

⁷ JHN to Jemima Newman (On board the *Hermes*, 12 December 1832), *LD* 3: 139; the following poem, entitled "Private Judgment" was later published with some slight variations in *Verses on Various Occasions*, 78-79, with the annotations: *Off Cape Ortegal, December 11, 1832.*

1

Poor wanderers, you are sore perplexed
To find that path which Christ has blest,
Tracked by His saintly throng:
Each claims to trust his own weak will,
Blind idol; - so ye languish still
All wranglers, and all wrong.

2

He saw of old, and felt your need,
Granting you prophets of his creed,
The throes of fear to swage;
They stored the rich bequest he made,
And sacred hands have safe conveyed
The charge from age to age

3

Wanderers, come home! When erring most,
The church aye kept the faith, nor lost
One grain of holy truth,
She ne'er has erred as those you trust,

Some of his verses reflected a growing sense of his commitment to the Church of England. Thus, as the voyage progressed, he also acquired a new sense of vocation as a man of God and the Church.⁸

1. In the Footsteps of the Apostles and Fathers

In a letter to his mother, Newman described how the Mediterranean had been the seat of the most celebrated empires and events, and how it had become the center of the lives of the Church Fathers. He sent her verses about his favorite champion of orthodoxy, Athanasius, and other Fathers including Cyprian, Chrysostom, and Ambrose.⁹ He told her that perhaps the best thing he had done “in the rhyming way” was to complete his “Patriarchal Course of Sonnets.”¹⁰

Looking across at the African coast from the deck of the *Hermes*, Newman wrote he could not resist “the thought of Cyprian and the glorious churches now apparently annihilated.”¹¹ On 25 December, the party arrived at Malta, but had to spend Christmas day in a “most wretched” way without “the comfort and order of an Established Church.”¹² Newman wrote to his mother that he was humbled by a Romanist who testified to the Savior through prayers towards the Church over the sea. Even more, the thought of not being able to offer appropriate prayer, like Paul and Silas who sang praises in the prison, disgusted him: “. . . St Paul was absolute and unlimited in his ministerial

And soon she shakes of her dust,
And REIGN as in her youth.

⁸ See Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 92.

⁹ JHN to Mrs. Newman (*Hermes*, 19 December 1832), *LD* 3: 155-162.

¹⁰ JHN to Mrs. Newman (Malta 26 January 1833), *LD* 3: 206.

¹¹ JHN to Mrs. Newman (On board the *Hermes*, 19 December 1832), *LD* 3: 158.

¹² JHN to Harriett Newman (On board the *Hermes*, Malta, 25 December 1832), *LD* 3:162-166, at 162.

authority.”¹³ After seeing St. Paul’s Bay, where, according to tradition the Apostle was ship-wrecked, Newman wrote:

It is strange to be in a place where an Apostle has been; and it makes it still more afflicting thus to pass the day which especially celebrates the introduction of that glorious gospel which he preached. Surely there is something very wrong in the actual state of the Church in England –we are neither one thing or [sic] the other; neither strong enough to command obedience, nor loose enough to protest in our separate persons.¹⁴

As they harbored at Parlitorio, Newman was fascinated by the sight of the people of Greece, the race which produced great Fathers like Nazianzen, Athanasius, and Chrysostom. Their present situation, however, made him feel “very melancholy—but surely the power, which out of the wild olive tree formed an Origen or Athanasius, can transform [sic] them too.”¹⁵ Undoubtedly, he was intrigued both by the scenic land of ancient Greek heroes and by the memories of the Greek Fathers “born of the Spirit’s fiery shower.”¹⁶

¹³ Ibid., 162.

¹⁴ Ibid., 163.

¹⁵ Ibid., 164.

¹⁶ Newman wrote: “[I] am full of joy to overflowing – for I am in the Greek sea, the scene of old Homer’s song and of the histories of Thucydides.” Newman penned more verses on the Greek Fathers:

Let the world hymn thy heathen praise
Fallen Greece! The thought of holier days
In my sad heart abides –
For sons of thine in Truth’s first hour
Were tongues and weapons of His power,
Born of the Spirit’s fiery shower.
Our fathers and our guides.

All thine is Clement’s varied pages;
And Dionysius, ruler sage
In days of doubt and pain;
And Origen of eagle eye,

2. The Greek Church

Newman was relieved to know that dissenters were unknown in the Greek Church. There seemed, however, to be much superstition among Greek Christians. He saw the Church and the *body* of St. Spiridon, patron saint of the Island, Corfu, “who was one of the Nicene Fathers –tho’ doubtless it is not *his* body.”¹⁷ He found the Greek clergy ignorant, but moral in their lives. For him, there was nothing objectionable in their rigid fasting¹⁸ and prayer books. The doctrine of the Trinity was the prominent subject of all their prayers.¹⁹ He also found the Greek liturgy most imposing²⁰ and devotion to the Virgin and saints very common among the Greeks. He examined the devotional books that he found in a country church, one of which was a collection of prayers by John of Damascus and found nothing objectionable in them.²¹ He posed the question:

And saintly Basil’s purpose high
 To smite imperil heresy
 And cleanse the altar’s stain.

From thee the glorious preacher came
 With soul of zeal and lips of flame,
 A court’s stern martyr-guest;
 And thine, O exhaustive race!
 Meek Nazianzen’s heaven-taught grace,
 And royalhearted Athanase
 With Paul’s own mantle blest.

This poem, “The Greek Fathers,” was published with minor variations in *Verses on Various Occasions*, 102-103, with the annotations: *Off Zanto, December 28, 1832*. See JHN to Jemima (*Hermes* between Zante and Patras, 29 December 1832), *LD* 3: 166-170.

¹⁷ JHN to Harriett (On board the *Hermes*, Corfu, 2 January 1833), *LD* 3: 180.

¹⁸ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 7 March 1833), *LD* 3: 239.

¹⁹ JHN to Harriett (On board the *Hermes*, Corfu, 2 January 1833), *LD* 3: 180.

²⁰ JHN to Jemima (Lazaretto, Malta, 15 January 1833), *LD* 3: 192.

²¹ JHN to Harriett (On board the *Hermes*, Corfu on January 2, 1833), *LD* 3: 181.

By the bye, what answer do Protestants make, to the *fact* of the Greek Church invoking saints, overhonoring the Virgin, and substituting ceremonies for a reasonable service, which they say are the *prophetic* marks of Antichrist? I do not see the Romanists are more than advanced Greeks — the errors being the same, the degree less in the latter.²²

The magnificence of St. John's Church in Malta impressed Newman so much so that he became reflective about the fate of the Church in general:

I am impressed with a sad presentiment, as if the gift of truth, when once lost, was lost for ever [sic] — and so the Christian world is gradually becoming barren and effete, as land which has been worked out and is become sand. We have lasted longer than the South — but *we* are going (it appears) also. As for the number of sects, which have split off from the Church, many of them have already ended in Soc[in]ianism, a heresy ten thousand times worse than any in Rome or Constantinople.²³

Compared to the city of Rome and its Church, Newman thought that the Greek Church was in a better state. The Greek Church did not teach Purgatory or the Mass, which for him, were the two chief practical delusions of Romanism.²⁴ He shared his observations with his sister Jemima:

As to poor Italy, it is mournful to think about it. . . . I fear I must look on Rome, as a city, still under a curse Then as to Greece, the prospect is hopeful, considering its favorable leaning towards the English Church — and its corruptions seem in the retrospect light as air compared with those of Rome.²⁵

3. The Irish Church Bill

The similarities he found between the Arian heresy and the contemporary events in England led Newman to reflect incessantly on matters such as the fate of the Church,

²² JHN to Mrs. Newman (Malta, 26 January 1833), *LD* 3: 205.

²³ *Ibid.*, 204-205.

²⁴ JHN to Jemima (Rome, 20 March 1833), *LD* 3: 265.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

the role of Scripture and Tradition, and the need for proper theological knowledge. In fact, before leaving Falmouth, he wrote to E. B. Pusey:²⁶

I am still of opinion that the great evil of our want of theological knowledge is its resulting in difference of opinion. Men may say what they will about going by Scripture not tradition – but nature is stronger than systems As to Scripture being practically sufficient for making the Christian, it seems to me a mere dream – nor do I find it anywhere said so in Scripture – nor can I infer logically that what is confessed *the* sole oracle of *doctrine*, is therefore also of *practice* and *discipline*.²⁷

Nostalgia for home never left Newman even when he reached Rome; he reminisced about the blessings of home and feared of their destruction by the politicians.²⁸ He continued to be interested about the events happening back home. From Malta, he wrote his friend Isaac Williams and asked him to be prepared for the inevitable:

They say the elections are going in favor of the Whig Conservatives. If so, I suppose the Church's trial begins at once I have greatest dread of any disturbance in *the State*; for then every one is at once burdened with the cares of this life – but if the Church only suffers, then our own suffering, as Churchmen, is alone involved. My dear W. prepare yourself being chasséd from St Mary's by your Vicar's turning Nonconformist.²⁹

When Newman and companions arrived at Naples on Wednesday 13 February, he found everyone “immersed in the most despicable frivolity and worst profligacy.”³⁰

²⁶ Pusey's *Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions in the Promotion of Sound Religious Knowledge, occasioned by Lord Henley's plan for their abolition*, appeared early in 1833. Lord Henley was the son-in-law of Sir Robert Peel. See *LD* 3: 127, footnote 1.

²⁷ JHN to E. B. Pusey (Falmouth, 5 December 1832), *LD* 3: 126-128.

²⁸ JHN to Mrs. Newman (Malta, 26 January 1833), *LD* 3: 206: “It is Sunday morning. I think of St Mary's and Littlemore. We do not know how great our privileges are — all the quiet and calmness connected with our services etc is so beautiful in the memory and so soothing after the sight of that most exciting religion which is around me.”

²⁹ JHN to Isaac Williams (Lazaret, Malta, 16 January 1833), *LD* 3: 198.

³⁰ JHN to Harriet (Naples, 16 February 1833), *LD* 3: 211.

After visiting the town and some of its principal churches, he wrote to Jemima that “there was nothing there to offend me, however, more the whole city itself –which does offend me very much.”³¹ Moreover, his anxiety for the Church of England was heightened when he had observed the deplorable conditions of the churches he visited.³²

Witnessing directly the pathetic conditions of the churches and the way the political powers were plundering the churches and depriving them of their rights and privileges made Newman nervous about the changes happening back at home: “It has surprised us to see how far Ministers have gone in their Irish Church Reform Bill”³³ He added that the Church in England might console herself with the knowledge of having partners in misfortune in Sicily and Italy.³⁴ Years later, in his *Apologia*, he recalled what he truly felt: “England was in my thoughts solely, and the news from England came rarely and imperfectly. The Bill for the Suppression of the Irish Sees was in progress, and filled my mind. I had fierce thoughts against the Liberals.”³⁵

³¹ JHN to Jemima (Naples, 19 February 1833), *LD* 3: 216. Giving a traveler’s description of Sicily, he wrote his mother: “The mixture of grandeur and filth in the towns is indescribable, and to an Englishman inconceivable” (Naples, 28 February 1833, *LD* 3: 223-224.

³² JHN to Mrs. Newman (Naples, 28 February 1833), *LD* 3: 224.

³³ The Church Temporalities Act of July 1833 abolished ten Sees of the established (Anglican) Church of Ireland and introduced a tax on bishoprics, chapters, and richer benefices. See *LD* 3: 224. Newman voiced his concern over the new Irish Church Reform Bill to Frederic Rogers: “. . . Ministers have gone . . . abolishing sees, taxing benefices immediately, etc.; not that we doubted their sacrilegious will, but thought them now too much of Conservatives” (Rome, 5 March 1833, *LD* 3: 234).

³⁴ Newman blamed the miserable condition of the clergy and churches all through Italy and Sicily on politicians. See JHN to Frederic Rogers, (Rome, 5 March 1833), *LD* 3: 234-235.

³⁵ *Apologia*, 22.

Newman was anxious to know what his friends in Oxford thought of the Irish Church Reform Bill.³⁶ Describing the miserable state of the churches in Italy, Malta, Naples, Greece, and the Ionian Isles,³⁷ he wrote to Henry Wilberforce: “I am so anxious to know what various individuals in England think of this cursed Irish spoliation bill.”³⁸ To George Ryder, he poured out his frustration: “Well, and what is your opinion of the accursed Whig spoliation bill? . . . The time is coming when everyone must choose his side.”³⁹

In Newman’s correspondence during the Mediterranean voyage, there are indications of his desire to participate in a movement aimed at the reform of the Church of England. He admitted frankly an absence of a comprehensive understanding of the principles and the “history of Church changes” and he realized “more and more the blunders one makes from acting on one’s own partial view of a subject, having neither that comprehensive knowledge nor precedents for acting which history gives us.”⁴⁰ He felt that his travels were helping him to transcend his own particular station and

³⁶ JHN to Thomas Mozley (Rome, 9 March 1833), *LD* 3: 242. In a letter to Hugh James Rose, who had been the first to warn of the perils of the biblical and theological speculations of Germany, Newman wrote: “How pleased we should be to get a peep at the ‘British Magazine’ here, and see the state of feeling in the Church upon that cursed spoliation bill which the Papers give us notice of!” (Rome, 16 March 1833, *LD* 3: 252).

³⁷ JHN to Henry Wilberforce (Rome, 9 March 1833), *LD* 3: 244-247, at 246-247.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 247.

³⁹ JHN to George Ryder (Rome, 14 March 1833) *LD* 3: 249. Newman repeated this theme of choosing sides in *Tract One*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

decisions.⁴¹ He was rather aggressive, even sarcastic, in his critique of Dr. Thomas Arnold's liberal plan of Church Reform.⁴²

Amidst the growing concern about the fate of both the "divinely founded body," the Church, and those who are faithful to the cause of the Church, Newman wrote to Pusey:

We have just learned that Lord Althorp promises an English Church Reform this Session – a fresh bribe I suppose to enable the Ministers to pass the Coercion Bill But it is the case with the Church all over the world, apparently – here, and in Sicily as in England, and tho' we shall not live to see it, can we doubt it is intended to effect the purification of the divinely founded body, for its edification in love, and for the re-union to it of those well-meaning but mistaken dissentients who at present cause so great a scandal?⁴³

Yet, Newman reassured Pusey that travelling had not diminished his respect for the authority at home,⁴⁴ and he was not totally in despair about the fate of the Church:

The Church in these parts is in a melancholy state However we hear many things encouraging as to the state of religion in Germany and the United States of America – and we are led to hope that, after a crisis, the Church has fair prospect of raising her head again, and reigning as in her youth.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Arnold published *The Principle of Church Reform* (1833), an appeal for religious comprehensiveness as the only escape from the "calamity" of disestablishment. See JHN to R. F. Wilson (Rome, 18 March 1833), *LD* 3: 257-258. Newman later wrote: "At this time I was specially annoyed with Dr. Arnold, though it did not last into later years. Some one, I think, asked, in conversation at Rome, whether a certain interpretation of Scripture was Christian. It was answered that Dr. Arnold took it; I interposed, 'But is *he* a Christian?'" (*Apologia*, 22). See JHN to H. A. Woodgate (Naples, 17 April 1833), *LD* 3: 298. Newman's attack on Arnold is thought-provoking in light of contemporary ecclesiological approaches such as those of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 8, who has spoken of "forms of churches" and "Free churches" and churches that do not like to be called a "church."

⁴³ JHN to E. B. Pusey (Rome, 19 March 1833), *LD* 3: 259-260.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 262.

⁴⁵ JHN to George Ryder (Rome, 14 March 1833), *LD* 3: 250.

Newman's confidence was vivid in a letter he wrote his sister Jemima:

We are at present in good spirits about the prospect of the Church. We find Keble at length is roused, and (if once up) he will prove a second St Ambrose – others too are moving – so that wicked Spoliation Bill is already doing service, no thanks to it.⁴⁶

Newman never wanted to remain neutral.⁴⁷ He was also confident of his Oxford friends' fidelity to the Church: "Surely in bad times Oxford and its neighborhood will be the stronghold of the Church."⁴⁸ To defend the cause of the Apostolic Church, he began to talk about a new brotherhood, or even a club or society, and to recruit friends.⁴⁹

4. The Church of Rome

Even in the midst of these preoccupations, Newman was eager to reach Rome by tracing the footsteps of St. Paul.⁵⁰ He and his companions reached Rome on Saturday, 2 March 1833. Two days later, he shared his impressions with his sister, Harriett:

And now what [can] I say of Rome, but that it is of all cities the first, and that all I ever saw are but as dust, even dear Oxford inclusive, compared with its majesty and glory In St Peter's yesterday, and St John Lateran today, I have felt quite abased – chiefly by their enormous size, which added to the extreme accuracy and grace of their proportions makes one seem quite little and contemptible The approach to Rome from Naples is very striking . . . Rome grows more wonderful everyday.⁵¹

⁴⁶ JHN to Jemima (Rome, 20 March 1833), *LD* 3: 264.

⁴⁷ JHN to Walter John Trower (Naples, 16 April 1833), *LD* 3: 293.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ JHN to H. A. Woodgate (Naples, 17 April 1833), *LD* 3: 300. In his correspondence during his Mediterranean voyage, there are indications of Newman's desire to participate in a movement aimed at the reform of the Church of England.

⁵⁰ JHN to Mrs. Newman (Malta, 26 January 1833), *LD* 3: 206.

⁵¹ JHN to Harriett (Rome, 4 March 1833), *LD* 3: 230-31.

Newman's fascination with "the most delightful residences imaginable" in Rome grew daily:⁵² "It is the first city that I have been able to admire, and it has swallowed up, like Aaron's rod, all the admiration which, in the case of others, is often distributed among Naples, Valetta, and other places."⁵³ With mixed feelings, he claimed that though he had not seen much, he could discern traces of long sorrow and humiliation, suffering, punishment and decay behind the vast and overpowering City of Rome.⁵⁴ He summarized his feelings about the wonderful city in the line of Virgil: "*Urbem, quam dicunt Romam, Melibæe, putavi, stultus ego!*"⁵⁵

Though Newman acknowledged that he had experienced "none of that largeness and expansion of mind, which one of my friends privately told me I should get from travelling,"⁵⁶ he was "busily employed every morning in seeing sights – for, as Rome was not built, assuredly it is not to be seen, in a day."⁵⁷ For him, "look on St Peter's and think that the Apostle was buried beneath, and think of St Paul too, and Ignatius and Laurence, and others whose names are in the book of life, who lie here in the dust, is enough occupation for the mind."⁵⁸ His thoughts on Rome, however, swung from apocalyptic to religious and classical views.

⁵² JHN to R. F. Wilson (Rome, 18 March 1833), *LD* 3: 258.

⁵³ JHN to Frederic Rogers (Rome, 5 March 1833), *LD* 3: 233-234.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 233-234.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 233-234. In Virgil's first *Eclogue*, Tityrus addressed Melibæus: "Melibæus, I foolishly thought that the city they call Rome was like ours."

⁵⁶ JHN to Thomas Mozley (Rome, 9 March 1833), *LD* 3: 242.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 242

⁵⁸ JHN to Jemima Newman (Rome, 20 March 1833), *LD* 3: 263.

A. An Apocalyptic Rome

Newman's mixed feelings about Rome were expressed in an essay, "Home Thoughts Abroad," that was later published in *The British Magazine*: "I was full of expectation and impatience for the sight of Rome; yet there was nothing here of promise to excite or gladden the mind."⁵⁹ As he continued to explore Rome, he wrote about how one could look upon Rome from different points of view: "The first notion one has of Rome is as of the great Enemy of God, the fourth monarchy – and the sight of the city in this view is awful"⁶⁰ He shared with John Frederic Christie his conflicting views on Rome as "the most wonderful place in the world" and as "the Great Enemy against heaven."⁶¹

In Rome for five weeks, Newman described how Rome simultaneously delighted and terrified him.⁶² Rome "is a very difficult place to speak of from the mixture of good and evil in it – the heathen state was accursed as one of the 4 infidel monsters of Daniel's vision – and the Christian system there is deplorably corrupt – yet the dust of the

⁵⁹ See Newman's "Home Thoughts Abroad," *The British Magazine, and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information, Parochial History, and Documents Respecting the State of the Poor, Progress of Education, &c.* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington) Vol. V (January 1, 1834): 1-11. The second part of "Home Thoughts Abroad. – No. I" appeared a month later (February 1, 1834): 121-131; copies of the first two parts of "Home Thoughts Abroad" were generously provided by Dr. Mitzi Budde, Bishop Payne Library, Virginia Theological Seminary; hereafter references to "Home Thoughts Abroad" will be abbreviated: "Thoughts."

⁶⁰ JHN to Harriett Newman (Rome, 4 March 1833), *LD* 3: 231.

⁶¹ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 7 March 1833), *LD* 3: 240.

⁶² JHN to Samuel Rickards (Naples, 14 April 1833), *LD* 3: 287: "We were 5 weeks at Rome, and spent a most delightful time – its memory will ever be soothing to me – Jerusalem alone could not impart a more exalted comfort and calm than that of being among the tombs and the Churches of the first Christian Saints."

Apostles lies there, and the present clergy are their descendants.”⁶³ Later in “Home Thoughts Abroad,” he clearly linked Rome to the Apocalypse and described how “the fearful Apocalypse” came into his mind about the “ungodliness” and “doomed” city of Rome, which is “one of the four monsters of Daniel’s vision.”⁶⁴

After describing Rome and its tourist attractions, Newman’s surprising adulation of Rome changed again “to a train of opposite reflections,—melancholy, indeed, but needful to complete our view of Rome.”⁶⁵ In effect, “the spirit of old Rome” continued in the corrupt papal system of Christian Rome⁶⁶ and he could not “quite divest himself of the notion that Roman Christian is somehow under an especial shade as Roman Pagan.”⁶⁷ This notion—both evangelical and apocalyptic—of Rome surfaced in many of Newman’s letters:

I am now enjoying myself by a repose of 5 weeks in this august city – a city reverend even in so far as it is stricken with God’s curses, Here we see the only remnant of the 4 great Enemies of God—Babylon , Persia, and Macedon have left scarce a trace behind them—the last and most terrible beast lies before us as a subject for our contemplation, in all the visibleness of its plagues. From the first it has been the doctrine of the Church that heathen Rome should be destroyed, while Christianity rose to the ascendancy – and the Christians of the early ages, as they saw the successive judgments which fell upon it, seem to have raised the song of the Saints in the Revelations, who exult over the manifestation of divine wrath upon the enemies of the Truth.⁶⁸

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ “Thoughts,” 2.

⁶⁵ In an apocalyptic judgment Newman wrote that “the monster of Daniel’s vision . . . has seized upon Christianity as the new instrument of its impieties, and awaits a second and final woe from God’s hand” (“Thoughts” [second part], 123).

⁶⁶ “In the corrupt papal system, we have the very cruelty, the craft, and the ambition of the Republic; its cruelty in its unsparing sacrifice of the happiness and virtue of individuals to a phantom of public expediency Old Rome is still alive” (ibid.).

⁶⁷ JHN to R. F. Wilson (Rome, 18 March 1833), *LD* 3: 258.

⁶⁸ JHN to George Ryder (Rome, 14 March 1833), *LD* 3: 248-249.

Newman's feelings about Rome had their basis in his reading of the books of Daniel and Revelation.⁶⁹ He found even patristic foundation for this apocalyptic understanding of Rome.⁷⁰ For him, it seemed that Rome would be "reserved for future *super human* judgments."⁷¹ His thoughts about this apocalyptic fate of Rome seemingly haunted him when he was writing to Pusey. Newman went into more detailed reflections on the basis of the Book of Revelation and agreed with Thomas Scott's⁷² evangelical position that the last persecution was coming over the Christian World.⁷³ He thought that the spirit of the old Rome had risen again in its former place and was evidenced by its works. The influences of the sinful ancient Rome continued to overshadow Christian Rome through its spirit of dominion, language, policies, and superstitious behavior.⁷⁴

Newman, however, tried to be sympathetic to Rome by distinguishing between the sinner and the sin: "it does not follow that the *Church* [Church of Rome] is the woman of the Revelations – any more than a man possessed with a devil *is* the devil."⁷⁵ He explained: "I am a great believer in the existence of Genii Locorum. Rome has had

⁶⁹ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Naples, 14 April 1833) *LD* 3: 287.

⁷⁰ "Gregory the Great seems to have held the notion (*3 centuries after Rome became Christian*) that still the spot was accursed" (ibid., 287-288).

⁷¹ "That this doctrine evidently has been acknowledged by a considerable party in the Church, and as a tradition has a sort of authority of the opinion of the Church" (ibid., 288).

⁷² Rev. Thomas Scott (1747-1821), an Anglican minister and convert to Evangelicalism, wrote a best-selling work: *A Commentary On The Whole Bible*. See the footnotes to JHN's letter to E. B. Pusey (Rome, 19 March 1833), *LD* 3: 260.

⁷³ JHN to E. B. Pusey (Rome, 19 March 1833), *LD* 3: 259-262, at 260. Newman argued: "Other cities doomed in Scripture, as Babylon, have totally perished – Rome still survives – qu [sic] then whether the prophesies about the place, as place, are yet fully accomplished? . . . How is the parable of the tares fulfilled here!" (ibid., 260, 262); see "Thoughts," 123-124.

⁷⁴ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Naples, 14 April 1833), *LD* 3: 288-289.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 288.

one character of 2500 years—of the late centuries the Christian Church has been the instrument by which it has acted—it is its slave.”⁷⁶

B. Classical Rome

Newman was amazed by the classical art that he found in Rome. These classical works provided another view of Rome. In many of his letters to family and friends from Rome, he described a Classical Rome:

Next when you enter the Museum etc, a fresh world is opened to you – that of imagination and taste. You have there collected all the various creations of Grecian genius – the rooms are endless – and the marbles and mosaics so astonishingly costly. The Apollo is quite unlike his casts. . . . And the celebrated pictures of Raffaele! They are above praise – such expression! What struck me most was the strange simplicity of countenance which he has the gift to bestow on his faces.⁷⁷

In “Home Thoughts Abroad,” Newman remarked that Christian travelers, forgetting the Apocalyptic prediction on Rome, became “full of classical thoughts” and looked for “the footsteps of the Gracchi, and Brutus, and the philosophic Marcus.”⁷⁸ But he hesitated to grant the Old Rome any claim of classical excellence.⁷⁹ He found nothing classical except the Roman system.⁸⁰ Though he suggested that one must come to Rome not as a classical reader but rather as a reader of Scripture, he spent about a third of his first essay of “Thoughts,” describing traditional tourist sites and sights of Rome: ruins of

⁷⁶ Ibid., 289.

⁷⁷ JHN to Harriett (Rome, 4 March 1833) *LD* 3: 231-232. Three days later, Newman shared the same view of Rome with John Frederic Christie (Rome, 7 March 1833), *LD* 3: 240.

⁷⁸ “Thoughts,” 2.

⁷⁹ See “Thoughts,” 2: “The old Romans, as such, were not classical in any praiseworthy sense. They were a cruel and crafty people; and, though they were a wonderful people, much more are the powers of evil wonderful, as being superhuman; but this is no reason for admiring or talking much of them.”

⁸⁰ Ibid.

Roman villas, including, “the golden house of Nero,” the Pantheon, the Coliseum, the theatre of Marcellus, Trajan’s forum, and the public baths of Caracalla and Diocletian.⁸¹

Comparing Rome and Greece for their contribution in classics, he stated that the “Grecian genius is not cursed and we may safely admire all its corruptions the fragments of a holier traditionary truth” however “Rome is one of the 4 beasts.”⁸²

C. Religious Rome

Newman described a third view of Rome in many of his writings during his voyage. He saw Rome as a place of religion in which pain and pleasure are mixed: “It is strange to be standing in the city of the apostles, and among the tombs of martyrs and saints.”⁸³ Then he gave an account of the interesting sacred sites he visited including “St. Gregory’s (the Great) Church” where the “inscription at the entrance records the names of some of our early Prelates, including the Monk Augustine.”⁸⁴ In a letter to John Frederic Christie, he seemed to struggle again with a mixture of feelings:

Well then, again after this, you have to view Rome as a place of religion – and here what mingled feelings come upon one. You are in the place of martyrdom and burial of Apostles and Saints But then on the other hand the superstitions; – or rather, what is far worse, the solemn reception of them as an essential part of Christianity Really this is a cruel place.⁸⁵

Though Newman himself was often concerned over the apocalyptic fate of Rome, he asserted that those thoughts should not interfere with Christian travelers’ affection for

⁸¹ Ibid., 7.

⁸² JHN to George Ryder (Rome, 14 March 1833), *LD* 3: 249.

⁸³ JHN to Harriett Newman (Rome, 4 March 1833), *LD* 3: 232.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 7 March 1833), *LD* 3: 240-241.

places where martyrs shed their blood.⁸⁶ He admitted his fascination with Rome to his friend Samuel Rickards:

As to Rome, I cannot help talking of it. You have the tombs of St Paul and St Peter, and St Clement – churches founded by St Peter and Dionysius (AD 260) and others in the catacombs used in the times of persecution – the house and table of St Gregory—the place of martyrdom of the above Apostles—but the catalogue is endless – O Rome, that thou wert not Rome!⁸⁷

As Newman traced out diligently and venerated piously the footsteps of apostles, bishops, and martyrs, he reminded his correspondents that a great many saints were buried there.⁸⁸ For him, pride of place went to Pope Gregory the Great (590-604): “St. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, has special claims on the respect of Englishmen, since he is the founder of our church.”⁸⁹ Continuing his self-assumed role of pilgrimage-guide, he described a number of basilicas, churches, and catacombs, and commented on a picture of the Virgin of great antiquity.⁹⁰ However, “the interest attendant on these, and similar memorials of the early Christians, vanishes before the enthusiasm which the traces of the great apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul excite in the mind.”⁹¹

Newman reminded his countrymen about the special meaning that St. Peter’s should have for them. He acknowledged a number of “traces” or traditions, such as the presence of St. Peter in Rome and the paucity of Petrine “vestiges” in Rome. He was

⁸⁶ “Thoughts,” 8.

⁸⁷ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Naples, 14 April 1833), *LD* 3: 290.

⁸⁸ For Newman: “The most eminent of these are, of course, St. Peter and St. Paul, both of whom lie buried here; then St. Clement, St. Sebastian, St. Laurence, St. Dionysius, and St. Gregory” (“Thoughts,” 8).

⁸⁹ In 596, Pope Gregory sent Augustine, the prior of the monastery that Gregory had founded on the Cœlian Hill, to England as the head of a missionary band. See “Thoughts,” 8.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

more inclined to accept the three traditional locations: St. Peter's residence, the site of his martyrdom, and the place of his burial.⁹² He then described the Basilica of St. Peter in detail like a typical tour-guide. He was overwhelmed not only by the enormous size of St. Peter's Basilica, but also by its significance as the most magnificent church on "the foundation of the chief and representative of the apostles."⁹³ After defending the historical authenticity of Peter's presence in Rome, Newman discussed Peter's primacy among the Apostles:

And, next, take into account *where* this church is found; not in a distinct province of Christendom, but in its very centre – in Rome itself, the head of all, and the mother of many, of the churches of the West; nay – considering the state of Eastern Christianity, the enfeebled state of some of its churches, and the utter degradation of others – undeniably the most exalted church in the whole world.⁹⁴

Newman then reflected on why "Rome itself, the head of all, and the mother of many, of the churches of the West" should be considered "undeniably the most exalted church in the whole world" on the basis of history.⁹⁵ The apocalyptic notion of Rome, however, revisited him as he was reflecting upon the Papacy and concluded that "it was beyond the power of the servants in the parable to pull up the tares from the wheat – but

⁹² "Thoughts," 121.

⁹³ Ibid., 122.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 122-123: ". . . from the first, it was known and respected throughout Christendom for the dignity and wisdom of its conduct. The name of Peter is typical of the church which he governed, as denoting its steadfast and determinate position amid the waves of heresy by which Christianity was assailed. The unstable Greeks took refuge in the decisions of the clear-sighted and manly Latins. Nay, the greatest prelates of other countries, . . . the apostolical Cyprian, the large-minded Dionysius, and the richly-gifted Athanasius were corrected or supported by the see of Rome; . . ."

that it is incomprehensible is no objection to the notion of God's doing it."⁹⁶ He was distressed to watch the court of Rome—perhaps the only religious court in the world. He could not endure watching “the Pope's foot being kissed” and “being carried in on high,” “considering how much is said in Scripture about the necessity of him that is greatest being as the least.”⁹⁷ He felt deeply the force of the parable of the wheat and tares as he was witnessing the customs and traditions of Rome.⁹⁸

In his “Home Thoughts Abroad,” Newman described Rome as a city where “God has put blessing and cursing on the same city, in the highest measure.”⁹⁹ His view of Rome was not so much rejection as regret: “The Roman church I will not blame, but pity; she is, as I have said, spell-bound, as if by an evil spirit; she is in thralldom.”¹⁰⁰ Seeking additional corroboration, he concluded from Scripture “that the sorceress upon the seven hills is not the *church* of Rome” but “Rome itself.”¹⁰¹ He thought that the “very moral of the parable of the tares” was “designed by our Lord to have a prophetic reference to the

⁹⁶ Newman added: “Indeed the more I have seen of Rome the more wonderful I have thought that parable, as if it had a directly prophetic character which was fulfilled in the Papacy” (JHN to Samuel Rickards, Naples, 14 April 1833, *LD* 3: 289).

⁹⁷ JHN to Mrs. Newman (Rome, 25 March 1833), *LD* 3: 268. In Newman's time, papal protocol required that visitors kiss the pope's foot; until 1978, the pope was carried by attendants to and from ceremonies in a portable throne (*sedia gestatoria*).

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 268.

⁹⁹ See “Thoughts,” 8: “Nay, not only in place and time, but in all things, good and evil go together, the tares and the wheat. This is a paradox of *facts*, not of *doctrines*, which our Lord's parable lays down, and which is striking exemplified in the great city I am speaking about . . .”

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 124.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

case of Rome”¹⁰² and so he attributed the position of Rome to the witness of the power of the Gospel.¹⁰³

Newman anguished over Rome, where the spirit of antichrist and the temple of God existed almost inseparably. He felt that a mystery of iniquity had developed with more subtlety over the course of history “in the very heart of the church, in her highest dignity, in the seat of St. Peter.”¹⁰⁴ Like people confronted with the shortcomings of their own families, he acknowledged his mixed emotions about the Church of Rome, yet indicated how sympathetic he was to the Church of Rome, the Mother of Christianity and the source of Apostolic Succession. Accordingly, he wanted to rescue Rome from corruptions.¹⁰⁵ He was confronted with an ecclesiological dilemma: “a solution of the great difficulty which perplexes Protestants – how to avoid popery without giving up the church.”¹⁰⁶ He began to seek a middle ground, a *via media*, “in his way of speaking concerning the Roman Church.”¹⁰⁷

Visiting the Basilicas in Rome, Newman sometimes felt that there was around him not an “unfit representation of both its noble Catholicism and its papistical corruptions” but religion in its proper place because he found devout worshippers and priests at the altar day after day.¹⁰⁸ He knew that such popular devotions were often dismissed by English writers “who wish to be philosophical and make smart and shallow

¹⁰² Ibid., 124-125.

¹⁰³ JHN to George Ryder (Rome, 14 March 1833), *LD* 3: 248-249.

¹⁰⁴ “Thoughts,” 125.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 125-126.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 125.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 126.

generalization” that “the catholic system addresses itself to the *imagination*.”¹⁰⁹ He, however, claimed “for them a much higher origin, though one which everyone has within him if he will cultivate it—the devotional sense.”¹¹⁰ For him, the “*reverential principle*” of the Church of Rome is something indissolubly connected with real religion and was inherited from the old catholic times rather than being of mere imaginative character.¹¹¹

Though there were many impressive things about Roman devotional practices, such as feast days, fast days and the observance of Lent, Newman felt obliged to point out how “popery has eaten into the high system of catholicism and left it but an outside shell.”¹¹² He knew that for many Englishmen accustomed to the orderliness of the *Book of Common Prayer*, such devotions were upsetting, even scandalizing. More shocking were the spectacles such as the “souls in purgatory painted on the wall,” the “admonition to take part in saving them from it.”¹¹³

For Newman, the crown of Romish inventions was the mass.¹¹⁴ After contrasting the Anglican and Roman views of the Eucharist,¹¹⁵ he raised two objections to the Romanist view of the Eucharist. First, the mass “is supposed to benefit souls in

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 127.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Newman marshaled a series of examples from personal observations (ibid., 127).

¹¹³ Ibid., 128.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Newman also compared the ways that the Lord’s Supper was celebrated in Rome and England: “We consider, as scripture teaches, that the blessings of the Sacrament consists in our *partaking* it; but the Romanist is taught to believe there is a virtue in the priest’s mere offering it up to God” (ibid., 128).

purgatory as well as the living.”¹¹⁶ Second, the mass, as an offering to God by a priest has “its effect in the action itself, and not requiring any congregation to take part in it.”¹¹⁷ He termed these views, the “grand sin” of the papal system and “the *degradation of the human mind*.”¹¹⁸ Yet he differentiated his position from those English Protestants who maintained that religion “can do without CREEDS and without BISHOPS, which God has appointed” and considered the “ecclesiastical discipline *tyranny*, and submission to it *degradation*.”¹¹⁹

For Newman, a major problem with the Church of Rome was that “She destroys *personal* religion, and so makes the world what it would be if the gospel had not been given.”¹²⁰ He felt that Rome had perverted some of the earliest doctrines of the Apostles;¹²¹ Anglicans, in contrast, “kept what is orthodox in faith!” and are neither “Socinians” nor “Erastians.”¹²² In spite of all his mixed feelings and his ever-haunting apocalyptic thoughts about Rome, he still felt more attached than ever to the Catholic system. The affection he felt for the priests and the seminarians whom he met in Rome was shared in many of his letters.¹²³ To Samuel Rickards, he wrote: “I like the looks of a great many of their priests – there is such simplicity, gentleness, and innocence among

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 128-129.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 129-130.

¹²¹ Newman also referred to the Roman version of the Apostolic teaching on poverty and celibacy (ibid., 130).

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ JHN to Mrs. Newman (Rome, 5 April 1833), *LD* 3: 273-274.

the Monks, I quite love them.”¹²⁴ In spite of the reports that Newman had heard of the state of the Roman clergy, he was impressed by what he encountered.¹²⁵ He thought the state of the clergy of Rome better than that of the clergy he had met in Naples.¹²⁶ Yet, watching the clergy and laity of the Church of Rome prompted more mixed feelings.¹²⁷

An important visit that Newman and Richard H. Froude made during their visit to Rome was their meeting with Nicholas Wiseman (1802-1865), then Rector of the English College in Rome (1828-40), and later Archbishop of Westminster.¹²⁸ They came away from the meeting dismayed by Wiseman’s insistence that the Church of England—if it wanted to enter into communion with Rome—needed to accept all Roman doctrinal

¹²⁴ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Naples, 14 April 1833), *LD* 3: 289. Newman also wrote to his sister, Harriett, about the clergy in Rome (4 March 1833), *LD* 3: 228-232.

¹²⁵ JHN to Henry Jenkyns (Rome, Easter Day, 7 April 1833), *LD* 3: 280.

¹²⁶ JHN to R. F. Wilson (Rome, 18 March 1833), *LD* 3: 258.

¹²⁷ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 6 April 1833), *LD* 3: 277. Newman’s anguish is clear in a letter to his sister Jemima from Naples on 11 April 1833: “Oh that Rome were not Rome; but I seem to see as clear as day that a union with her is *impossible*. She is the cruel Church — asking of us impossibilities, excommunicating us for disobedience, and now watching and exulting over our approaching overthrow” (*LD* 3: 284).

¹²⁸ Nicholas Wiseman was the Rector of the English College in Rome (1828-1840) and later the President of Oscott College in Birmingham; he was named a Bishop in 1840. Wiseman followed the Tractarian movement eagerly and it was he above all who welcomed the converts. In 1847 he moved to London, where in 1849 he succeeded Bishop Walsh, as the last Vicar Apostolic of the London district, before the restoration of the English hierarchy in 1850, when he was made the first Archbishop of Westminster and a cardinal (see *LD* 3: 344). After calling on but missing Wiseman on 10 March 1833 (*LD* 3: 247), Newman “heard” him on March 24 (*LD* 3: 266); after calling on and again missing Wiseman on April 5 (*LD* 3: 272), Newman and Froude finally “had a long talk” with Wiseman on April 6 (Newman, *LD* 3: 276); later that day Newman alluded to this conversation in a letter to John Frederic Christie (1808-1860), a fellow of Oriel College (*LD* 3: 277).

teachings.¹²⁹ Newman immediately concluded: “A union with Rome, while it is what it is, is impossible; it is a dream.”¹³⁰ Froude, however, shared his impressions of the visit with Wiseman in detail:

Monsignor [Wiseman], the head of the college, who has enlightened [Newman] and me on the subject of our relations to the Church of Rome. We got introduced to him to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole. . . . So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. [Newman] declares that ever since I heard this I have become a staunch Protestant, which is a most base calumny on his part, though I own it has altogether changed my notion of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for the total overthrow of their system. I think that the only *τόπος* now is “the ancient Church of England,” and as an explanation of what one means, “Charles the First and the Nonjurors.”¹³¹

This conversation with Wiseman may have provided the background for the bitterness evident in Newman’s closing remarks in “Home Thoughts Abroad,” which mentioned Rome’s “intense hatred of us, and the iron temper with which she resists all proposals of ever so little concession.”¹³² Yet, he candidly remarked to Jenkyns: “How one may speculate about the future! This is but a dream, yet I suppose in some way the

¹²⁹ Doctrines mentioned were the teachings of the Council of Trent, infallibility, and the Mass; see Richard Hurrell Froude, *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude: Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838), 1: 306-308; hereafter cited: *Remains*.

¹³⁰ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 6 April 1833), *LD* 3: 277. In a letter to Henry Jenkyns, Newman wrote: “The Greeks are ready, I believe, to acknowledge us. As to Rome, a union with her on our part is impossible and ever will be” (Rome, 7 April 1833), *LD* 3: 280.

¹³¹ Froude’s letter to J. F. Christie from Rome in April 1833, *Remains*, 306-308; see also footnote no. 2 in *LD* 3: 276.

¹³² See “Thoughts,” 131: “Time softens not her resentment; a hard mother she, with no relentings of parental affection or misgivings or purpose, she is looking on, at this very time, with satisfaction at the prospect of our church’s destruction.”

Roman system will be broken up, yet without destroying the essentials of the Church system.”¹³³

5. Newman’s Return to Sicily

Newman travelled with the Froudes from December 1832 to April 1833. On 6 April 1833, he wrote to John Frederic Christie that he was “drawn by an irresistible attraction to the fair levels and richly verdure heights of Sicily” and wanted “as Wordsworth would say, to commune with high nature.”¹³⁴ Accordingly, when the Froudes departed for Marseilles on Tuesday, 9 April, Newman went to Naples a second time. He wrote to Jemima:

I wander about the place after the Froudes had gone with a blank face – I went to the Church of St. Maria in Cosmedin which Dionysius founded AD. 260 and where Austin is said to have studied rhetoric, I mounted the height where St Peter was martyred, and for a last time wandered through the vast space of his wonderful Basilica and surveyed his place of burial, and then prepared for my departure.¹³⁵

Arriving in Sicily, Newman set off inland northwest across the island on 1 May, but collapsed at Leonforte, very weak and ill. After his recovery, he wrote to Frederic about his illness:

. . . I had thought myself so bad that I gave my servant directions how to convey news of my death (should it be so) to England, at the same time expressing to him a clear and confident conviction that I should *not* die. The reason I gave was that ‘I thought God had work for me.’ I do not think there was anything wrong in this, on consideration.¹³⁶

¹³³ JHN to Henry Jenkyns (Rome, 7 April 1833), *LD* 3: 280.

¹³⁴ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 6 April 1833), *LD* 3: 277. See JHN to Henry Wilberforce (Rome, 9 March 1833), *LD* 3: 245 and JHN to George Ryder, Rome, 14 March 1833, *LD* 3: 247.

¹³⁵ JHN to Jemima Newman (Naples, 11 April 1833), *LD* 3: 282-286, at 282.

¹³⁶ JHN to Frederic Rogers (Palermo, 5 June 1833), *LD* 3: 314.

On 13 June 1833, Newman embarked for Marseilles. During the voyage, on 16 June, he composed “The Pillar of the Cloud”—better known by its opening words, “Lead, Kindly Light.”¹³⁷ He landed in France on 27 June, set off for Lyons the next day and arrived there the evening of Sunday, 30 June. After a week’s travelling through France, he arrived back home, at Rose Hill, Oxford, at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, 9 July.

Though Newman himself maintained that he had “experienced none of the largeness and expansion of mind” which he had been told he would “get from traveling,”¹³⁸ he did gain first-hand experience of the Greek and Roman churches. As Ian Ker has pointed out, Newman’s claim is misleading:

[Newman’s] religious vision had certainly been dramatically widened, and there is no question that his imagination, if not his mind, had been powerfully affected by witnessing at first hand the Church which his early Evangelical formation had convinced him was the Church of the Antichrist, a view which in a more modified and less extreme version he still held.¹³⁹

Newman was then in a position to compare the primitive Church which he had read about in the Fathers with the actual “unreformed” churches of the East and West which traced their origins to that early undivided Church, and particularly, the Roman Church; he had had an opportunity of seeing what sort of people real Roman Catholics were.¹⁴⁰ He made the distinction between Rome as a place and Rome as a Church; consequently, he was perplexed about how to draw a distinction between the two powers, spiritual and devilish, which were so strongly united and seemingly inseparable—beyond the power of the servant in the parable to pull up the tares from the wheat.

¹³⁷ See the Footnote, *LD* 3: 322.

¹³⁸ JHN to Thomas Mozley (Rome, 9 March 1833), *LD* 3: 242.

¹³⁹ Ker, *Biography*, 64.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 59.

6. A Summary: Encountering Real Churches

What Newman learned notionally about the Church during his study of the Arians of the fourth century became real for him during his Mediterranean voyage, as he traced the footsteps of the Apostles and Fathers of the Church. His reflections about the Greek Fathers, his favorite champions of Orthodoxy, re-echoed in his mind and found expression in his poetry. When he visited Greek churches, he was impressed with many aspects of Greek ecclesial life; practices, such as prayers, veneration to the saints, and fasting which became more acceptable to him and he liked the growing leniency of the Greek Church towards the Church of England.

Simultaneously, during his voyage, Newman was concerned about the contemporary events in his homeland and the Church of England. He was particularly concerned about the Irish Church Reform Bill and other proposed liberal reforms in the Church of England. His anxiety about these issues was heightened by his observations of the deplorable conditions of the churches he visited in Greece, Malta, Italy, and the Ionian Isles. He was passionate, sarcastic and even aggressive against those who supported the Irish Reform Bill and other liberal reforms in the Church. He began to be conscious of the lack of theological knowledge about, and the freedom of, the Church of England. Even during his voyage, he started to approach people about joining him in defending the right of the Church of England.

Touring the city of Rome, Newman was overpowered by mixed feelings: on the one hand, he felt a genuine appreciation for the Church and Rome; on the other, he experienced an evangelical, even apocalyptic, dismay about Rome and her Church. In

spite of these haunting thoughts about the apocalyptic fate of Rome, he enjoyed the classical and religious features of Rome. His essay, "Home Thoughts Abroad," expressed his reflections about the churches of Rome and England and their possible union. Finally, the Mediterranean voyage helped Newman to formulate a realistic understanding of the churches of Greece and Rome: the Church in this world is an actualization of the parable of the wheat and weeds.

CHAPTER THREE: AN ECCLESIOLOGICAL CONVERSION ABROAD

In his four-part essay “Home Thoughts Abroad,” Newman used the context of his visit to Rome to publish his reflections about the political and religious events taking place in England. The essay takes the form of an imaginary discussion about the Church and the need for planning for a reform movement within the Church of England. In retrospect, these “Thoughts” reflect the ecclesiological principles that Newman was pondering at the beginning of the Oxford Movement.

In these “Thoughts,” there are several hints of what would be Newman’s agenda for the next decade: defense of apostolicity, recognition of the importance of tradition, concern about doctrinal diminution by Protestant Liberalism on the one hand, and excessive and unscriptural devotionism by Roman Catholics on the other. These themes were reiterated in Newman’s writings during the following years.

1. An Ecclesiological Dialogue in Rome

When he completed “Thoughts,” Newman sent what he modestly referred to as this “nonsense,” to his friend and Oriel colleague, Hurrell Froude, for his “Imprimatur.”¹ Froude responded that the essay “might put before the people’s imagination the state of the Church in Greece and Italy.”² In contrast, Hugh James Rose, after reading “Thoughts,” wrote: “Your *trash* is so admirable that I should have kept it in spite of all you say and used it in my next No. . . . The order of your travel hardly signifies much –

¹ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriel, 22/23 August 1833), *LD* 4: 32.

² Froude to JHN (August 1833), *LD* 4: 37-38, at 37.

and the chapter on Rome will strike people much.”³ In another letter to Newman, Rose wrote: “I return your MS most unwillingly. Pray let me have it again as soon as you can, for I am taken with it beyond measure.”⁴

After a personal theological reflection against the background of the tour to Rome in “Thoughts, No. I,” Newman described his dialogue with two friends that ended in a debate. In his account, Newman entered into a discussion about the Church with an anonymous English friend, whom he called Ambrose.⁵ Decades later, he explained this conversation as a discussion

carried on by two speculative Anglicans, who aim at giving vitality to their Church, the one by uniting it to the Roman See, the other by developing a nineteenth-century Anglo-Catholicism. The narrator sides on the whole with the latter of these.⁶

As the two friends were enjoying a striking view of the city of Rome, Ambrose, alluding to a former conversation, surprised Newman by asking: “Have you really the

³ Hugh James Rose to JHN (Fairsted, 14 October 1833), *LD* 4: 160.

⁴ Hugh James Rose to JHN (Trinity College, 16 October 1833), *LD* 4: 62.

⁵ JHN, “Home Thoughts Abroad, No. II,” *The British Magazine* IX (1836): 237-238. Newman originally published “Home Thoughts Abroad” in four separate parts in *The British Magazine, and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information, Parochial History, and Documents Respecting the State of the Poor, Progress of Education, &c.* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington): “Home Thoughts Abroad, No. I” appeared in two parts in Volume V (January 1, 1834): 1-11, and (February 1, 1834): 121-131; “Home Thoughts Abroad, No. II” appeared in *The British Magazine*, Volume IX (March, 1836): 237-248, and (April, 1836): 357-369; these last two parts were republished with the title “How to Accomplish It” in *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London: Basil Montagu Pickering, 1872), 1-43; hereafter cited: *Discussions and Arguments*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/arguments/index.html>

⁶ *Discussions and Arguments*, 43; Newman (*ibid.*, 21) wrote: “For the future, I will call him Basil, and my first friend Ambrose, to avoid circumlocution.”

heart to say that all this is to be visited and overthrown?”⁷ He then added: “If Rome itself, as you say, is not to last, why should the daughter who has severed herself from Rome? The amputated limb dies sooner than the wounded and enfeebled trunk which loses it.”⁸ Ambrose then argued that in spite of the Church of Rome being corrupt, “there is such a religious *fact* as the existence of a great Catholic body, union with which is a Christian privilege and duty. Now, we English are separate from it.”⁹ While Newman accepted that there was “an unsatisfactory, miserable state of things”¹⁰ in the Church of England, he strongly felt:

The Church is founded on a doctrine—the gospel of *Truth*; it is a means to an end. Perish the Church Catholic itself, (though, blessed be the promise, this cannot be,) yet let it perish *rather* than the Truth should fail. Purity of faith is more precious to the Christian than unity itself. If Rome has erred grievously in doctrine (and in so thinking we are both of one mind), then is it a duty to separate even from Rome.¹¹

Newman felt intellectually victorious in his controversy with Rome; he also felt that Rome had failed in charity.¹² Ambrose, in turn, emphasized the importance of Catholicity with citations from the Fathers of the Church:¹³

⁷ Newman wrote: “One day I had called at the Prussian Minister’s, and found my friend there News of public affairs had lately come from England, which had saddened us both, as leading us to forebode the overthrow of all that gives dignity and interest to our country, not to touch upon the more serious reflections connected with it” (ibid., 1).

⁸ Ibid., 4.

⁹ Ibid., 5.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² “Thoughts,” 240.

¹³ Newman’s friend cited from Fathers such as Cyril and Augustine (“Thoughts,” 240-241).

Do you recollect the notion entertained by the primitive Christians concerning Catholicity? The Church was, in their view, one vast body, founded by the Apostles, and spreading its branches out into all lands,—the channel through which the streams of grace flowed, the mystical vine through which that sap of life circulated, which was the possession of those and those only who were grafted on it. In this Church there can be no division. Pass the axe through it, and one part or the other is cut off from the Apostles. There cannot be two distinct bodies, each claiming descent from the original stem. Indeed, the very word *catholic* witnesses to this. Two Apostolic bodies there may be without actual contradiction of terms; but there is necessarily but one body Catholic.¹⁴

Ambrose then pointed to the undeniable *fact* that the communion of Rome constitutes the main body of the Church Catholic and that the Anglicans were split off, like the Donatists in the time of St. Augustine:¹⁵

This, I say, is a *fact*; and if it be a grave fact, to account for it by saying that they are corrupt is only bringing in a second grave fact. Two such serious facts—that we are separate from the great body of the Church, and that it is corrupt—should, one would think, make us serious; whereas we behave as if they were plus and minus, and destroyed each other. Or rather, we *triumph* in the Romanists being corrupt, and we *deny* they are the great body of Christians, unfairly merging their myriad of churches under the poor title of ‘*the Church of Rome*,’ as if unanimity destroyed the argument from numbers.¹⁶

Newman disagreed with his friend’s claim that the Church of Rome alone is Catholic. For him, the Anglican Church also was catholic and already had branches in many countries:¹⁷

¹⁴ Ibid., 240.

¹⁵ Ibid., 241. Ironically, the Donatist controversy later became one of the events that led Newman to question the position of the Church of England; see Ker, *Biography*, 182-183.

¹⁶ “Thoughts,” 241.

¹⁷ Newman asked: “Is the Greek communion to go for nothing, extending from St. Petersburg to Corinth and Antioch? or the Armenian churches? and the English communion which has branched off to India, Australia, the West Indies, the United States, Canada, and Nova Scotia?” (ibid., 241; see 242).

The true state of the case is this: the condition of the early Church, as Augustine and Cyril describe it, exists no more; it is to be found nowhere. You may apply, indeed, the terms which they used of it to the present time, and call the Romanists Catholics, as they claim to be; but this is a fiction and a theory, not the expression of a visible fact.¹⁸

Ambrose interrupted him reminding that the schismatical Greeks, the Nestorians, the Monophysites, and the Protestants had been from the first “the Catholics” but later at different times, grown up on a novel doctrine or foundation. In reply, Newman referred to Apostolicity: “Foundation we have as apostolical as theirs, . . . and doctrine much more apostolical.”¹⁹ For him, this was a “plain tangible *fact*, . . . as the universal or catholic character of the Roman communion.”²⁰

Newman explained his reservations about thinking that “every word that the Fathers utter concerning the Church Catholic applies at once to the Church of this day.”²¹ The state of things regarding divisions in the churches had certainly changed since the time of the Fathers and “a state of things has grown up, of which hereditary dissent is an element.”²² He felt that “such outlying communities have blessings equal to the Church Catholic” and they retained “so much of privilege, so much of the life and warmth of that spiritual body, from the roots of which they spring, as irregular shoots, as to secure their individual members from the calamity of being altogether cut off from it.”²³ He, thus,

¹⁸ Ibid., 241-242.

¹⁹ Ibid., 242.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid, 242-243.

²² Ibid., 242.

²³ Ibid.

was hesitant “to apply the strong language which Cyprian used against schismatics to the Scottish presbyterians or to the Lutherans. At least, they have the Scriptures.”²⁴

Another change that Newman pointed out concerned Tradition:

. . . for instance, the tradition of the early Church was of an historical character, of the nature of testimony; and possessed an authority superadded to the Church’s proper authority as a divine institution. It was a witness, far more perfect in its way, but the same in kind, as the body of ancient writers may be for the genuineness of Cæsar’s works. It was virtually infallible.²⁵

In addition, Newman gave another ecclesiological reason for giving priority to Apostolicity over Catholicity:

Here, then, is another reason for caution in applying the language of the Fathers concerning schism to our own times, since they did not in their writings curiously separate the Church’s intrinsic and permanent authority as divine, from her temporary office of bearing witness to the Apostolic doctrine as to an historical fact.²⁶

Ambrose was happy to learn of Newman’s acceptance of the position of the Church of Rome: “The Latin communion is the main portion of Christendom—that participation with it is especially our natural position—and that our present separation from it is a grievous calamity as such, and, under the circumstances, nothing short of a solemn protest against corruptions in it, of which we dare not partake.”²⁷ For Ambrose,

²⁴ Ibid., 242-243.

²⁵ Ibid., 243. Newman added a sentence in “How to Accomplish It,” *Discussions and Arguments*, 11: “The early Christians had not the complete canon, nor were books then common, nor could most of them read.”

²⁶ “Thoughts,” 243.

²⁷ Ibid.

the difference in circumstances between the present and the ancient Church was only “ill-starred” theory.²⁸ Newman’s reply suggested the possibility of doctrinal development:

Christianity is intended to meet all forms of society; it is not cast in the rigid mould of Judaism. Forms are transitory—principles are eternal: the Church of the day is but an accidental development and type of the invisible and unchangeable. It will always have the properties of truth; it will be ever (for instance) essentially conservative and aristocratic; but its policy and measures will ever vary according to the age. Our Church in the seventeenth century was inclined to Romanism; in the nineteenth, it was against Catholic emancipation . . . Thus, the spirit of the Church is uniform, ever one and the same; but its relative position and ordinances change.²⁹

Ambrose, however, wondered what Newman really meant: “May we not suppose that the rules of the early Church were expedient then—nay, expedient now—as far as they could conveniently be observed, without considering them absolutely binding?”³⁰ Newman did not support anything contrary to the continued usage of the Church that was contrary to *apostolic* usage.³¹ However, he thought that “outward circumstances being changed, we may alter our rule of conduct.”³² Disagreeing with Newman, Ambrose insisted on “liberty of acquiescing in innovations” and was convinced of “providential phenomenon, the growth of a secondary system” compatible with some “portion of true faith” which cannot be considered schismatic.³³ Newman acknowledged that he was glad to gain a clearer view on this point than he had ever obtained before.³⁴

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid., 243-244.

³⁰ Ibid., 244.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., 245.

³⁴ Ibid.

For Ambrose, there was no convincing reason why the ancient unity of Christendom should not be revived and Rome be again the ecclesiastical head of the whole Church. He considered Newman's accusations of Roman corruption and idolatry inadequate because "these are corruptions of the Greek Church also."³⁵ Ambrose then repudiated Newman's view and allegiance to Laud's principles:³⁶

. . . they (Andrewes, Laud, Stillingfleet and the rest), defend and develop their peculiar view most originally and satisfactorily; still, after all, it is a *theory*,—a fine-drawn theory, which has never been owned by any body of churchmen, never witnessed in operation in any system. The question is not, how to draw it out, but how to do it. Laud's attempt was so unsuccessful as to prove he was working upon a mere theory. The actual English Church has never adopted it: 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. Nay, not only is Anglicanism a theory; it represents, after all, but an imperfect system; it implies a return to that inchoate state, in which the Church existed before the era of Constantine. It is a substitution of infancy for manhood.³⁷

For Ambrose, "the Anglican Principle is scarcely fair" and "the Anglican system itself is not found complete," and so "the principle is self-destructive."³⁸ His main objection was "that it is not, and never has been realized."³⁹ Therefore, the theory of *via media* was a failed experiment, once and for all:

³⁵ Ibid., 246.

³⁶ Ibid. William Laud (1573-1645), the Chancellor of Oxford and Archbishop of Canterbury, was throughout his career, a bitter opponent of Calvinism and Puritanism; he wanted to see the Church of England catholic and reformed in the spirit of Jewel and Hooker but with outward expression in ceremonial and ritual. Faced with the danger of separation and division, Laud sought to preserve the unity of the Church by strict uniformity and by rigid enforcement of the law; with a passion for discipline, he demanded obedience to the bishops and to the *Book of Common Prayer*. See Moorman, *A History of the Church in England*, 229-232.

³⁷ "Thoughts," 246.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

Protestantism is embodied in a system; so is Popery: but when a man takes up this Via Media, he is a mere doctrinarian When a person calling himself a 'Reformed Catholic,' or an 'Apostolical Christian,' begins to speak, people say to him, 'What are you? If you are a Catholic, why do you not join the Romanists? If you are ours, why do you not maintain the great Protestant doctrines?'⁴⁰

In reply, Newman insisted:

Rome is corrupt When she reforms, it will be time enough to think about the share of honour and power belonging to her in the Universal Church. At present, her prerogative is, at least, suspended, and that most justly.⁴¹

He then turned into "speculating upon the means of building up our existing English Church, the Church of Andrewes and Laud, Ken and Butler".⁴²

[W]e never can unite with Rome; for even were we disposed to tolerate in its adherents what we could not allow in ourselves, they would not listen to our overtures for a moment, unless we began by agreeing to accept all the doctrinal decrees of Trent, and that about images in the number. No; surely, the one and only policy remaining for us to pursue is, not to look towards Rome, but to build up upon Laud's principles.⁴³

Newman admonished Ambrose to incur boldly the "reproach" of upholding truth because "the Truth has in no age been popular, and those who preached it have been thought idiots, and died without visible fruit of their labours."⁴⁴ He, however, cheered his friend with the hope that "the Anglican principles" in the designs of Providence, were to be expanded and realized.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Ambrose also referred to Hall of Norwich's words to Laud: "Today you are in the tents of the Romanists—tomorrow in ours; the next day between both—against both How long will you halt in this indifference? Cast off either your wings or your teeth, and, loathing this bat-like nature, be either a bird or a beast" (ibid., 247).

⁴¹ Ibid., 246.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 248.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

2. Towards an Ecclesiological Debate

A second friend, Basil (B), one of the companions on Newman's excursion,⁴⁶ and well known to his friend Ambrose (A) with whom Newman was conversing, joined the discussion.⁴⁷ Newman explained to Basil what they were discussing and asked him to comment. For Basil, nothing seemed "so chimerical" as "the notion that the Church temper of the seventeenth century will ever return in England."⁴⁸ At the same time, he felt that they could "develop, in a diocese, or a single city, those principles and tendencies of the Caroline era which have never yet arrived at their just dimensions."⁴⁹ Like Newman, Basil thought that the element of high-churchmanship could retreat into the depths of the Christian temper,⁵⁰ and Apostolicity could be elicited instead in greater measure:

I never expect the *system* of Laud to return, but I do expect the due continuation and development of his *principles* The (so-called) union of Church and State, as it then existed, has been a wonderful and most gracious phenomenon in Christian history. It is a realization of the Gospel in its highest perfection, when both Cæsar and St. Peter know and fulfill their office. I do not expect anything so blessed again. Charles is the King, Laud the prelate, Oxford the sacred city, of this principle; just as Rome is the city of Catholicism, and modern Paris of infidelity. I give up high-churchmanship.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Ibid., 357.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 357-358.

⁵¹ Ibid., 358.

While Ambrose was wondering when the “substitution of apostolicity for high-churchmanship”⁵² would happen, Basil intended to be neither disaffected nor fanatical, yet he would retain his anticipation. When change is the rule of the world, he held:

The Church alone is eternal; and, being such, it must, by the very law of its nature, survive its friends, and is bound calmly to anticipate the vicissitudes of its condition. We are consulting for no affair of the day; we are contemplating our fortunes five centuries to come . . . like seed in the earth, spring up at some distant day. History is full of precedents in favour of such an anticipation.⁵³

As Basil argued for the English hierarchy “to develop an ‘apostolical’ spirit which even kings could not control,”⁵⁴ Newman quickly extended support by citing Leslie, who defended apostolicity for the Church, in his case of the Regale and Pontificate.⁵⁵ He added the witness of an acute contemporary observer, Alexander Knox:

No Church on earth has more intrinsic excellence, [than the English Church,] yet no Church, probably, has less practical influence My persuasion of the radical excellence of the Church of England does not suffer me to doubt, that she is to be an illustrious agent in bringing the mystical kingdom of Christ to its ultimate perfection.⁵⁶

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ For Basil, the Church continued to evolve in history from its beginning to the unknown future (ibid., 359).

⁵⁴ The word “apostolical” was added to the sentence in “How to Accomplish It,” *Discussions and Arguments*, 26; see “Thoughts,” 359.

⁵⁵ “Thoughts,” 360. Charles Leslie (1650-1722), appointed chancellor of Connor in 1687, refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary and was deprived of his offices; he then went to England, where he wrote a number of works including *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontificate Stated: In A Conference Concerning the Independency of The Church Upon Any Power on Earth, In The Exercise of Her Purely Spiritual Power and Authority* (1702; reprinted: Nabu Press, 2010; available at: www.archives.org/stream/a61098400lesluoft#page/n0/mode/2up). Charles Leslie’s great-great-grandson (1810-1870) of the same name and briefly Anglican Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh (1870) was Newman’s contemporary.

⁵⁶ “Thoughts,” 360-361; Alexander Knox (1757-1831) has been described as a “forerunner of the Oxford Movement” (see *LD* 4: 406).

Ambrose, unwilling to give up his view, challenged Newman and Basil:

. . . that your triumphant Church will, after all, be very much like what the papal was in its pride of place Why not, then, avail ourselves of what is ready to our hands in the Church of Rome? Why attempt, instead, to form a second-best and spurious Romanism?⁵⁷

At this point, Newman was eager to speak for Basil:

Basil thinks the Roman Church corrupt in doctrine. We cannot join a Church, did we wish it ever so much, which does not acknowledge our Orders, refuses us the Cup, demands our acquiescence in image worship, and excommunicates us, if we do not receive it and all other decisions of the Tridentine Council. While she insists on this, there must be an impassable line between her and us; and while she claims infallibility, she must insist on what she has once decreed; and when she abandons that claim she breaks the principle of her own vitality. Thus, we can never unite with Rome.⁵⁸

Basil agreed with Newman⁵⁹ and added that “we have nothing really to do with the future. Our business is with things as they are . . . we are concerned, not with illusions, (as the French politicians say,) but with things that are.”⁶⁰ For him, “to do anything effectually, certainly we must start upon *recognized* principles and customs.”⁶¹

He further illustrated his view:

Putting aside the question of truth and falsehood . . . we must be aware of the great error of making changes on no more definite basis than their abstract fitness, their alleged scripturalness, their adoption by the ancients. Such changes are rightly called *innovations*; those which spring from existing institutions, opinions, or feelings, are called *developments*, and may be recommended without invidiousness as being *improvements*. I adopt, then, and claim as my own, that position of yours, ‘that we must take and use what is ready to our hands.’ To do otherwise, is to act the *doctrinaire* and to provide for simple failure: for instance, if we would enforce observance of the Lord’s Day, we must not, at the outset, rest

⁵⁷ “Thoughts,” 361.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

it on any theory (however just) of Church authority, but on the authority of Scripture.⁶²

Accordingly Basil instructed his friend:

. . . we find among us, at this day, an intense fear and hatred of Popery It is mere headstrong folly, then, to advocate the Church of Rome. It is to lose our *position* as a Church, which never answers to any, whether body or individual. If, indeed, salvation were not in our Church, the case would be altered; as it is, were Rome as pure in faith as the Church of the Apostles, which she is not, I would not join her, unless those about me did so too, lest I should commit schism. Our business is to take what we have received, and build upon it: to accept, as a legacy from our forefathers, this ‘Protestant’ spirit which they have bequeathed us, and merely to disengage it from its errors, purify it, and make it something more than a negative principle; thus only have we a chance of success.⁶³

Ambrose was amused, yet unconvinced as before. Newman, on the other hand, was not quite pleased with the tone of political expedience which Basil had assumed and his patience towards the “Protestant.” However, he agreed with his friend’s general sentiment: “It is certainly *safer* in so serious a matter to go upon more obvious, more religious grounds than those you have selected”⁶⁴ The only exception, for Newman, was conscience.⁶⁵

To convince Ambrose, who likened the present union of Church and State to the “union of the Israelites with the Egyptians, in the house of bondage,” Newman referred to

⁶² Ibid., 361-362. Basil gave examples: “Hildebrand found the Church provided with certain existing means of power; he vindicated them, and was rewarded with the success which attends, not on truth as such, but on this prudence and tact in conduct. St. Paul observed the same rule,—whether preaching at Athens or persuading his countrymen. It was the gracious condescension of our Lord Himself, not to substitute Christianity for Judaism by any violent revolution, but to develop Judaism into Christianity, as the Jews might bear it” (ibid, 362).

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 363.

Biblical episodes of God's Providence.⁶⁶ "We, too, who are in captivity, must *bide our time*."⁶⁷ Basil also confronted Ambrose, who thought that they have "no *church* basis,— we have nothing but certain merely political rights."⁶⁸ Beginning a renewal was a moderate plan of action of making "the most of what we have" and restoring "the connexion between bishops and people" based on the existing spiritual powers of the Church, like the early Church commanding moral influence on believers.⁶⁹

Basil then listed the foundations the Anglican Church already had and which could be the basis for beginning a renewal: 1) "Ordination Service acknowledging three, and three only, divinely appointed orders of ministries," 2) "the sacraments for salvation," 3) "the injunction of daily service, and the solemnization of fast and festival days," and 4) "a yearly confession of the desirableness of a restoration of the primitive discipline."⁷⁰

Ambrose, however, pointed out that "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."⁷¹ Accordingly, he wondered how it would be strengthened or accomplished. Agreeing with Basil, Newman

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 363-364.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 364.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

added: “Hildebrand really had to create as well as we.”⁷² He made the *received* forms and rules of the Church his fulcrum. Accordingly, Newman suggested a road-map:

If master-minds are ever granted to us, to build us up in faith and unity, they must do the same; they must take their stand upon that existing basis They must make that basis their creed and their motive; they must persevere for many years, in preaching and teaching . . . and impressing members of the Church with the real meaning of the truths which are her animating element, and which her members verbally admit. In spite of opposition, they must persevere in insisting on the episcopal system, the apostolical succession, the ministerial commission, the power of the keys, the duty and desirableness of Church discipline, the sacredness of Church rites and ordinances.⁷³

Newman thought that the real strength of his Church was in her Apostolic succession and that he “who is told that the Church is the treasure-house of spiritual gifts, comes for a definite privilege” rather than “an excitement.”⁷⁴ Accordingly, Newman thought that the Church was keeping “back those doctrines, which, to the eye of faith, give a reality and substance to religion.” Therefore, their “first business . . . will be to stop this continual secession to the dissenters, by supplying those doctrines which nature itself . . . desiderates in our existing institutions”⁷⁵

As an example, Newman spoke of the religious institutions of the Middle Ages which he considered to be imperative to stop the progress of dissent.⁷⁶ He lamented that the religious life, though sanctioned by the Apostles and illustrated by the early saints, had given scope to moroseness, tyranny, and presumption in his Church.⁷⁷ Basil

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid., 365.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 366-367.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 367.

intervened, expressing his surprise to so ingrained, unfortunate prejudices against religious life. Newman saw “Religious Institutions” as “legitimate instruments of working upon a populace.”⁷⁸ In fact, he thought that “you necessarily must have either dissent or monachism in a Christian country.”⁷⁹ He hoped for “a dream of A. D. 2500,” the rise of “Religious Life” and “a high episcopal system” in England.⁸⁰

Ambrose was happy to see his friends’ thoughts progressing to what they themselves seemed to admit, and was considered one of its most remarkable characteristics—monachism.⁸¹ Their discussion ended with the sharing of Newman’s hope: “. . . our generation has not yet learned the distinction between Popery and Catholicism. But, be of good heart; it will learn many things in time.”⁸²

After reading the first part of “Home Thoughts Abroad II,” Rose suspended its publication for some time⁸³ for fear that good Protestants would leave the Church and suggested “publishing No. 3 along with it.”⁸⁴ In his “Home Thoughts Abroad,” Newman expressed his readiness to implement the reform of the Church by preaching and teaching, impressing members of the Church with the real meaning of the truths which should be animating the Church: the Episcopal system, Apostolic succession, the

⁷⁸ Ibid., 368-369.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 366.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 367.

⁸¹ Ibid., 369.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriol, 11 June 1833), *LD* 5: 79-81, at 80.

⁸⁴ See the Footnote in *LD* 5: 80: “This may have been the anonymous *The views of our reformers as bearing on religious dissent*, Oxford 1835.

ministerial commission, the power of the keys, the duty and desirableness of Church discipline and the sacredness of Church rites and ordinances.⁸⁵

3. A Movement of the Friends of the Church

A few days after arriving in Oxford from Rome, Newman heard John Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy" at St Mary's Church before the judges of the Assize. Newman considered that day the beginning of the Oxford Movement of 1833.⁸⁶ The Movement was to take shape around Newman's developing view that the clergy must defend four principles: the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, the exclusive privileges of bishops and priests to consecrate the bread and wine, the freedom of the Church and the popular aspect of the Church.⁸⁷

As he recalled later when he was "lowspirited about the state of things and thought nothing could be done," he received a suggestion of doing something "in the way of a Society, Association etc. for Church purposes."⁸⁸ He began writing to his friends regarding Keble's Assize Sermon and called them to action on behalf of the Church:

Surely the Church is not lost, when men like yourself show their readiness to act for it and the Lord's sake, and, even if it be lost, yet doubtless the more of its servants play a good part now, the happier for them hereafter. Let us work as knowing we shall have the reward of our labours, elsewhere if not here. This is

⁸⁵ To Wiseman, who had courteously expressed a wish that Newman and his friends might make a second visit to Rome, Newman said: "We have a work to do in England" (*Apologia*, 34).

⁸⁶ In *Apologia* (35), Newman wrote: "The following Sunday, July 14th, Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University Pulpit. It was published under the title of 'National Apostasy.' I have ever considered and kept the day, as the start of the religious movement of 1833."

⁸⁷ JHN to Charles Portales Golightly (Oriel, 11 August 1833), *LD* 4: 28-29.

⁸⁸ See the "Fragmentary Diary" that Newman wrote at Oriel College on 6 December 1833 (*LD* 4: 10).

the spirit of a Sermon of Keble's just published (an Assize Sermon) on the subject. We have here a small body of resolute men – besides Keble, Palmer of Worcester, Williams of Trinity, Froude and some others.⁸⁹

Newman also mentioned the meeting that was held at Rose's rectory to discuss the danger posed to the Church by the Irish Church Temporalities Bill.⁹⁰ Keble shared Newman's concern about the contemporary condition of the Church and was disappointed with the divergent opinions among the "Friends of the Church." He shared his frustration in a letter to Newman: "Now concerning mater Ecclesia, your letter has convinced me more than ever that she is (as my brother Tom says) like a broken China Dish lying on the floor, and 'tis no use to stand moaning round the fragments.'" ⁹¹

From the very beginning, the newly evolving group—"Friends of the Church"⁹²—was split into two views: one party for a society, the other for tracts.⁹³ Those who

⁸⁹ JHN to Charles Portales Golightly (Oriel, 30 July 1833), *LD* 4: 13.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 13. Newman wrote to John Frederic Christie: "There has been a meeting at Rose's in Suffolk of Apostolicals, and I suppose we must look round about us and do all we can to prepare for the worst, without committing ourselves to the open anticipation of certain changes . . ." (Oriel, 6 August 1833, *LD* 4: 26. He also wrote to H. A. Woodgate: "Have you seen Keble's excellent Sermon? If these men go much further, I mean the Blomfields etc, they will cause a schism in the church, such as it has never known. It is impossible any truehearted man, who knows the Apostolical doctrine and has a care for his soul, can long submit to them" (Oriel, 7 August 1833, *LD* 4: 27).

⁹¹ John Keble to JHN (Fairford, 8 August 1833), *LD* 4: 22.

⁹² Newman wrote to Froude: "You see I call the association 'Friends of the Church – ' i.e. by implication. Next about the Committee. As the meetings must be in Oxford, it is no matter what names we put in, yet I can find none but Oriel men" (Oriel, 9 September 1833), *LD* 4: 47.

⁹³ Newman stated: "The Associationists abominated, or at least were offended at the Tracts; the distributors of the Tracts dreaded an Association, as being Anti-episcopal, productive of partyspirit, and open to secret influence etc" ("Fragmentary Diary," *LD* 4: 11). At least for Newman, the issue was settled when he wrote the first three *Tracts* in September 1833; the *Tracts* are available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract1.html>.

avored the society approach were “sober clergymen like Palmer and Rose”⁹⁴ to whom heroic and romantic attitude was alien; those who favored the tract approach, believed in the principle that “living movements do not come of committees.”⁹⁵

Newman was strongly against structuring the effort as an association, particularly any organization in which a majority bound a minority, and found a great many people agreed with him.⁹⁶ In many letters to his friends, he defended his position against an association or a society.⁹⁷ He feared an “association would involve compromise and the tracts would “become cold and formal and impersonal.”⁹⁸ He was, however, open to laymen belonging to a society:

As to your question of laymen belonging to it, we hail any co-operation, as the greatest benefits to it. I send you one or two tracts, which are not authorized by the Committee, but were written by individuals belonging to it – indeed our views are quite undecided as yet in what way, and with great degree of responsibility in the Society we shall circulate them.⁹⁹

Newman also compared the present crisis of the Church of England with the struggles of Arian times and wished his archbishop would be like Athanasius.¹⁰⁰ He

⁹⁴ Ker, *Biography*, 85.

⁹⁵ *Apologia*, 39. See also Ker, *Biography*, 84-85.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁹⁷ JHN to William Palmer of Worcester College (Oriel College, 24 October 1833), *LD* 4: 67-69. To Froude, Newman wrote: “My first notion of the Society was this, ‘a mere name, which may give us pretext for agitating.’ On this account I wished the names of the members secret” (Oriel, 18 September 1833), *LD* 4: 51-52.

⁹⁸ Ker, *Biography*, 84.

⁹⁹ JHN to John William Bowden (Oriel, 23 September 1833), *LD* 4: 54. In a later letter to Bowden, who wrote Tract [5] on the Church, Newman wrote: “Your tract on the Church has been revised by Keble and myself – i.e., we have altered – a dozen words. It meets with great approbation, and we hail you as a fellow-labourer with great satisfaction, especially as being a layman” (Oriel, 18 October 1833), *LD* 4: 60-61.

¹⁰⁰ JHN to John William Bowden (Oriel, 31 August 1833), *LD* 4: 33.

likened this new movement of the people to the struggle of the early Church which relied on the people rather than on the political or ecclesiastical leaders.¹⁰¹ The disappointment that the current state of Church affairs caused Newman even made him think of the separation of the Church from the State. Though he would not advocate a separation of Church and State, he feared that “the Church is being corrupted by the union.”¹⁰² He expressed this shift in his view on the relationship of State and Church in a letter to Frederic Rogers:

Yet, I confess, Tory as I still am, theoretically and historically, I begin to be Radical practically . . . yet I cannot deny the plain fact that in most ages the [Church] has been based on a popular power. It was so in its rise, in the days of Ambrose and in the days of Becket, and it will be so again. I am preparing myself for such a state of things, and for this simple reason, *because* the State has deserted us and we cannot help ourselves. You must not think, however, that I myself meant to hasten the downfall of the Monarchy by word or deed.¹⁰³

For Newman, the “first duty is the defence of the Church” and he found that people are the real “fulcrum of the Church power.”¹⁰⁴ The defense of the Church became his central concern: “Our political affections are now centered in the Church.”¹⁰⁵ As he wrote to Samuel Rickards: “We wish you to profess and act upon the principle of merely

¹⁰¹ JHN to Charles Portales Golightly (Oriel, 30 July 1833), *LD* 4: 14. As a Roman Catholic, Newman would express this view in his essay “On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine” (1859).

¹⁰² JHN to John William Bowden (Oriel, 31 August 1833), *LD* 4: 34.

¹⁰³ JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel, 31 August 1833), *LD* 4: 35. To Arthur Philip Perceval, Newman wrote: “For myself, I agree with you in wishing the Church loose from the tyranny of the State, but should not yet like to say so in print” (Oriel, 6 September 1833), *LD* 4: 40-41.

¹⁰⁴ JHN to R. F. Wilson (Oriel, 8 September 1833), *LD* 4: 44. Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 85, has proposed that in 1833, the idea was dawning on Newman that if the Church of England was only doubtfully the Church of the whole nation, she was still the English Catholic Church.

¹⁰⁵ JHN to R. F. Wilson (Oriel, 8 September 1833), *LD* 4: 45.

fulfilling the designs of the Church – i.e. to keep every thing we have, and restore things, where it is possible.”¹⁰⁶ Thus, he gradually accepted an ecclesiological principle that the Church is essentially a popular institution and that the people are her real guardians. He knew that the “Fathers held constantly that the Church is a community” however, “it is not enough familiarized to [his] mind, or realized in its bearing, to enable [him] to advocate it yet.”¹⁰⁷

Newman outlined the principles that needed to be defended immediately by the clergy: “the doctrine is the Apostolic Succession . . . the exclusive privileges of Bishops and Priests to consecrate the Bread and Wine,” the freedom of the Church, and the popular aspect of the Church.¹⁰⁸ Presenting this “rough sketch of plan,” Newman invited friends to join the new movement to defend the “Apostolical Succession,” by “printing tracts bearing upon this subject – perhaps Ignatius’s epistles first.”¹⁰⁹ He repeated the immediate goals of the movement: “Our objects are ‘to rouse the Clergy, to inculcate the Apostolical Succession and to defend the Liturgy.’ We hope to publish tracts etc.”¹¹⁰

As the catalyst, Newman began a new series on the Church of the Fathers.¹¹¹ He also decided to write on the subject of ecclesiastical censure at the suggestion of Keble.¹¹²

¹⁰⁶ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Brentford, 8 October 1833), *LD* 4: 59.

¹⁰⁷ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriental, 18 September 18, 1833), *LD* 4: 53.

¹⁰⁸ JHN to Charles Portales Golightly (Oriental, 11 August 1833), *LD* 4: 28-29.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹¹⁰ JHN to Bowden (Oriental, 31 August 1833) *LD* 4: 33-35. In another letter to Frederic Rogers, Newman wrote: “*Entre nous*, we have set up Societies over the kingdom in defence of the Church . . . ‘to enforce the Apostolical Succession, and to defend the Liturgy.’ We mean to publish and circulate tracts” (Oriental, 31 August 1833, *LD* 4: 35).

¹¹¹ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (1 August 1833), *LD* 4: 18.

¹¹² John Keble to JHN (August <or July> 1833), *LD* 4: 20.

In October 1833, Newman, as “a Churchman,” wrote a series of letters on the revival of Church discipline, to the editor¹¹³ of the newspaper, *Record*:

The heading given to them was, ‘Church Reform.’ The first was on the revival of Church Discipline; the second, on its Scripture proof; the third, on the application of the doctrine; the fourth was an answer to objections; the fifth was on the benefit of discipline.¹¹⁴

Newman wanted to have “a revival of Church discipline” in the way that the Anglican reformers desired but could not complete in their day.¹¹⁵ He discounted the objection that such a revival would be impractical and utopian; rather, “if it be a duty, all doubts about its possibility are absurd.”¹¹⁶ He insisted that he was expecting a “pure Church”—“when all the members of a Church will be members of Christ’s invisible kingdom”—such an expectation was both unrealistic and unscriptural: “we know, on our Lord’s own authority, that the tares will ever be mixed with wheat.”¹¹⁷ He then proposed his understanding of the Church:

Now my notion of our blessed Lord’s design as to the visible Church is this; that, besides its being the bosom of the Church invisible (*i.e.* as having the dispensation of the sacraments), it was intended as a *type* of it, and a *means* towards forming it – a means, by preaching and teaching; and type or figure, as holding up consciously before the ungodly world, the rules of God’s governance, the gospel system, and the final separation of sinners from the elect.¹¹⁸

¹¹³ S. F. Wood, the editor of the *Record* wrote on October 16: “But, as one is driven, as it were, by an external force to think and judge about it (the subject of the Church), I will just say that I believe I differ with you a good deal as to the need the English Church has to be reformed itself” (*LD* 4: 63, footnote 1).

¹¹⁴ *Apologia*, 42.

¹¹⁵ JHN to the editor of the *Record* (Oxford, 21 October 1833), *LD* 4: 63-64, at 63.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 63-64.

Newman wrote a second letter to the editor of the *Record* to explain the Scriptural evidence for Church discipline.¹¹⁹ He wrote a third letter giving more proofs from Scripture and concluded that the “*duty* of discipline seems clearly marked in Scripture; our neglect of discipline is undeniable.”¹²⁰ In his fourth letter, he added that “the object of discipline is short of this, being that of avoiding scandals, removing the instruments of evil, and limiting the Church to those who may be considered in the way of salvation.”¹²¹ In his fifth letter, he explained the benefits of Church discipline.¹²²

Later Newman recalled that writing these letters was the “fruit of that exuberant and joyous energy with which [I] had returned from abroad, and which I never had before or since” but “were not congenial to his natural temper, to the genius of the Movement, and to the historical mode of its success.”¹²³ The major and momentous benefit, which would accrue to the Church from a strict discipline was, in his view, to counteract the increase of the Papists.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ For Newman, the duty of Church discipline is a clear command of the Lord on the basis of Matthew 18: 15-17; see Newman to the editor of the *Record* (Oxford, 31 October 1833), *LD* 4: 76. “Further, there are two modes of excommunication insisted on in Scripture; one to be exercised by the spiritual authority, the other by its individual members. . . . The duty of *ecclesiastical* excommunication is more solemn and its effect is much greater than that of merely separating the guilty individual from the intercourse of his brethren” (ibid., 77).

¹²⁰ JHN to the editor of the *Record* (7 November 1833), *LD* 4: 87-88.

¹²¹ JHN to the editor of the *Record* (11 November 1833), *LD* 4: 95.

¹²² JHN to the editor of the *Record* (Oxford, 14 November 1833), *LD* 4: 101.

¹²³ *Apologia*, 43.

¹²⁴ “I say then that the alarming increase of the Papists is a strong reason for our stirring ourselves in the matter of the Church discipline. . . . I find that Scripture speaks of ‘a pillar and ground,’ and enforces discipline; that the Apostles made use of an exact organization in preaching the Gospel. . . .” (JHN to the editor of the *Record* (Oxford, 14 November 1833), *LD* 4: 101-102.

Newman advocated: “I say then, let us make the Church of England, a bulwark against Popery, by advocating the restoration of her discipline. She has evidently retained all the better of the Roman Catholic system, which is altogether in her favor in her controversy with Rome.”¹²⁵ He was apparently confident that the English Church, by witnessing its Creed as powerfully, would be able to drive out Popery from England:¹²⁶

The Church will never be pure: I only mean, that the probability is, that, on the whole we should have governors sufficiently right-minded, self-denying, sound in faith, and holy in lives, to wage war successfully against Popery; nay, not only so, but to inculcate the truth actively, since the language of our Liturgy, Articles, etc., secure, in the case of an active preaching militant hierarchy, the enforcement of the high spiritual doctrine of Scripture and the Church.¹²⁷

On 17 November 1833, Newman wrote to his college friend, John Bowden, about his plan of publishing alongside the tracts, “The Record of the Church” to reinforce what he called the Apostolical doctrines.¹²⁸ He wanted “to be prepared and to prepare the public mind for the restoration of the old Apostolic System.”¹²⁹ Decades later, he recalled: “I thought . . . , that the Apostolical form of doctrine was essential and imperative, and its ground of evidence impregnable.”¹³⁰

In autumn 1833, the Tracts were printed and reached the public. They immediately aroused both supporters and critics. On 20 November, Newman wrote to Keble: “I have heard so much criticism on my tracts that it is comfortable to have heard

¹²⁵ Ibid., 102.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 103.

¹²⁸ JHN to John William Bowden (Oriel, 17 November 1833), *LD* 4: 109-110.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 109.

¹³⁰ *Apologia*, 44.

one or two things of a more pleasant kind”¹³¹ Some of Newman’s friends including Rickards, protested against the Tracts and the demands for Church reform that the Tractarians envisioned.¹³² To Newman, however, “[t]his then is our position –connected with no Association, answerable to no one except God and His Church, committing no one, bearing the blame, doing the work.”¹³³ He maintained that the “Association has nothing to do with the Tracts. The latter are the work of Oxford men; Keble, myself and others are answerable for them.”¹³⁴

Together with some of his friends,¹³⁵ Newman also drafted and submitted a statement¹³⁶—“Remarks on ‘Suggestion for an Association of friends of the Church’”—for the consideration of churchmen who, he thought, would have the same feeling that the Church was then in such circumstances as to require unusual exertions on the part of her

¹³¹ JHN to John Keble (Oriol, 20 November 1833), *LD* 4: 113.

¹³² See Samuel Rickards’ letter to JHN (Stowlangtoft [Suffolk], 28 November 1833, *LD* 4: 119) also Rickards’ letter to Newman (20 November 1833, *LD* 4: 115-116). The first tracts led to the end of a very affectionate friendship between Rickards and Newman (*LD* 4: 116).

¹³³ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Oriol, 22 November 1833), *LD* 4: 116-117.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 117. Newman also wrote to John William Bowden explaining what he had in mind regarding the Tracts: “As to the Tracts at Turrills’ we must wait the course of things, and creep before we can fly Whenever you talk of the tracts, mind and persist they are not connected with the Association, but the production of ‘Residents in Oxford’. I wish them called ‘the Oxford Tracts’, but I cannot myself so-call them for modesty-sake. So I think that soon I shall advertise them as ‘Tracts for the Times by Residents in Oxford’” (Oriol, 17 November 1833, *LD* 4: 109).

¹³⁵ The friends were Keble, Williams, Copeland and Christie (*LD* 4: 129).

¹³⁶ Two different versions were printed, November 30, and December 2. On both of them Newman wrote ‘Not issued’, i.e. not circulated widely, but given to a few friends (*LD* 4: 129).

members, but who could not yet see their way clear as to the best mode of answering the call made upon them.¹³⁷

The statement claimed that it was inexpedient for churchmen to form one general association throughout the nation¹³⁸ and presented a list of principles and objectives such as safeguarding the Sacraments, Episcopal Order, and the Liturgical forms, etc.¹³⁹ This proposal, however, was not acceptable to everyone.¹⁴⁰ Objections came from important quarters.¹⁴¹ For some, there was a general good feeling on the subject of the Address, but they were concerned over the Tracts.¹⁴² For others, it was “unexceptionable.”¹⁴³ Some supported the idea of forming a “local association of clergy and laity” to guard the

¹³⁷ JHN’s Diary, *LD* 4: 130.

¹³⁸ JHN, “Remarks on Suggestions for an Association of Friends of the Church” (*LD* 4: 129).

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ On November 29, 1833, John Bramston wrote to JHN: “I am afraid I am not so decided as to the primary and fundamental importance of the Apostolical Succession as you are Is the statement true, that your association holds the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or, what seems the same . . . ? if so I heartily grieve at it” (JHN’s Diary, *LD* 4: 128). After three days, S. L. Pope wrote to JHN on 2 December 1833 from Whittlesey: “Your Tracts have all arrived safe, but I do not in general find the cause meet with a zealous assent. I fear for the Church. There is too much division, my dear Newman, and too little charity for the feelings of others” (*ibid.*, 128). Rogers wrote to Newman that “the Address is moderate and appropriate,” however, he could not agree with “advice given in the paper on the Liturgy, to resist the alteration of *even one jot or title [sic] of it*” (Mawnan, 14 December 1833, *LD* 4: 145).

¹⁴¹ Regarding the Address, Archdeacon Froude warned Newman about “the most radical step ever taken by the Clergy of the Church of England, completely passing by their Bishops . . .” (15 December 1833, *LD* 4: 144).

¹⁴² “Some, it is true, call forth a little observation, and perhaps not without reason Another is grievously alarmed lest Popery be insinuating itself into the Church.” (James Dean, Derby, 2 December 1833, *LD* 4: 131). In another letter, Dean wrote Newman: “. . . the Tracts give great satisfaction, and are read with much interest. But I have, at the same time, so many complaints of their papistical tendency, as to interfere with the signing of the Address” (16 December 1833, *LD* 4: 144).

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

doctrine of the Church of England.¹⁴⁴ However, on 3 December, Newman reported: “The thing goes on here very well, I trust. The zs [[Establishment men]] and xs [[Evangelicals]] seem both well inclined, and the Address seems useful in bringing them together. The Oxford Tracts also I hear well spoken of.”¹⁴⁵

In spite of the growing publicity for the tracts,¹⁴⁶ Newman decided to keep the original intention of writing tracts and desired that “each tract should be *separate*; we do not want regular troops, but sharpshooters.”¹⁴⁷ Towards the end of 1833, Newman re-emphasized that all his efforts are “*for* the Church” rather than for politics.¹⁴⁸ He also realized that the “Tracts have prejudiced some persons against the Address – but we hope to get over this.”¹⁴⁹ He was confident that the Address was a threshold for reform in the Church: “Should the Address fail of an overpowering support from the Clergy, doubtless

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., footnote 1; surprisingly the proposed “local association of clergy and laity” omitted “bishops.”

¹⁴⁵ Henry Wilberforce to JHN (Isle of Wight, 3 December 1833), *LD* 4: 137.

¹⁴⁶ JHN wrote Richard Hurrell Froude: “Upon this I sent up to Turril to advertise the Tracts in our own way in the Record and St James’s Chronicle, – also in the British Magazine – and it is probable we shall soon put them on the footing of a periodical, without giving up the Tract shape. Our demand increase we have had new editions of several. . . . I have lately heard that the Christian Observer has a furious attack upon us, nay upon *Oriel*, in this last month. Can we have more favorable signs? Men do not cry out till they are frightened. – It is curious (but may be an accident) the British Museum sent for our Tracts about 10 days since” (*Oriel*, 15 December 1833, *LD* 4: 141-142). In a letter to Hugh James Rose from *Oriel* on 15 December 1833, Newman wrote: “The Record, and (I am told) the Christian Observer, have advertised them [Tracts] for us in their own way – and we are going to advertise them in consequence for ourselves; Turril being our London depot with a percentage of 25. However the increasing demand for them makes us think seriously of his proposal to circulate them for us through all his connexions, and advertise them in the Magazine for 40 per cent. The trouble of making up parcels is already very great” (*LD* 4: 143).

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. Smith was a publisher (*LD* 4: 410).

¹⁴⁸ JHN to John William Bowden (*Oriel*, 29 December 1833), *LD* 4: 151.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

there will be counter addresses; which is a serious matter – yet after all, is not anything better than a hollow peace?”¹⁵⁰ Like his friend, Hugh James Rose, who “spent his strength and shortened his life, Pro Ecclesia Dei, as he understood that sovereign idea,”¹⁵¹ Newman was determined to go forward for the reform of his Church.

4. A Summary: Ecclesiological Conversion and Movement

The second part of “Home Thoughts Abroad,” reveals how Newman struggled in his understanding of the Churches of Rome and England. In their conversation, Newman’s friend Ambrose challenged him to accept the fact of the existence of the Church of Rome and its Catholicity according to the Fathers of the Church. He considered the Anglicans as separated from the Catholic Church of Rome and like the Donatists. For Ambrose, Anglican reasons, such as corruptions of doctrines and idolatry, were unconvincing, and the Anglican claim of a *Via Media* was a failed experiment.

Newman, however, defended himself first by relying on the Catholicity and purity of his Church. Expressing reservation about relying on every word of the Fathers and stumbling on the claim of Catholicity, he brought forth the claim of the Apostolicity of his Church and its priority over Catholicity. He also attempted to justify his Church and other churches separated from Rome by affirming that they had blessings equal to the Church of Rome. He advocated the principle of doctrinal development and suggested a building up of the existing Church of England rather than going over to Rome.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 152.

¹⁵¹ *Apologia*, 37. Rose (1795-1838) died before the publication of *Tract XC* (1841).

When his second friend, Basil, joined the dialogue, they expressed the hope of developing the Caroline principles and tendencies again in England, eliciting the Apostolicity, and turning Oxford into the sacred city of those principles just as Rome is the city of Catholicity. Newman rejected the idea of union with Rome because of its corruptions and advocated that except in the matters of conscience, it is one's duty to submit to the authority where one is born. For Newman and his friend, developing the existing fundamental principles of the Anglican Church was the only option for the future.

Consequently, Newman advocated a movement of Friends of the Church for inculcating the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, defense of the Liturgy, and the revival of Church discipline. In pursuit of that goal, Newman and his friends began writing a series of tracts and essays which drew both acceptance and disapproval from many corners of England. Newman likened this movement to the struggles of the early Church which threw itself on the people and so he invited everyone including laity to partake in the movement. Finally, to gain support for the reform of the Church of England, he wrote several tracts to provide the ecclesiological foundation for this movement.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE CHURCH IN NEWMAN'S TRACTS

The *Tracts for the Times*—the first three were written by Newman, though published anonymously—began to appear on 9 September 1833.¹ By the end of 1833, twenty tracts had been written and widely circulated—ten of them written by Newman. Three decades later, reflecting on the beginning of the Oxford Movement, he explained the origin and purpose the *Tracts*:

As to the Tracts, every one has his own taste. You object to some things, another to others. If we altered to please every one, the effect would be spoiled. They were not intended as symbols *à cathedra* [sic], but as the expression of individual minds; and individuals, feeling strongly, while on the one hand, they are incidentally faulty in mode or language, are still peculiarly effective.²

Newman's thinking about the Church during the period—1833-1837—is discernable in the many tracts and letters that he wrote, as well as the sermons that he preached during this period.³ Two aspects of Newman's ecclesiology are particularly evident during this period: First, his emphasis on the Visible Church in general, and the Church's apostolic foundation, the role of bishops and the pope, and Church reform in particular. Second was Newman's view of the Church of England as a *via media* between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism.

¹ The *Tracts* were originally published separately; they were collected as *Tracts for the Times* by members of the University of Oxford, 5 volumes (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838-1840); a list of the authors of the *Tracts for the Times*, 1833-1841, is available in the Appendix of H. P. Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* (London: Longman, Green, 1894), 3: 473-480.

² *Apologia*, 41-42.

³ A number of tracts with distinctive but complementary notions of the Church were written by other Tractarians; this chapter, however, discusses only the tracts written by Newman.

1. The Visible Church

To a friend who wished to know his opinion about the Holy Catholic Church, as presented in Scripture and taught in the Creed, Newman replied in his *Tract 11: The Visible Church, Letters I & II*, published on 11 November 1833:

Scripture makes the existence of a Visible Church a condition of the existence of the Invisible. I mean, the *Sacraments* are evidently in the hands of the Church Visible; and these, we know, are generally necessary to salvation, as the Catechism says. Thus it is an undeniable fact, as true as that souls will be saved, that a Visible Church must exist as a means towards that end.⁴

For Newman, “it is plain this Visible Church is a standing body” and “everyone who is baptized, is baptized *into* an existing community.”⁵ The Anglican liturgy spoke of “baptized infants being *incorporated* into GOD’S holy Church.”⁶ Thus, the visible Church is a continuation of the one that existed from the time of Apostles rather than a voluntary association.⁷

Using a number of biblical references to substantiate his claim, Newman then explained the biblical foundation for the doctrine of the Visible Church.⁸ He held that the word “Church,” as used in Scripture, with a few exceptions, means a visible body:

I have shown that there is a divinely instituted Visible Church, and that it has been one and the same by successive incorporation of members from the beginning. Now I observe further, that the word Church, as used in Scripture, ordinarily means this actually existing visible body. The possible exception to this rule, out of about 100 places in the New Testament, where the word occurs, are four

⁴ See JHN, *Tract 11: The Visible Church*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract11.html>, 2-3; hereafter cited: *Tract 11*.

⁵ *Tract 11*, 3.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid. For some “dissenters” (those who refused to be members of the established church), the Church was a “voluntary association.”

⁸ Ibid.

passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians; two in the Colossians; and one in the Hebrews. (Eph. i. 22; iii. 10, 21; v. 23-32. Col. i. 18, 24. Heb. xii. 23.) – And in some of these exceptions the sense is at most but doubtful.⁹

For Newman, Christ intended to found a Visible Church on earth: “Further, our SAVIOUR uses the word twice, and in both times of the Visible Church.”¹⁰ Newman felt that the Visible Church was warranted by the plain sense of Scripture:

Now I am certain, any unprejudiced mind, who knew nothing of controversy, considering the Greek word [*ekklēsia*] means simply an *assembly*, would have no doubt at all that it meant in this passage a visible body. What rights have we to disturb the plain sense?¹¹

Similarly, in a sermon delivered on 25 October 1835, Newman insisted that the Church is both visible and invisible:

The word Church, applied to the body of Christians in the world, means but one thing in Scripture, a visible body invested with invisible privileges. Scripture does not speak of two bodies, one visible, the other invisible, each with its own complement of members.¹²

On the basis of Scripture, Newman distinguished two other characteristics of the Church: “the grant of *power* to the Church and the promise of *permanence*.”¹³ Therefore, the body that began with Christ has continued and has always claimed and exercised the power of a corporation or society. This doctrine is embodied in the article of the Creed

⁹ Ibid., 3-4.

¹⁰ Ibid., 4.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Sermon 391, *Parochial and Plains Sermons* previously published in eight volumes by Longman, Green, and Company, London is reprinted into one by (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1977), 623; hereafter cited: *PPS*.

¹³ *Tract 11*, 4.

about “The Holy Catholic Church.” Thus, for Newman, Scripture and history illustrated each other.¹⁴

For Newman, there was nothing amazing about Christ appointing a company of men for the mediation of His instruction and spiritual gifts and so he discussed the use of Visible Church in the second part of *Tract 11 (Letter II)*: What is most clearly revealed in Scripture is “that the blessings of redemption come to us through the Visible Church.”¹⁵ We are to come to that one Society, to which Christ “entrusted the office of stewardship in the distribution of gifts, of which He alone is the Author and real Dispenser.”¹⁶ Thus, the Church possesses the sacraments which are the ordinary means of grace, and the Spirit indwells in the Visible Church or Body:

The Lord’s Supper carries evidence of its social nature even in its name; it is not a solitary individual act, it is a joint communion. Surely nothing is more alien to Christianity than the spirit of Independence, the peculiar Christian blessing, i.e. the presence of Christ, is upon two or three gathered together, not on mere individuals.¹⁷

Nonetheless, Newman believed that “the Sacraments are committed, not into the hand of the Church Visible assembled together, (though even this would be no unimportant doctrine practically) but into certain definite persons, who are selected from their brethren for that trust.”¹⁸ These are those with whom Christ is present,¹⁹ who are

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., 5.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid., 6.

¹⁹ For Newman, “the doctrine is implied in the original institution of the LORD’S Supper, where CHRIST says to His Apostles, ‘Do this.’” (ibid., 6).

His stewards, and whom it is our duty to obey. St. Paul spoke of himself and others as “*Stewards of the mysteries of GOD.*”²⁰

In his sketch of the Visible Church, Newman was not arguing for a particular form of polity, or even for Apostolic Succession. He wanted to focus on certain points that were relevant to the Church, such as the duties of order, union, ecclesiastical gifts, and ecclesiastical obedience. He believed that once these points were acknowledged, others would eventually follow. He felt that two things were self-evident in Scripture: first, that there was a Visible Church in the Apostles’ day, and, second, that the Visible Church instituted by the Apostles was intended to continue.²¹

²⁰ Ibid., 7.

²¹ Newman listed the following references as scriptural proofs (*Tract 11*, 7-8): “I. That there was a Visible Church in the Apostles’ day. 1. General texts. Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17. 1 Tim. iii. 15. Acts passim, &c. 2. Organization of the Church. (1.) Diversity of ranks. 1 Cor. xii. Eph. iv. 4-12. Rom. xii. 4-8. 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. (2.) Governors. Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15, 16. John xx. 22, 23. Luke xxii. 19, 20. Gal. ii. 9, &c. (3.) Gifts. Luke xii. 42, 43. John xx. 22, 23. Matt. xviii. 18. (4.) Order. Acts viii. 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17; xi. 22, 23; xi. 2, 4; ix. 27; xv. 2, 4, 6, 25; xvi. 4; xviii. 22; xxi. 17-19. conf. Gal. i. 1, 12. 1 Cor. xiv. 40. 1 Thess. v. 14. (5.) Ordination. Acts vi. 6. 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22. 2 Tim. i. 6. Tit. i. 5. Acts xiii. 3. conf. Gal. i. 1, 12. (6.) Ecclesiastical obedience. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. Heb. xiii. 17. 1 Tim. v. 17. (7.) Rules and discipline. Matt. xxviii. 19. Matt. xviii. 17. 1 Cor. v. 4-7. Gal. v. 12, &c. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. 1 Cor. xi. 2, 16, &c. (8.) Unity. Rom. xvi. 17. 1 Cor. i. 10; iii. 3; xiv. 26. Col. ii. 5. 1 Thess. v. 14. 2 Thess. iii. 6. II. That the Visible Church, thus instituted by the Apostles, was intended to continue. 1. Why should it not? The onus probandi lies with those who deny this position. If the doctrines and precepts already cited are obsolete at this day, why should not the following texts? e.g. 1 Pet. ii. 13, or e.g. Matt. vii. 14. John iii. 3. 2. Is it likely so elaborate a system should be framed, yet with no purpose of its continuing? 3. The objects to be obtained by it are as necessary now as then. (1.) Preservation of the faith. (2.) Purity of doctrine. (3.) Edification of Christians. (4.) Unity of operation. Vid. Epistles. to Tim. & Tit. passim. 4. If system were necessary in a time of miracles, much more is it now. 5. 2 Tim. ii. 2. Matt. xxviii. 20, &c. Take these remarks, as they are meant, as mere suggestions for your private consideration.”

When Newman's views about the Visible Church were interpreted as if they "should lead to Popery," he responded with a third letter, published on 24 December 1833, as *Tract 20: The Visible Church, Letter III*, which attempted to clarify "his" understanding of the Church. Though Divine Truth was in the world as a pilgrim, it was Christ who set up "a Visible Church" as a witness to the Truth.²² The Church was an external fact rather than "a dream" or "argumentative proof" because "Christ set up a visible Society, His Church, to be as a light upon a hill, to all the ends of the earth, while time endures."²³

It is a witness of the unseen world; a pledge of it; and a prefiguration of what hereafter will take place. It prefigures the ultimate separation of good and bad, holds up the great laws of GOD'S Moral Governance, and preaches the blessed truths of the Gospel. It pledges to us the promises of the next world, for it is something (so to say) in hand; CHRIST has done one work as the earnest of another. And it witnesses the truth to the whole world; awing sinners, while it enspirits the fainting believer.²⁴

Secondly, for Newman, the Church as a visible society was the "keeper of the Sacraments" and so an essential means of making the world-to-come present in our fallen race.²⁵ However, "while it teaches substantially the Truth, we ought to look upon it as one whole, one ordinance of GOD, not as composed of individuals, but as a house of

²² JHN, *Tract 20: The Visible Church*; hereafter cited *Tract 20*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract20.html>, 1-2.

²³ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.* For Newman, the Church visible is the sign of the invisible sacramental life of heaven. The Church is an earthly story of the communion of the saints in heaven that should be continued in history. The Church has to preserve orthodoxy not with rigidity but with faithfulness to every truth revealed with the richness and exuberance of Christian Tradition. See Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 31.

GOD’S building;—as an instrument in His hand, to be used and revered for the sake of its Maker.”²⁶ Recognizing the success of “the Papists,” yet lamenting that their “communion is infected with heterodoxy,”²⁷ Newman pointed out that the Church of England had been providentially guided:

He [God] has wonderfully preserved our Church as a true branch of the Church universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal error. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical.²⁸

Accordingly, Newman wrote, it would be utter ingratitude to the astonishing providence of God, to be neglectful of such a gift and to argue as if religion were altogether and only a matter of each person’s private concern, and if the state and nation were not bound to prefer the apostolic Church to all self-originated forms of Christianity.²⁹

Since the Church of Rome has retained visibility, Newman acknowledged that it has all the advantages.³⁰ However, he felt that Anglican union with Rome was impossible because the Church of Rome had been infected with heterodoxy. Roman Catholics had established a lie in place of God’s truth and, by their claim of immutability in doctrine, could not undo the sin they had committed. Accordingly, on the one hand,

²⁶ Ibid., 2.

²⁷ Ibid., 3.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid., 4. As a Roman Catholic in 1848, Newman caricatured such self-originated churches in his novel, *Loss and Gain* (London: Longmans, Green, 1906), 387-401; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/gain/index.html>.

³⁰ “Now the Papists have retained it; and so they have the advantage of possessing an instrument, which is, in the first place, suited to the needs of human nature; and next, is a special gift of CHRIST, and so has a blessing with it And truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think that we should be separate from them; Cum talis esses, utinam noster esses!” (ibid., 2-3).

Popery had to be destroyed; it could not be reformed;³¹ on the other hand, the present position of the Church of England was a real blessing.³² In addition, he argued that to insist on the doctrine of the Visible Church was not a favor to the Papists, but a blow: “It is to deprive them of their only strength.”³³ Simultaneously, he argued that the neglect or breakdown of the “Divine Authority of our Apostolical Church” prepared the way for Popery in England.³⁴

Almost a year later, a friend accused Newman of advocating the doctrine of the Church catholic and apostolic by using expressions and making assumptions which imply that the dissenters were outside the pale of salvation. In reply, he wrote a fourth letter, published on 1 November 1834 as *Tract 47: The Visible Church, Letter IV*. Referring to Jesus’ strategic approach in his discourse with the woman of Samaria,³⁵ Newman insisted that God had providentially preserved the Church of England as a true branch of the Church Universal. He believed that it was parallel with the order of Divine Providence that there should be a variety, a sort of gradated scale, in God’s method of dispensing His favor in Christ.³⁶

³¹ Ibid., 3.

³² Newman wrote: “It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical” (ibid).

³³ Ibid., 4.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Newman wrote: “Consider our SAVIOUR’S discourse with the woman of Samaria. While by conversing with her He tacitly condemned the Jews’ conduct in refusing to hold intercourse with the Samaritans, yet He plainly declared that ‘salvation was of the Jews.’ ‘Ye worship ye know not what,’ He says, ‘we know what we worship.’ Can we conceive His making light of the differences between Jew and Samaritan?” (*Tract 47, The Visible Church, Letter IV*; hereafter cited *Tract 47*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract47.html>, 2).

³⁶ Ibid., 3-4.

While attempting to reclaim “to a more excellent way those who are at present severed from the true Church,”³⁷ Newman believed that “Eternal Wisdom may reconcile the exuberance of his mercy in CHRIST to the whole race of man, with the placing of it in its fulness in a certain ordained society and ministry.”³⁸ Newman preferred to rely upon “the simple word of truth, of which Scripture is the depository . . . being aware on the one hand that His thoughts are not our thoughts, nor our ways His ways, and on the other, that He is ever justified in His sayings, and overcomes when He is judged.”³⁹

A. Apostolic Foundation of the Church

In his first tract, published on 9 September 1833, *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission*, Newman emphasized that the Church was a creature of neither the state nor the people; rather the Church was founded on the authority of apostolic descent: “CHRIST has not left His Church without claim of its own upon the attention of men. . . . I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built,—our APOSTOLICAL DESCENT.”⁴⁰ He then explained:

The LORD JESUS CHRIST gave His SPIRIT to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so

³⁷ Ibid., 3.

³⁸ Ibid., 4.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Newman, *Tract 1: Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission*; hereafter cited *Tract 1*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract1.html>, 2. Christopher Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1934), 92-93, has stated that “the first two Tracts contain the essential principle of the Oxford Movement: its appeal to apostolic authority and to the doctrine of the apostolical succession against the Erastianism of the supporters of the Establishment and the Liberalism of its opponents.”

the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives.⁴¹

Throughout the ages, the grace of ordination has been conveyed in the laying on of hands and transmitted through the bishops, the successors of the Apostles.

Accordingly, the Christian ministry could be seen as a succession and the very form of ordination acknowledges the doctrine of apostolic succession.⁴² Nonetheless, Newman recognized that some clergy felt this doctrine overly theoretical because of the difference they felt between the present state of the Christian Church and her primitive form and condition.⁴³

Newman disagreed with those who undervalued apostolic succession as a “fond thing.”⁴⁴ For him, the obligation to uphold the tradition of apostolic succession was consistent with the general spirit of the “Jewish Church” and the practices of Jesus and his disciples.⁴⁵ Accordingly, along with his third tract, he published a number of references from two Apostolic Fathers, St. Clement, “the associate of St. Paul,” and St. Ignatius, “the friend of St. Peter,” as testimonies for apostolic succession and authority.⁴⁶

⁴¹ In order to prove his view, Newman brought his fellow-ministers’ attention to the words used when they were made ministers of Christ’s Church (ibid., 2).

⁴² Ibid., 2-3.

⁴³ JHN, *Tract 6: The Present Obligation of Primitive Practice*; hereafter cited *Tract 6*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract6.html>, 1.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Newman referred to the strict practices of the Mosaic Law by the chosen people down through their history; he also maintained that Jesus observed the Mosaic Law in its strictness, just as if he had lived in the generation after Moses. Even in an age of miracles, the Apostles observed the ceremony of Imposition of Hands (ibid., 1-2).

⁴⁶ JHN, *Tract 3: Thoughts on Alterations in the Liturgy*; hereafter cited *Tract 3*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract3.html>, 8.

For many of Newman's fellow Anglicans, episcopacy was the best form of ecclesiastical polity—one that had originated with the Apostles. He, however, considered this view as defective, “because the expediency of a system, though very cogent, is not the highest line of argument that may be taken in its defence” and because “an opponent may deny the fact of the Apostolicity of Episcopacy” in an argument.⁴⁷ Accordingly, one must not only hold on to ministerial succession, but also upon superintendence:

Doubtless the more clear and simple principle for a Churchman to hold, is that of a *Ministerial Succession*; which is undeniable as a fact, while it is most reasonable as a doctrine, and sufficiently countenanced in Scripture for its practical reception. Of this, Episcopacy, i.e. *Superintendence*, is but an accident; though, for the sake of conciseness, it is often spoken of by us as synonymous with it.⁴⁸

Newman explained the origin of the hierarchy of the Church as follows: “the Apostles appointed successors to their ministerial office, and the latter in turn appointed others, and so on to the present day.”⁴⁹ “The Apostles and their Successors have in every age committed portions of their power and authority to others, who thus become their delegates, and in a measure their representatives, and are called Priests and Deacons.”⁵⁰ Thus, for Newman, episcopacy is the fruit of the ministerial succession and the practice of delegation in the Church.⁵¹ In regard to apostolic succession, he concluded: 1) the bishops of his Church were the “heirs and representatives of the Apostles by successive

⁴⁷ JHN, *Tract 7: The Episcopal Church Apostolical*; hereafter cited *Tract 7*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract7.html>, 1.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid., 1-2.

transmission of the prerogative of being so”;⁵² 2) the doctrine of a succession was quite natural;⁵³ 3) the *argument from Scripture* was surely quite clear to those who honestly wished direction for practice.⁵⁴

In view of the current infringement on the rights of the Anglican Church by the state,⁵⁵ Newman encouraged his readers to ponder the foundational article of the Creed: “The One Catholic and Apostolic Church”—a tenet so important as to have been in the Creed from the beginning and the foundation of the ecclesiology of Anglican Divines:

Doubtless the only true and satisfactory meaning is that which our Divines have ever taken, that there is on earth an existing Society, Apostolic as founded by the Apostles, Catholic because it spread its branches in every place; i.e. the Church Visible with its Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.⁵⁶

He concluded that since Christ had appointed only one way and not two ways to heaven, communion with the apostolic Church was necessary for salvation.⁵⁷ As he acknowledged: “I am already called Papist and Pelagian – well, I am neither Puritan nor Protestant at least – what I am at is to be apostolical.”⁵⁸

⁵² Ibid., 2.

⁵³ Ibid., 3-4.

⁵⁴ “CHRIST promised He should be with His Apostles always, as ministers of His religion, even unto the end of the world . . .” (ibid., 3-4).

⁵⁵ The event that provoked Newman and the other tractarians was the proposed amalgamation of various dioceses of the (Anglican) Church of Ireland by Parliament. See Newman, *Tract 2: The Catholic Church*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract2.html>, 1-2.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 2-3.

⁵⁷ Newman added (ibid., 3): “This indeed is the unanimous opinion of our divines, that, as the Sacraments, so Communion with the Church, is ‘generally necessary to salvation,’ in the case of those who can obtain it.”

⁵⁸ JHN to Simeon Llyod Pope (Bisley, 21 August 1834), *LD* 4: 324-324, at 325.

B. The Role of Bishops

In his understanding of the ecclesiastical system, Newman highly esteemed bishops as the successors of apostles:

They [bishops] stand in the place of the Apostles, as far as the office of ruling is concerned, and, whatever we ought to do, had we lived when the Apostles were alive, the same ought we to do for the Bishops. He that despiseth them, despiseth the Apostles. It is our duty to reverence them for their office-sake; they are the shepherds of CHRIST'S flock.⁵⁹

In his view, the bishops were apostles for us, because of their “witnessing Christ” and “suffering for Him.” The suffering of the bishops was the second mark of their being our living apostles; in fact, bishops had undergone trials in every age⁶⁰ and witnessed Christ in their local churches:

Moreover, the Bishop *rules* the whole Church here below, as CHRIST, the true and eternal sovereign, rules it above; and here again the Bishop is a figure or witness of our LORD. And further, it is the Bishop who is commissioned to make us Clergymen GOD'S Ministers. He is CHRIST'S instrument; and he visibly chooses those whom CHRIST vouchsafes to choose invisibly, to serve in the Word and Sacraments of the Church.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Newman wrote in the footnote: “As far as the office of *ruling*, not as far as the office of *teaching* is concerned. The Apostles were both *inspired teachers* (Acts ii. 3, 4), and Bishops (John xx. 21-23). Their successors are Bishops only, not inspired teachers; and rule according to the Apostles' teaching,—not absolutely, as the Apostles may be said to have done” (JHN, *Tract 10: Heads of a Weekday Lecture, Delivered to a Country Congregation in -shire*, available at:

<http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract10.html>, 6); hereafter cited: *Tract 10*.

⁶⁰ “The presence of every Bishop suggests a long history of conflicts and trials, suffering and victories, hope and fears, through many centuries. His presence at this day is the fruit of them all He is the promise of a bold fight and a good confession and a cheerful martyrdom now, if needful, as was instanced in those of old time” (Sermon 355, delivered on 14 September 1834, in *PPS*, 640).

⁶¹ *Tract 10*, 4.

It is from “the Bishop that the *news of redemption and the means of grace* have come to all men; this again is a witnessing CHRIST” [sic].⁶² Thus, Christ is the true Mediator above and his servants, the bishops, are His earthly likeness.⁶³ In Tract 15, *On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*, dated 13 December 1833, Newman acknowledged the dilemma that Anglican churchmen sometimes felt about the doctrine of apostolic succession.⁶⁴ However, he continued to advocate the doctrine, making five main points of argument in its favor.

First of all, on the basis of existing Anglican teaching, Newman knew that the Christian Church consisted of clergy and laity. Though these two classes are distinguished from each other, they are also united to each other by the command of God Himself. The clergy have a commission from God through regular succession from the apostles, to preach the Gospel, administer the sacraments, and guide the Church. Consequently, people are bound to hear them with attention, receive the sacraments from their hands, and pay them dutiful obedience.⁶⁵

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 4-5.

⁶⁴ “. . . that they are sometimes met with the objection, that they cannot prove it without tracing their orders back to the Church of Rome; a position, indeed, which in a certain sense is true. And hence it is argued, that they are reduced to the dilemma, either of acknowledging they had no right to separate from the Pope, or, on the other hand, of giving up the Ministerial Succession altogether, and resting the claims of their pastors on some other ground; in other words, that they are inconsistent in reprobating Popery, while they draw a line between their Ministers and those of Dissenting Communion” (JHN, *Tract 15: On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*; hereafter cited *Tract 15*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract15.html>, 1; *Tract 15* was originally written by William Palmer, but revised and completed by Newman.)

⁶⁵ Ibid., 1-3.

Secondly, Newman defended three aspects of the doctrine of apostolic succession:

We hold, with the Church in all ages, that, when our LORD, after His resurrection, breathed on His Apostles, and said, “Receive ye the HOLY GHOST,—as My FATHER hath sent Me, so send I you;” He gave them the power of sending *others* with a divine commission, who in like manner should have the power of sending others, and so on even unto the end; and that our LORD promised His continual assistance to these successors of the Apostles in this and all other respects, when He said, “Lo I am with you,” (that is, with you, and those who shall represent and succeed you,) “always [sic], even unto the end of the world.”⁶⁶

If it was evident that the apostles received the Holy Spirit and commissioned successors to continue their work, it was equally evident that the bishops were these successors. For only the bishops have ever been called “successors” and history has documented the perpetual succession of these bishops in the Church. They alone were always esteemed to have the power of sending other ministers to preach and administer the sacraments.⁶⁷

Thirdly, for Newman, it was only a matter of common sense that a person was not entitled to teach religion, to administer baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and to take care of souls, unless he was in some way called to undertake the office. He further believed that since religion has always been a business between every person’s conscience and God, no one could have a right to interfere in the religious concerns of another with the authority of a teacher, unless he was able to show that God had in some way called him to do so. A minister of religion, therefore, is a person who has been called to “exhort, rebuke, and “rule,” “with all authority,” as well as called to love, and humility.⁶⁸ Jesus and His

⁶⁶ Ibid., 1-2. Although Newman often cited the scriptural passages that he had in mind, in this instance, he did not give specific references.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 1-2.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 2.

Apostles proved their divine commission by miracles. Newman believed that there must be some other way for a man to prove his right to be a minister of religion: “What other way can there possibly be, except a regular call and ordination by those who have succeeded to the Apostles?”⁶⁹

Fourthly, Newman pointed out that all “sects” consider it necessary that their ministers should be ordained by other ministers. Accordingly, even for sects, the validity of ordination rests on a succession. Was it not evident then that they too ought to trace their succession to the apostles? How much more would the ministers of the Anglican Church, who derive their ministry from the apostles.⁷⁰

Finally, the succession of bishops and episcopal ordination were the invariable doctrine and rule of the early Christians. Since this rule had prevailed from the first age, everywhere, and without exception; accordingly, it had been given to the primitive Church by the apostles themselves.⁷¹

In Tract 33, *Primitive Episcopacy*, dated 1 May 1834, Newman explained in detail how episcopacy worked in the primitive Church where a bishop was surrounded by a sufficient number of associates and assistants and eventually formed in “the shape and influence of an organized Church.”⁷² As his flock increased, the bishop sent out his clergy to greater and greater distances from the city; he would then appoint others to take his place in various parts of the province. To these individuals, the bishop would commit

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 3.

⁷¹ Ibid., 4-5.

⁷² JHN, *Tract 33: Primitive Episcopacy*; hereafter cited *Tract 33*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract33.html>, 1.

a greater or lesser share of his spiritual power, as might be necessary: sometimes he would make them fully his representatives, or ordain them bishops; at other times he would employ presbyters for his purpose.⁷³

Newman observed that “large dioceses are the characteristics of a church in its infancy or weakness; whereas, the more firmly Christianity was rooted in a country, and the more vigorous its rulers, the more diligently were its sees multiplied throughout the ecclesiastical territory.”⁷⁴ However, he thought that the “most perfect state of a Christian country would be, where there was a sufficient number of separate dioceses; next, where there were *Chorepiscopi*, or Suffragan Bishops in the modern sense of the word.”⁷⁵ After describing this “Primitive Regimen,” where Christianity especially flourished in the zeal and number of its adherents, Newman described the office of *Chorepiscopi*:

The office of these Chorepiscopi, or country Bishops, was to preside over the country clergy, inquire into their behaviour, and report to their principal; also to provide fit persons for the inferior ministrations of the Church. They had the power of ordaining the lower ranks of clergy, such as the readers, sub-deacons, and exorcists; they might ordain priests and deacons with the leave of the city Bishop, and administer the rite of confirmation; and were permitted to sit and vote in councils.⁷⁶

According to Newman, little use had been made of suffragans during the Middle Ages but at the time of English Reformation, Archbishop Cranmer felt the deficiency of bishoprics and proposed several measures to increase the number of dioceses by founding

⁷³ Ibid., 2.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 3.

twenty additional sees.⁷⁷ By following the manner of the primitive Church, he believed that the Anglican Church embraced the genius of a good ecclesiastical system.⁷⁸ Similarly, Newman defended the genius of the Anglican ecclesiastical system and also reminded churchmen of the injury which the Irish branch of their Church had lately sustained by the reduction of the number of its sees.⁷⁹

Newman was convinced that the English Church had its authority by succession from the Apostles. The bishops and clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation, and with the aid of the civil power, delivered the churches of England and Ireland from the yoke of papal tyranny and usurpation. At the same time, they gradually removed various superstitious opinions and practices that had grown up during the Middle Ages, and which, though never formally received by the judgment of the whole Church, were still very prevalent among the people. The Church of England, by its proper rulers and officers, reformed itself. In Newman's view, a new Church had not been founded in England rather the rights and the true doctrines of the ancient Church had been asserted and established.⁸⁰

C. Rejection of the Pope

Newman thought that by casting off the pope, the people of England concurred in the acts of their own spiritual superiors and committed no schism. There was no revolt against those who had a commission from God. It was the bishops and clergy

⁷⁷ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 4-5.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁰ *Tract 15*, 4-5. In October of 1834, Newman wrote to the editor of the *British Magazine* justifying the centralization of the Church of English (*LD* 4: 339-343, at 341).

themselves, who maintained the just rights of their Church. When they revolted from the pope, the people of England never disobeyed or deserted their own bishops and clergy.⁸¹ Newman drew on Scripture and Church history to defend his view. He emphasized that there was not a word in Scripture about the duty to obey the pope. He argued that though the bishops of Rome were often called the successors of Peter in the early Church, every other bishop also had that title. If it is true that Peter was the foremost of the Apostles, this did not prove that he had any dominion over them. Peter was like the eldest brother in a family who had certain privileges and precedence, but had no power over the younger branches of the family.⁸² Rome had always had the so-called primacy of the Christian Churches, but it did not have any right to interfere in their internal administration.⁸³

Newman pointed out a vivid resemblance between the Church of England, which followed the practices of the early Church, and the early Christian churches.⁸⁴ In early times, all Christians thought substantially alike and formed one great body all over the world, called the Church Catholic or Church Universal. This great body, consisting of a vast number of separate Churches, each with its own bishop at its head, was divided into a number of patriarchates, which in turn were divided into provinces, which were made up of separate dioceses or bishoprics. The bishop at the head of a patriarchate was called

⁸¹ *Tract 15*, 4-5.

⁸² At the outset of the Oxford Movement, Newman was attracted by the “Branch Theory” that maintained that there were three authentic “branches” of the Church: Greek, Roman, Anglican; since each branch is authentic, the Roman branch had no authority over the Anglican branch.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 5.

the patriarch and had the place of honor and certain privileges over all other bishops within his patriarchate. In the early Christian Church, there were four or five patriarchates. These patriarchs were the primates or head bishops of their respective patriarchates and had an order of precedence among themselves, Rome being the first of all. Thus, the bishop of Rome, as the first of the patriarchs in dignity, might be called the honorary Primate of all Christendom.⁸⁵

According to Newman, as time went on, the bishop of Rome, not satisfied with the honors which were readily conceded to him, attempted to gain power over the whole Church. He interfered in the internal management of other patriarchates. He appointed bishops to sees, and clergy to parishes, and illegally imposed various religious and ecclesiastical usages. Newman maintained that, in doing so, the pope acted in remarkable contrast to Peter.⁸⁶

According to Newman, the pope, among other tyrannical proceedings, took upon himself the control of the churches in Britain and forbade them to reform their doctrine and usages. The pope had no right to do so because the English and Irish churches,

⁸⁵ Newman mentioned the patriarchate in the east, whose head was the bishop of Antioch and the patriarchate in Egypt, whose head was the bishop of Alexandria; and the patriarchate in the west, whose head was the bishop of Rome. Newman also argued that from the first, there were portions of the Christian world, which were not included in any patriarchate, but were self-governed, such as the churches of Cyprus and the British churches (*ibid.*, 6).

⁸⁶ Newman upheld the tradition of St. Paul, who though inspired and a universal bishop, yet suffered not himself to control the proceedings even of the churches he founded—saying to the Corinthians, “not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand” (2 Cor. 1:24); Newman considered this an impressive declaration as a prophetic warning against the popish abuse of apostolic succession (*ibid.*, 6).

though in the west, were outside the boundaries of his patriarchate.⁸⁷ For Newman, it was a plain refutation of the Romanists on their own principles because they professed to hold the canons of the primitive church, namely, “to declare the Church to be one and the same in all ages.”⁸⁸ Accordingly, the pope had encroached on the rights of other churches and violated the canon of the Council of Ephesus.⁸⁹

Newman believed that the bishops of England, at the time of the reformation, were doing nothing more than vindicating their ancient rights. They were but acting as grateful, jealous champions of the honor of the Fathers and the sanctity of their institutions. The duty of the English in such matters surely laid in neither encroaching

⁸⁷ Newman found a remarkable parallel to the dispute between Rome and the Church of England at the Council of Ephesus, whose decision was promulgated for all provinces in all future times, as well as for the immediate exigency (ibid., 6-8). In the edition of *Tract 15* on www.newmanreader.org, the date of the Council of Ephesus is mistakenly given as 451 A.D., rather than as 431.

⁸⁸ Newman recalled the rule of the First Nicene Council, A.D. 325, which, in defending the rights of the Patriarchates, expressed the same principle in all its simple force and majesty (ibid., 8).

⁸⁹ Newman quoted the canon as follows: “We therefore decree, that the Prelates of the Cyprian Churches shall be suffered without let or hindrance to consecrate Bishops by themselves; and moreover, that the *same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces every where, so that no Bishop shall interfere in another province, which has not from the very first been under himself and his predecessors*; and further, that if any one has so encroached and tyrannized, he must relinquish his claim, that the Canons of the Fathers be not infringed, nor the Priesthood be made an occasion and pretence for the pride of worldly power, nor the least portion of that freedom unawares he lost to us, which our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who bought the world’s freedom, vouchsafed to us, when He shed His own blood. Wherefore it has seemed good to this Holy Ecumenical Council, that *the rights of every province should be preserved pure and inviolate, which have always belonged to it, according to the usage which has ever obtained*, each Metropolitan having full liberty to take a copy of the acts for his own security. And should any rule be adduced repugnant to this decree, it is hereby repealed” (ibid., 7-8). According to Newman, not only did the Council of Ephesus control the ambition of Antioch, but also Fathers like St. Augustine specifically rebuked Rome for encroaching on the liberties of the African Church (ibid., 8-9).

nor conceding to encroachment. The Church of England had the duty to assert its freedom under any circumstances and much more so when the corruptions imposed on it by Rome made it a duty to do so.⁹⁰

Newman also addressed some of the concerns raised by his fellow-Anglicans, against the apostolic descent of the Anglican Church. First, because it could be said that Rome had withdrawn the orders and excommunicated the Church in England, she could no longer plead her apostolic descent. However, for Newman, if a ministerial body became apostate, it would lose its privilege of ordination. Since the Church of England had never been proved to be heretical in doctrine, she would fairly and fearlessly maintain that her bishops were still invested with the power of ordination.⁹¹

Secondly, some would say that if Anglicans would not admit that they were heretics, they must necessarily accuse the Romanists of being such; and therefore, Anglicans really did not have valid orders, insofar as they were received from an heretical Church. Newman answered that even if Rome was to be considered heretical at the present, she was not heretical in the primitive ages. No one would say that she was then the Antichrist. Even after acknowledging and deploring all the errors of the Middle Ages, Anglicans could rightly maintain, that after all, they were but the errors of individuals. Furthermore, Anglicans could safely maintain that that these errors did not interfere with the validity of the ordination received by Anglican bishops.⁹²

⁹⁰ Ibid., 9.

⁹¹ Ibid., 9-10.

⁹² Ibid.

Thirdly, blame could be thrown on Luther and other foreign reformers who acted without the authority of their bishops. For Newman, it had always been in accord with the principles of the Church, that, if a bishop taught and upheld what was contrary to the orthodox faith, the clergy and people were not bound to submit, but were obliged to maintain the true religion. If excommunicated by such bishops, the clergy and people were never cut off from the Church.⁹³

On accepting the doctrine of apostolic succession, Newman suggested the criterion of Bishop Butler, that the “faintest probabilities are strong enough to determine our conduct in a matter of duty.”⁹⁴ Considering the undeniable fact that ordination had always been considered necessary in the Church,⁹⁵ he thought that if there were but a reasonable likelihood of pleasing Christ more by keeping than by not keeping to the fellowship of the apostolic ministry, that was a sufficient foundation to undertake the sacred office. Accordingly, any deliberate reluctance to confess the apostolic succession was an act of unchristian cowardice.⁹⁶ At the beginning of 1834, he wrote to Hugh James Rose: “Never had I such proof of the necessity of the Episcopal, or such bitter thoughts about the present widowed state of our Church, the members of which are surely as sheep without shepherds.”⁹⁷

⁹³ Ibid., 10-11.

⁹⁴ JHN, *Tract 19: On Arguing concerning the Apostolical Succession*; hereafter cited *Tract 19*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract19.html>, 1.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 2.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 3.

⁹⁷ JHN to Hugh James Rose (1 January 1834), *LD* 4:155-159, at 155.

D. Church Reform

Regarding church reform, Newman thought that all parts of Christendom had much to confess and reform, including his own Church,⁹⁸ whose greatest sin was perhaps the disuse of a “godly discipline.” He wished that his church would take the lead in the renovation of the Church Catholic on scriptural principles.⁹⁹ However, he wrote, “the Bible is not intended to teach us matters of *discipline* so much as matters of *faith*; i.e. those doctrines, the reception of which are necessary to salvation.”¹⁰⁰ As a Law of Liberty, the Gospel treats us as sons and not as servants and expects us to use our discretion by choosing what is most likely to please Christ.¹⁰¹

For Newman, the Gospel, rightly understood, shows God’s infinite holiness and justice as well as His infinite love. He felt that those who clamored for alterations in the liturgy were people who held the notion of the day, “that love and love only is in the Gospel the character of the Almighty God and the duty of regenerate man.”¹⁰² It was a just matter of common sense to have discipline and reform in the church; as he wrote to Keble: “it seems so open to commonsense that a Church must have discipline.”¹⁰³

In Tract 34, *Rites and Customs of the Church*, dated 1 May 1834, Newman attempted to provide the apostolic foundation for the observances and customs generally

⁹⁸ JHN, *Tract 8: The Gospel a law of Liberty*; hereafter cited *Tract 8*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract8.html>, 4.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 1.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² JHN, *Tract 3: Thoughts Respectfully Addressed to the Clergy on Alteration in the Liturgy*; hereafter cited *Tract 3*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract3.html>, 4.

¹⁰³ JHN to John Keble (Oriel College, 5 August 1833), *LD* 4: 21.

received in the Church of England. Though the Epistles were not written to prescribe and enforce the ritual of religion, they provide occasional allusion regarding the existing rituals.¹⁰⁴ St. Paul instructed and implemented a uniform system of discipline in regard to Christian conduct, worship, and church government.¹⁰⁵ Newman also held that “many of the religious observances of the early Church are expressly built upon words of Scripture.”¹⁰⁶ On the basis of illustrations from patristic authors like Tertullian and Basil, he concluded that “the ritual of the Church was derived from the Apostles, and was based upon religious principles and doctrines.”¹⁰⁷

2. The Anglican Church as *Via Media*

With the publication of Newman’s tracts, the characteristic features of the movement for the Church or Tractarianism had begun to take shape. The two tracts, Tract 38: *Via Media I* and Tract 41: *Via Media II*, which appeared in July and August of 1834, were written by Newman at the suggestion of his friend Bowden to forestall the

¹⁰⁴ JHN, *Tract 34: Rites and Customs of the Church*; hereafter cited *Tract 34*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract34.html>, 1.

¹⁰⁵ Newman recalled the Pauline command: “Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught, whether *by word*, or our epistle” (2Thess. ii. 15.) [ibid., 2]. See JHN to the editor of the *Record* (31 October 1833), *LD* 4: 76-78, at 76).

¹⁰⁶ *Tract 34*, 4-5.

¹⁰⁷ Newman concluded: 1) “That rites and ordinances, far from being unmeaning, are in their nature capable of impressing our memories and imaginations with the great revealed verities; far from being superstitious, are expressly sanctioned in Scripture as to their principle, and delivered to the Church in their form by tradition” (ibid., 6-7. 2). “Further, that they varied in different countries, according to the respective founder of the Church in each” (ibid., 7. 3); “. . . although the details of the early ritual varied in importance, and corrupt additions were made in the middle ages, yet that, as a whole, the Catholic ritual was a precious possession; and if we, who have rid ourselves of those corruptions, have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value” (ibid.).

accusation of popery:¹⁰⁸ “The world accuses you of Popery” and the “Apostolical” system “is like that against which our forefathers protested at the Reformation.”¹⁰⁹

A. The Problem: Popish or Protestant?

Admitting that “the Popish system resembles the Apostolical,” Newman asked: “Indeed, how could it be otherwise, seeing that all corruptions of the truth must be like the truth which they corrupt, else they would not persuade mankind to take them instead of it?”¹¹⁰ He assumed boldly that his was the later (truth) and the popish the earlier (corruption).¹¹¹ Simultaneously, he acknowledged that “the genius and principles of our Church have ever been what is commonly called Protestant.”¹¹²

Newman thought that many in his Church assumed “that the Protestant principles and doctrines of this day were those of our Reformers in the sixteenth century; and that what is called Popery now, is what was called Popery then.”¹¹³ However, these assumptions were based either on a matter of history, from “knowing the opinions of our Reformers, or from what you consider probable” and people who are not divine, judged

¹⁰⁸ *LD* 4: xiv; Newman replied to Bowden on 10 August 1834 (*LD* 4: 320-322, at 321): “I took your hint about Popery immediately, and wrote the Tract called *Via Media* . . . I am quite prepared for the charges of both Popery and Pelagianism.”

¹⁰⁹ JHN, *Tract 38: Via Media* 1: 21; hereafter cited *Tract 38*; (published on 25 July 1834), is available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/viamedia/volume2/viamedia.html>, 21.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 22.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ *Ibid.* Newman examined the Protestant-Catholic tension within the Church of England in *Tract 45: The Ground of our Faith*; hereafter cited *Tract 45*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/times/tract45.html>, 1-2. See also O’Connell, *The Oxford Conspirators*, 164-166.

from “a general knowledge of history, and from the obvious probabilities of the case, which no one can gainsay.”¹¹⁴ Accordingly, he asked rhetorically:

Is it not according to probabilities that opinions and principles should not be the same now as they were three hundred years since? . . . Can you point to any period of Church history, during which doctrine remained for any time uncorrupted?¹¹⁵

Newman was then sure of the need for a second Reformation in the Church of England. In spite of the Articles and the Liturgy, which kept Anglicans from deviating from the standard of truth set up in the sixteenth century, he observed that change of some sort was probable, considering the history of the universal Church. He believed that Anglicans had departed from both the Articles and liturgy and pointed out a number of liturgical practices that were neglected or styled as impracticable.¹¹⁶

Accordingly, Newman believed unfair the accusation that “we are plainly and indisputably proved to be Popish, if we are proved to differ from the generality of Churchmen now-a-days.”¹¹⁷ He also felt “that our Reformation was never completed in its details.”¹¹⁸ On the one hand, foreign reformers had altered and destroyed the ongoing reform and on the other hand, Anglicans were indebted to them for Protestant doctrine. As he disliked the foreign interference, he asked: “Why could we not be let alone and suffered to reform ourselves?”¹¹⁹

¹¹⁴ *Tract 38*, 22-23.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 24-26.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 26-27.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

B. The Answer: The Anglican Church as *Via Media*

Although Newman did not completely separate his creed and cause from that of the reformed churches of the Continent, he protested against being brought into close alliance with them, since the English Church had a unique place: “The glory of the English Church is, that it has taken the VIA MEDIA, as it has been called. It lies between the (so called) Reformers and the Romanists”¹²⁰

Newman strengthened his argument by appealing to the foreign reformers such as Calvin, who upheld the necessity of an Episcopal Regimen.¹²¹ Newman questioned the notion that defining the Catholic Church as “the body of Christians governed by Bishops, Priests, and deacons, would exclude pious Dissenters and others.”¹²² He also wondered whether he would be convicted of popery if he were to use the statement of Calvin concerning the manner of the Lord’s presence in the sacrament.¹²³

Newman believed that he was following in the footsteps of the Anglican reformers of the sixteenth century. He thought that it was not unexpected that the sixteenth century reformers should have fallen short of a full reformation in matters of

¹²⁰ Ibid., 28. Newman wrote to Samuel Rickards on 30 July 1834 (*LD* 4: 314-315): “We are a ‘Reformed’ Church, not a ‘Protestant’ We, the while, children of the Holy Church, whencesoever brought into it, whether by early training, or after thought, have had one voice, that one voice which the Church has had from the beginning Meanwhile the Church of Rome apostatized at Trent.” Later in *Tract 90*, Newman attempted to show the compatibility of Anglican doctrine with that of Trent.

¹²¹ *Tract 38*, 28-29; rather than giving a precise reference to Calvin, note 2 refers to “Mr. Perceval’s Churchman’s Manual, p. 13”; Arthur Philip Perceval (1799-1853), a graduate of Oriel and fellow of All Souls, was an author of several tracts, and later became royal chaplain to King William IV and Queen Victoria.

¹²² Ibid., 29.

¹²³ Ibid.

doctrine and discipline; “light breaks but gradually on the mind: one age begins a work, another finishes.”¹²⁴ He suggested that people should reproach him not with popery but with Protestantism and they should be impartial enough to assail not only him, but also “the Blessed Reformation,” because he shared the opinions of the reformers.¹²⁵

According to Newman, the reformers were searching Scripture and Antiquity and feeling their way to the Truth: “they speak in the formularies of the Church; more cannot be required of [them], nor indeed is it possible to say more.”¹²⁶ Though he was accused of being dissatisfied with the formularies of the Church and adding doctrines that were not contained in them, he believed that the doctrines that he upheld were of the Church.¹²⁷ He then described his ecclesiology: “I receive the Church as a messenger from CHRIST, rich in treasures old and new, rich with the accumulated wealth of ages.”¹²⁸

For Newman, the Anglican Articles are one portion of that accumulation. Age after age, fresh battles have been fought with heresy, fresh monuments of truth set up:

As I will not consent to be deprived of the records of the Reformation, so neither will I part with those of former times. I look upon our Articles as in one sense an addition to the Creeds; and at the same time the Romanists added their Tridentine articles. Theirs I consider unsound; ours as true.¹²⁹

¹²⁴ Ibid., 30.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Newman wrote (ibid., 31): “The following are some of its doctrines: that the Church has an existence independent of the State; that the State may not religiously interfere with its internal concerns; that none may engage in ministerial works except such as are episcopally ordained; that the consecration of the Eucharist is especially entrusted to Bishops and Priests.”

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 31-32.

However, Newman made it clear that the Anglican Articles are not a body of doctrines, and are not absolutely binding. They are only protests against certain errors of a certain period of the Church: “I am bound to the Articles by subscription; but I am bound, more solemnly even than by subscription, by my baptism and by my ordination, to believe and maintain the whole Gospel of CHRIST.”¹³⁰ He then pointed out that it is the duty of the clergy to maintain and confess the inspiration of Holy Scripture but “this doctrine is nowhere found in the Articles.”¹³¹

For Newman, “there are many other doctrines unmentioned in the Articles, only because they were not then disputed by either party; and others again, for other reasons, short of disbelief in them.”¹³² Further he observed: “A statesman of the last century is said to have remarked that we have Calvinistic Articles, and a Popish Liturgy.”¹³³ For Newman, this was an idle calumny, since there is a distinction of doctrine and manner between the liturgy and the Articles. The liturgy, as coming down from the Apostles, is the depository of their complete teaching; while “the Articles are polemical.”¹³⁴ Accordingly, there are many doctrines that are only indirectly contained in the Articles. However, the times had changed and “We are in danger of unbelief more than of superstition.”¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Ibid., 32.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid., 32-33.

¹³³ Ibid., 33.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

Newman concluded Tract 38 on the *via media* by reiterating the irreconcilable difference of the Church of England and Rome: “In the seventeenth century the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true *Via Media*; Rome sought to block up that way as fiercely as the Puritans did.”¹³⁶ Newman acknowledged that the “ignorance of our historical position as Churchmen is one of the especial evils of the day.”¹³⁷

He wrote a second tract discussing the *via media*—Tract 41: *Via Media No. II*—dated 24 August 1834, in which he presented his views on church matters¹³⁸ based on the conclusions and illustrations from a “smattering of reading in Church history”¹³⁹ He felt that forgetting “its own principles, as declared in the sixteenth century,” the church focused on “the errors and corruptions of the Papists.”¹⁴⁰ As an example, he felt that the church’s practice of excommunication, though a solemn duty of the church under certain circumstances, needed to be reformed. He lamented the helplessness of the Anglican Church that bound herself hand and foot to the civil power, to escape the pope.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ Ibid., 34.

¹³⁷ JHN, *Tract 41: Via Media II*; hereafter cited *Tract 41*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/viamedia/volume2/viamedia.html#tract41>, 35.

¹³⁸ JHN wrote to Henry Wilberforce on 27 July 1834 (*LD*: 4: 311-313, at 313): “J. Keble has written a beautiful Richard Nelson for August [gap in text] I a *Via Media*, which I like a good deal, if it is worth while giving [my opi]nion.” Tract 40, “On Baptism,” dated 25 July 1834, was written by John Keble using the pseudonym, “Richard Nelson”—a pseudonym, which was also used by his brother Thomas (1793-1875), for Tracts 12, 22, and 43.

¹³⁹ *Tract 41*, 35.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 36.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

Newman did not want to limit the second reformation only to matters of discipline, but following the path of the sixteenth century reformers, he wanted to extend reform to the Articles as well, not by changing them but by adding “protests against the erastianism and latitudinarianism which have incrusted them.”¹⁴² He wanted to append to the catechism a section on the power of the church.¹⁴³ He also illustrated how corruption took place in the liturgy: the “Liturgy keeps [them] right in the main,” yet there are what may be considered corruptions, though for the most part occasional.¹⁴⁴ He then explained why new articles were necessary:

. . . as time goes on, fresh and fresh articles of faith are necessary to secure the Church’s purity, according to the rise of successive heresies and errors. These articles were all hidden, as it were, in the Church’s bosom from the first, and brought out into form according to the occasion. Such was the Nicene explanation against Arius; the English articles against Popery: and such are those now called for in this Age of schism, to meet the new heresy, which denies the holy Catholic Church¹⁴⁵

Newman esteemed the reformers as far as they had spoken in the formularies, but at the same time, he considered the Articles as incomplete and lacking doctrines, such as the Apostolic Commission and the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. For him, these were essential doctrines of the Church Catholic and were held by every member of the Church, even prior to subscription to the Articles. These doctrines were quite consistent with the Articles and sometimes were even implied in them; they were sometimes clearly

¹⁴² Ibid., 38.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ For instance, Newman wrote (ibid., 39): “To board over the altar of a Church, place an orchestra there of playhouse singers, and take money at the doors, seems to me as great an outrage, as to sprinkle the forehead with holy water, and to carry lighted tapers in a procession.”

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 40.

contained in the liturgy of the Anglican Church, though not in the Articles. Accordingly, Newman felt that the “Reformers only began their own work.”¹⁴⁶

Newman thought that a careful examination of the liturgy in its separate parts would show how the church was presently more protestant than at the time of the reformers. A number of distinct doctrines are included in the notion of Protestantism but the Anglican Church had “taken the VIA MEDIA between it and Popery.”¹⁴⁷ Many of the Protestant doctrines, according to Newman, were very inconsistent with the liturgy of the Anglican Church.¹⁴⁸

While Newman claimed that he fully concurred with the Articles, as far as they went, those who called him papist did not acquiesce in the doctrine of the liturgy including such liturgical services as the confirmation service, the order for visiting the sick, the communion service, and the commination service.¹⁴⁹ He also felt that those who accused him failed to understand that the liturgy speaks of the Gospel dispensation, under which it is our blessedness to live, as being, at the same time, a moral law. The external observances and definite acts of duty are the means and the tests of faith.¹⁵⁰ He concluded this tract emphasizing the inevitability of a “SECOND REFORMATION” in the Church.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 40-41.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 41.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 41-42.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 42-46. The Commination Service was a penitential service for sinners; for a sample service, see:
<http://www.ccel.org/h/herbert/temple/Commination1559GH.html>.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 46.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 48.

Newman's tracts on the *via media* were his most vivid statements of the movement that became known as Tractarianism.¹⁵² Apart from what Newman wrote in his tracts, his thoughts during the first phase of the Tractarian Movement were detailed in a letter he wrote to his sister Jemima:

Since I have been away I have read Butler's Book of the R. C. [[Roman Catholic]] Church, Marsh's Comparative View, and Faber's Romanism almost, and have more of a view. To *become* a Romanist seems more and more impossible; to *unite* with Rome (if she would let us) not impossible – but *she* could not, without ceasing to be Rome. Somehow my own confidence in my views seems to grow. I am aware I have not yet fully developed them to myself yet; there are opinions as yet unknown to me which must be brought out and received, inconsistencies too (perhaps) to be set right – but on the whole I seem to have a grasp of a system very comprehensive – I could go a great way with Rome, and a great way with the peculiars, nay I should not despair of religious dissenters. I think our system will be very *taking*, from its novelty, its sublimity, and its argumentative basis.¹⁵³

3. A Summary: The Church in Newman's *Tracts*

Many of the tracts that Newman wrote between 1833 and 1837 were an effort to construct a theology of the Church that was very much lacking among his fellow

¹⁵² O'Connell (*The Oxford Conspirators*, 164) has commented on Newman's Tracts 38 and 41, which were in the form of dialogues between "Laicus" and "Clericus": "Both Tracts bore the title 'Via Media,' and together they provide perhaps the clearest and most rigorously reasoned statement of the Tractarian position ever presented." Gary Lease 32) has also maintained that Newman's "first clear statement of *via media* found its place in tracts 38 and 41 of the *Tracts for the Times*." See Gary Lease, *Witness to the Faith: Cardinal Newman on the Teaching Authority of the Church* (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1971), 32; hereafter cited: Lease, *Witness to the Faith*.

¹⁵³ JHN to Jemima Newman (Tunbridge Wells, 2 October 1834), *LD* 4: 337. He also wrote to Mrs. William Wilberforce on 17 November 1834 (*LD* 4: 367-368): "The more I examine into the R.C. system, the less sound it appears to me to be; and the less safely could I in conscience profess to receive it . . . I feel the Roman Catholic system to be irreverent towards Christ, degrading Him, robbing Him *practically* of His sole honor, hiding His bounty; i.e. so far forth as it *is* Roman Catholic – *so far as* it differs from ours. Its high points are our points too, if it would but keep them, and not give up our jewels."

Anglicans. He wrote extensively though not systematically on the characteristic features of the church in these tracts.¹⁵⁴ First of all, Scripture makes the existence of a visible church a condition of the invisible and a visible church was what Jesus Christ founded on this earth.¹⁵⁵ From Scripture, it is clear that a visible church was set up as a witness to truth, a witness to the unseen world, and as a keeper of the sacraments.¹⁵⁶ Consequently, the Church has a number of aspects such as organization, governors and diversity of ranks, gifts, order, ecclesiastical obedience, rules and disciplines, purity of doctrines and unity. Scripture also witnesses to the characteristics of power and permanence of the Church.

For Newman, the Church was founded on apostolic authority and succession and not on any political or popular authority. He emphasized the Anglican divines' doctrine of ministerial and apostolic succession as a foundational element of his tractarian ecclesiology: episcopacy is the fruit of ministerial succession entrusted to the Church; the bishops of the Church are the heirs and representatives of the apostles of Christ for the

¹⁵⁴ In 1840, Pusey summarized the Oxford Movement under the following headings: "(1) High thoughts of the two Sacraments, (2) High estimate of Episcopacy as God's ordinance, (3) High estimate of the visible Church as the Body wherein we are made and continue to be members of Christ, (4) Regards for ordinances . . . , (5) Regards for visible part of devotion . . . , (6) Reverence for and deference to the ancient Church of which our own Church is looked upon as the representative to us, and by whose views and doctrines we interpret our own Church when her meaning is questioned or doubtful; in a word, reference to the ancient Church, instead of the Reformers, as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church." See Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, 41- 42.

¹⁵⁵ Newman also said in his Sermon 355, delivered on 14 September 1834 (*PPS*, 636): "In this Visible Church the Church Invisible is gradually moulded and matured."

¹⁵⁶ Newman said (*PPS*, 637): "The Holy Spirit has vouchsafed to take up His abode in the Church, and the Church will ever bear, on its front, the visible signs of its hidden privilege."

successive transmission of the ministry of word and sacraments. Thus, they became the instruments of Christ for the news of redemption and the means of grace. He also traced the origin of the church's system of patriarchs, bishops, *chorepiscopi*, priests, and deacons to ministerial succession according to Scripture, the teaching and practice of the early church, common sense, and existing Anglican teaching.¹⁵⁷

Since every bishop had the title of the successor of St. Peter in the early church, for Newman, there was nothing particularly special about the bishop of Rome. Newman justified the Anglican rejection of the pope on the basis of Roman encroachment and tyrannical proceedings. He believed that the rites and ordinances of the Church, although varied, were a precious possession and they should be cherished and reformed by the Church according to common sense, patristic and scriptural practices.

In the *via media* of the Anglican Church, he felt that he now had a grasp of a very comprehensive but not fully developed system. Between Protestantism and Romanism, he defended the Anglican Church as the *via media*, a probable and true representation of the Church. His tracts were intended to uphold his theory of the *via media* and to call for a second Reformation to continue the reform initiated by the Anglican reformers of the sixteenth century by reforming the existing Anglican articles, disciplines, and the liturgy.

¹⁵⁷ Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, 2-3, argued that "one characteristic doctrine of the Oxford men was that high doctrine of the Episcopal and priestly ministry which is usually described in the phrase *apostolic succession*."

CHAPTER FIVE: NEWMAN-JAGER CONTROVERSY ON CHURCH AUTHORITY

Newman wrote: “As my Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, rose out of my correspondence with the Abbé Jager, so those on Justification rose out of my controversy with the Christian Observer.”¹ The controversy between Newman and Abbé Jean-Nicolas Jager² appeared in print during the early period of the Tractarian Movement—a period of approximately eighteen months from 25 December 1834 to the spring of 1836.³ According to Louis Allen, the controversy may be seen as a debate between a Roman Catholic and an Anglican on the nature of the Church:⁴

By being compelled to counter the *abbé’s* arguments, Newman was driven to formulate views which ultimately became the nucleus of a course of sermons delivered in Adam de Bromes’ chapel in 1836 and then in 1837, the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office*. In other words, the key texts of the Via Media, and the

¹ See Footnote 2, LD 6: 53.

² Father Jean-Nicolas Jager (1790-1868), a former schoolmaster and army chaplain, was well enough equipped with theological and patristic learning. He was appointed, a few years later, to the chair of Ecclesiastical History on the faculty of the University of Paris. See Louis Allen, *John Henry Newman and the Abbé Jager: A Controversy on Scripture and Tradition (1834 – 1836)*, edited from the original manuscripts and the French version (London/New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 4; hereafter cited: Allen, *Newman and Jager*.

³ There are many scholarly studies about the controversy: in 1945, Henry Tristram of Birmingham Oratory summarized the origins and themes of the controversy between Newman and Jager in his article, “In the Lists with the Abbé Jager,” in *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1945), 201-222. In the following years, a few other scholars also stressed the importance of this controversy: Günter Biemer, *Newman on Tradition*, foreword by H. Francis Davis, translated by Kevin Smyth (London: Burns & Oates, 1966); Jean Stern, *Bible et tradition chez Newman* (Paris: Aubier, 1967), 111-136; Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, Chapters 5 and 6. Allen’s *Newman and Jager* is a detailed study of the controversy.

⁴ “Although each protagonist dealt with a great many points, each is basically concerned with one issue: the nature of the Church” (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 3).

main idea behind the *Essay on Development*, are directly derived from this controversy.⁵

Allen's identification of the underlying concern of the controversy, the nature of the Church nonetheless remained unexplored and unexplained. Though Newman scholars have observed different topics such as the nature of the Church, Tradition, and the idea of the doctrine of development as part of the controversy, the basic ecclesiological concern is the authority of the Church.⁶ Consequently a study of the controversy provides a contextual history for Newman's *Prophetical Office* and an understanding of Newman's ecclesiology.

1. Context of the Controversy

On 12 November 1834, Newman wrote:

Since that [sic] I have got into controversy with a Parisian abbé, whom Harrison, arabicizing with De Saci, fell in with. The war is to be on the whole Romish question, and I have been reading Laud, Stillingfleet etc. –And now the battle of the university has come upon us.⁷

Benjamin Harrison⁸ and William Cureton⁹ during a dinner with Jager agreed to continue the theological discussion by correspondence. Jager was acquainted with some of the *Tracts for the Times*, but his main source was a little book Harrison had given him, *The*

⁵ Ibid., 3.

⁶ Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 135, concluded that Jager forced Newman “to develop a much more sophisticated understanding of Tradition than he had held before.”

⁷ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (12 November 1834), *LD* 4: 359-363, at 360.

⁸ Benjamin Harrison (1808-1887) went to Paris in the summer of 1834 to study Arabic under the great French Orientalist and friend of Pusey, Sylvestre de Sacy. Harrison was a brilliant Hebrew scholar and a contributor to the Tracts. Later he became the Archdeacon of Maidstone. See Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 3.

⁹ William Cureton (1808-1864) became a Syriac scholar of some renown and a chaplain to Queen Victoria and Canon of Westminster (ibid., 3-4).

Pastoral Instructions by Bishop John Jebb.¹⁰ The kernel of this book was the *via media* theory of the Anglican Church.¹¹ Jebb used the expression *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* (what is always, everywhere, accepted by all) from the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerins as a touchstone of fidelity to the ideals of the rule of faith of the Church Catholic. This view was to be the main area of contention for much of the discussion between Jager and the Anglicans from Oxford.¹²

The correspondence was begun first between Jager and Harrison.¹³ In his *First Letter*, Jager pointed out that Anglicanism admitted a visible Church, One, Catholic and Apostolic, rejected private interpretation of Scripture, and believed in Vincent's rule. These themes had been developed by Jebb in his tract, *The Peculiar Character of the*

¹⁰ The *Pastoral Instructions* by John Jebb (1775-1833), Anglican Bishop of Limerick, were compiled from previous volumes of his sermons and discourses and were published in 1831 in a volume of nearly 400 pages (ibid., 5-6).

¹¹ The book that presented the case for the unique historical and doctrinal situation of the Church of England, was a tract entitled *The Peculiar Character of the Church of England*; as distinguished, both from other branches of the Reformation, and from the modern Church of Rome, whose title and theme of 'middle course' preceded the *Via Media* by two decades. According to Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 6: "This tract, of which Jebb's friend, Alexander Knox, has been said to be 'virtually the author' had been reprinted several times as an appendix to a reprint of Jebb's *Discourses*; and although Jebb says he found it growing under his hands, its arguments and supporting texts were essentially, in 1831, the same as in 1815, the date of its publication as an appendix to his *Sermons* when he was Rector of Abingdon in the diocese of Cashel."

¹² For an English translation of the *Commonitorium*, see *The Commonitory of St. Vincent of Lerins*, translated into English by T. Herbert Bindley (London: SPCK, 1914).

¹³ Jager's *First Letter* appeared on 30 August 1834. Harrison's *Reply* was published on 18 September, and was followed by a *Second Letter* from Jager. Harrison wanted Newman to take his place, but was forced by Newman's absence from Oxford to compose an answer himself, which appeared in *Univers* on 14 October 1834. Jager's *Third Letter* to Harrison appeared in two issues of the daily paper, *L'Univers Religieux* on 23 and 24 October. See Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 4 and also Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, 43.

Church of England.¹⁴ Jager proposed that Anglicans should take the first six centuries of the Church as the basis of their discussion.¹⁵

In his *First Reply*, Harrison insisted on the catholicity of the Church of England and argued that the Church of Rome had imposed doctrines which had no warranty of Scripture or Antiquity¹⁶ and so had abandoned Vincent's maxim.¹⁷ In his *Second Letter*, Jager conceded the title of catholic to the Anglican Church but defended the Roman Catholic position regarding Scripture, Tradition and the Church Fathers.¹⁸ Harrison, however, in his *Second Reply*, insisted that, "for Anglicans, Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, and that what is not in Scripture cannot be imposed as an article of faith."¹⁹

¹⁴ Ibid., 20.

¹⁵ He asked where its tradition ended, in the fifth century as Bishop Jebb saw it, or in the sixth, in Hall's. See *ibid.*, 20-21. Anglican Bishop Joseph Hall (1 July 1574–8 September 1656), a devotional writer and a high-profile controversialist of the early 1640s, tended to the middle road in Church politics. He did his best in his *via media*, *The Way of Peace* (1619), to persuade the two parties (Calvinist and Arminian) to accept a compromise. His later defence of the English Church, and episcopacy as Biblical, entitled *Episcopacy by Divine Right* (1640), was twice revised at Laud's dictation.

¹⁶ Harrison questioned the biblical foundation of Roman Catholic doctrines such as the adoration of images, the invocation of the Virgin Mary and other saints, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, communion under one kind, celibacy of the clergy, the doctrine of purgatory, the authority of Rome over all other churches, obedience due to the Pope, and the seven sacraments. See Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 20-21.

¹⁷ According to Harrison, as far as Jebb was concerned, the issue was that the Anglican Church was more faithful to Vincent's maxim than the Roman Church (*ibid.*).

¹⁸ Ibid., 22-24.

¹⁹ For Harrison, this was consonant with Vincent's rule and Anglican Article 20 (*ibid.*, 24-25).

Jager replied in his *Third Letter*:

Scripture alone is not sufficient to reveal the whole of the religion of Jesus Christ and, to know its real meaning, we must turn to the authority of the Church which preserved the antiquity, uniformity, and universality of its teaching against the arbitrary and multiple interpretations of private judgment.²⁰

He added that “part of the essential faith of the Roman Church consists of certain things unwritten and yet regarded as divine.”²¹ For Jager, Jebb’s interpretation of Vincent’s rule was impractical and therefore unacceptable. According to him, Vincent believed the guidance of the bishops, who constitute the Church, to be infallible, and concluded that the Roman Catholic Church still has recourse to Antiquity and Scripture as her guides.²²

2. Correspondence between Newman and Jager

While Jager was composing a *Fourth Letter*,²³ Harrison asked Newman to take part in the debate:²⁴

²⁰ Ibid., 26.

²¹ Jager wondered “how the Anglican Church can admit –according to *Tracts for the Times*, No. 34–rites and ceremonies derived from tradition and yet feel justified in rejecting dogmatic truths from the same source” (ibid., 26). He thought that the Anglican Thirty-nine Articles admitted unwritten articles such as Christ’s descent into Hell, the virginity of the Mother of God, and Sunday observance of the Lord’s Day, etc (ibid., 27).

²² Ibid., 27-29.

²³ Jager’s *Fourth Letter* was on the importance of the worship of images (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 4-5).

²⁴ “I am in imminent danger of a controversy with a French Abbé in a Paris Journal about the Oxford Tracts.” See JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriel, 4 September 1834), *LD* 4: 326. Harrison wrote from Paris on 1 September 1834 that he had met Jager: “Jager wanted information about sects in England, and asked whether Anglicans held the doctrine of ‘individual independent illumination’; he very much liked the *Tracts* and wished to have someone with whom he could conduct an ‘amicable controversy’ about them; the columns of *Univers* were open to him, and he would get published any communication from Oxford, including the *Tracts*, partly with a view to confounding continental Protestants who were already much divided” (*LD* 4: 326, footnote 2).

Is it not time for us to work? — if you would but gratify the Abbe's wish . . . you will bring upon yourself and the Tracts and our Church the equal opposition I suppose, of Protestant and Papist; but at least your Protestant friends will see that there is a slight difference between us and Popery.²⁵

Newman explained to Harrison the plan he wanted to follow in the controversy;²⁶

however, after reading Newman's *Second Letter*, Harrison was concerned about the

direction Newman was taking in the controversy and asked him to emphasize "the

peculiar character of their Church."²⁷ Jager's letters disquieted Newman, who felt

compelled "to combat the Church of Rome from a position other than that of extreme

Protestantism."²⁸ Thus, the main reasons that induced Newman to participate in the

²⁵ LD 4: 326, Footnote 2.

²⁶ Newman wrote to Harrison (24 November 1835): "My plan was to look through the index of the Fathers and get together all the passages on the subject—to select out of these those which seemed to me most suitable to comment on—then to look at your list—and then at Bellarmine. . . ." (LD 5: 168).

²⁷ Harrison wrote: ". . . it seems of the greatest importance to keep constantly before him the 'peculiar character of the Church of England' as Bp Jebb put it before him from authoritative document & standard writers of our Church, compared with Vincentius & his maxims" (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 156). Accordingly, Harrison reminded Newman: "Our object, in the Controversy with the Abbé, was to put forward the peculiar system of the Church of England: instead of this your letter contains what you yourself speak of as a 'theory' of your own: -a theory moreover, which seems to be essentially Ultra-Protestant . . ." (ibid., 157-158).

²⁸ The Tractarians thought that the earlier controversy with Rome was carried on upon wrong (Genevan) principles, they wanted to have right principles, Catholic principles on their side (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 7). Newman sent to Harrison, for forwarding to Jager, the first part of his *Second Letter [Fourth Reply, Part One]* at the end of July 1835 and it appeared in *Le Moniteur* in two sections between December 1835 and February 1836. Jager printed his reply (*Seventh Letter*) to this first part without waiting for the second part to arrive; he also informed Harrison that he intended to publish the controversy as far as it had gone, in book form, with his answer to Newman as the concluding piece. This led the controversy to an unpleasant lapse, as Newman did not appear to have sent off the *Third Letter* (part two of his reply to Jager's Fourth Reply). There had been some differences between Harrison and Newman over Newman's argument in defence of the Anglican position (ibid., 8).

controversy were: first, he “felt it likely that if I did not engage with you, no one else would”; and second, “a profound persuasion that the truth is mainly on the side which I should have to advocate.”²⁹

A. Church, Scripture and Tradition

Newman began his *First Letter [Third Reply]* by insisting that “the range of Apostolic purity in the Church” was not six centuries, but “the period of the first four Councils, i.e., down to the middle of the fifth century.”³⁰ Restating the peculiar position of the Church of England,³¹ Newman underlined the main principle of the Anglican Church: “the Scripture is the ultimate basis of proof, the place of final appeal, in respect to all fundamental doctrine.”³² He added; “These three words, *ultimate appeal*, *doctrines*, and *fundamentals* must be clearly understood.”³³ He then explained what he meant by fundamentals:

If we are asked what we mean by fundamentals, we answer that we mean such doctrines as are necessary for Church Communion; if we are asked which these are, we answer briefly the articles of the Creed. Further, if we are asked what we consider to be the obligation of receiving doctrines *not* fundamental, or of matters of discipline, (such as come to us on the voucher of tradition), we answer we consider it *pious* to receive them, but not *necessary* for Church communion. Thus

²⁹ JHN to Jager (end of October 1834), *LD* 4: 350. See also Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 30-32. Newman also found the controversy a stimulus for his reading; see JHN to Robert Isaac Wilberforce (Oriel College, 30 August, 1835), *LD* 5: 133.

³⁰ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 33. Newman’s *First Letter [Third Reply]* was completed on 25 December 1834, but only half of it was published, accompanied by Jager’s *Fifth Letter*. Immediately Jager wrote three more *Letters [Sixth Letter]* in reply at great length; the last was published on 27 March 1835 after which the controversy was transferred to the weekly *Le Moniteur de la religion*; see *ibid*, 5 and Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, 43-44.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 34-35.

³² *Ibid.*, 35.

³³ *Ibid.*, 36.

we make a distinction between the authority of pure tradition and the authority of tradition based on Scripture in fundamental points, somewhat answering to your distinction between a praeceptum and a consilium of the Church. The reception of pure tradition is pious, of doctrines conveyed to us by Tradition but proved by Scripture is imperative.³⁴

Newman gave great and extensive influence to Tradition; “It is evident, from what has been said, we make 1. a tradition interpretative of Scripture, 2. a tradition of doctrine not in Scripture, 3. a tradition of discipline, ceremonies, historical facts, &c. extending to a variety of matters.”³⁵ Anglicans, however, denied a fourth use of tradition: “Tradition per se the sufficient authority for the Church’s considering a doctrine fundamental.”³⁶ For him, some of the decrees of the Council of Trent were specimens of this point.³⁷

Newman next discussed another topic of disagreement between Anglicans and Roman Catholics: the relationship of “the Church towards these two sources of Truth,”³⁸ Scripture and Tradition: “We say the Church first is *keeper* of Christian doctrine, next *declares* it, thirdly has authority in regard to it, i. e. speaks definitively about it. You argue as to the two first, and differ as to the last; so let me explain myself”.³⁹

We consider the Gospel Faith to be the foundation on which the Church is built; prior to it, the essential deposit committed to it, the main object proposed thro’ it

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid., 36-37.

³⁶ Ibid., 37. Newman wrote to Jager: “Whether or not Tradition per se is a sufficient authority for the Church to go by in settling *fundamentals*. You answer in the affirmative; we in the negative” (ibid., 38).

³⁷ Newman pointed out as examples: the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Adoration of the Host, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Indulgence (ibid., 37).

³⁸ Ibid., 38.

³⁹ Ibid.

to mankind, the ground of communion, ever one and the same, admitting of no addition, and imperishable.⁴⁰

First of all, the “doctrine of Christ is the foundation” and then “the doctrine of the Trinity,” as confessed in the baptismal form.⁴¹ They are fundamentals and the fountain head of all doctrines. There are also other fundamentals such as the Articles of the primitive Antenicene Creed that are developed by the guidance of Scripture. These doctrines are considered to have been revealed as the basis of the Church, the conditions of baptism, the profession of churchmen.⁴²

Accordingly, for Newman, “the Church Catholic will never lose the deposit committed to her” and she is “infallible in fundamentals.”⁴³ He also allowed that “the Church, nay to separate branches of it, [has] a power to develop its fundamental Creed into Articles of religion, according to times and circumstances, not however as necessary to be believed for communion, but useful for all her people as necessary for holding rule or influence.”⁴⁴ The Church has authority in controversies of faith “to oblige her Ministers to take her view and exposition of the fundamentals” and “to hinder individuals

⁴⁰ “It is the foundation according to the words: ‘on this Rock (i.e. St. Peter’s confession) will I build My Church.’ It is prior to it, *because* it is its foundation, just as revelation itself is prior in turn to the Gospel Faith. . . . It admits of no increase, i.e. no more than the foundation of a house; the Church having no power over that on which it stands. It is imperishable; by which I mean that the time will never come for it to sink into oblivion like Greek and Roman polytheism” (Ibid., 38-39).

⁴¹ Ibid., 39.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 40.

from openly professing or teaching any other exposition.”⁴⁵ Newman summarized the Anglican position vis-à-vis the Roman Catholic view:

1. Scripture as the repository of the fundamentals 2. a corpus of traditions professedly apostolical, partly interpretative of Scripture, partly independent of it though agreeable to it. 3. the Church’s teachings as based on the fundamentals, authoritative, of an argumentative and systemizing character; whereas you rest the fundamentals on Infallible Definitions of the existing Church, availing itself of the materials contained in Scripture and Tradition.⁴⁶

Since Newman held that the period of Apostolic purity only lasted until the first four General Councils, he felt that the decrees of subsequent Councils could not be imposed as terms of communion “as the distance from the Apostles is greater.”⁴⁷ Jager was surprised by the limit of the first 450 years which Newman considered the period of Apostolic purity. He replied to Newman in his *Fourth Letter*:⁴⁸ “This limit itself must surely be insulting to Jesus Christ who has promised *eternal* guidance”⁴⁹ Accordingly, Jager concluded that “if the Church has erred since the fifth or sixth centuries, she has ceased to exist. Therefore, the Reformation is either nothing because it succeeds nothing, or it succeeds the true Church, which makes it schismatic.”⁵⁰

B. Infallibility of the Church

Knowing the absurdity of giving the individual the onerous task of seeking out his own faith, Newman accepted the authority of the Church and, indeed, its infallibility on

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 41.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 40.

⁴⁸ Jager’s *Fourth Letter*, fifth in the original newspaper sequence, was published in part in *L’Univers* on 25 December 1834, and continued in January 1835, the second part of Newman’s letter having appeared on the previous day (ibid., 53).

⁴⁹ Ibid., 54.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

the main points of belief. Moreover, he claimed that the Church has the right to make articles according to time and circumstances. This, however, was a claim Jager refused to accept and one which the Roman Church had never attributed to herself. Newman then discussed the question of the infallibility of the Church:

. . . we do not consider the Church infallible so far forth as she thus exercises her own judgment, (i.e. in explaining, commenting on, guarding her deposit,) we are not unwilling to allow that at various times various errors have incrustated the faith of the Gospel. Such indeed is the view which we actually take of the Churches of the Roman communion; accounting them true Churches, Churches holding the fundamentals but overlaid with corruptions.⁵¹

In fact, Newman accused Jager of drawing the line of infallibility much higher than Anglicans by believing “the Catholic to have the power of adding to the fundamentals of faith” and “maintaining that absolutely no doctrine small or great, propounded by the Church can be other than true, and entitled to our cordial and unhesitating acceptance.”⁵²

To the argument that the Roman Church had added to the fundamental beliefs, Jager asked in his *Fifth Letter*: “can the Protestant holding to the teaching of *his* Church have certainty of faith?”⁵³ Since faith must be based on truths beyond doubt and without solid foundation it might lapse into mere opinion, he insisted that the only way to achieve this certain truth is to follow the constant and universal teaching of the Church.⁵⁴ Jager was certain that the Roman Catholic has certainty of faith, “because by adhering to the teaching of the Church, which is infallible, he is committed to a doctrine which is of all

⁵¹ Ibid., 40-41.

⁵² Ibid., 41.

⁵³ Ibid., 60.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 60-61.

times and all places.”⁵⁵ For him, “the history of the Roman Church is in agreement with human reason.”⁵⁶ He also characterized the Anglican middle course as irrational:

But if Anglicans admit the integrity of Scripture, then they must admit *all* that its guardians teach. Dr. Jebb claims that the Church of England holds a middle course between Catholics and Protestants. There is no such middle course. If any foundations of the Protestant Church are to remain, they must admit everything which the Fathers taught from the Apostles. If they reject tradition on points which divide the Church, they must reject Scripture. It is all or nothing, for everything rests on the same foundation. Therefore the Protestant has two alternatives—both fearful. Ahead there opens before him an abyss of doubt. Behind him looms the Council of Trent and all the overwhelming evidence of tradition. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic finds assurance in the past and trust in the future.⁵⁷

Jager demonstrated the evidence for the Church’s infallibility, “Because the universal teaching of the Church is infallible, it follows that the bishops who are the judges of faith cannot be deceived on that teaching.”⁵⁸ However, “the Pope, the bishops, and the councils have no right to depart from fundamentals. They are not arbiters but depositors of Christ’s word.”⁵⁹ Therefore, the bishops provide human testimony of the Church’s infallibility. For Jager, both Scripture and the Fathers are unanimous in demonstrating the infallibility of the Church.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Ibid., 62.

⁵⁶ Ibid. Jager challenged: “If the authorities of the Church—Fathers, councils, bishops—cannot be relied on, Anglicans must renounce their faith and tear up the New Testament, because these were its guardians” (ibid., 64).

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ For Jager, the belief in the infallibility of the Church also has a supernatural basis set out in Scripture: “a Church which must exist forever is of necessity infallible” (ibid., 65). He maintained that the Fathers of the Church left no special treatise on the fallible authority of the Church because it was perfectly acceptable at the time (ibid., 66).

C. Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Dogmas

Though he held that the Church is infallible on fundamentals and that the truths in the Creed are fundamental, Newman seemed to be unclear about differentiating what exactly the fundamental articles were: At times they were those articles contained in the Apostles' Creed and at other times all the truths delivered by Tradition and supported by Scripture. He knew that Scripture did not contain everything and that there were certain doctrines not found in it and hence, he proposed the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles.⁶¹

Jager, however, challenged Newman to say where he could find this distinction, where in the words of Jesus Christ or His Apostles, where in Scripture or the Fathers; and by what signs the Christian could recognize what is fundamental or not in Scripture or Tradition. Jager insisted that Anglicans admitted that there were fundamental articles which were not contained in Scripture⁶² such as the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church. He then confronted Newman with evidence of the Anglican acceptance of fundamental of points of belief not found in Scripture.⁶³

⁶¹ Ibid., 35-45.

⁶² Jager observed that many of the Thirty-nine Articles are characterized as Articles of Faith (ibid., 54).

⁶³ For Jager, "The one Article cited by Newman as being fundamental, that concerning canonical books, is founded on tradition alone. The virginity of the Mother of God and the descent of Christ into Hell are fundamental because they are contained in the Apostles' Creed, but they are not in Scripture Article 26 [of the *Thirty-nine Articles*] declares that the effect of sacraments is independent of the worthiness of the minister. It is nowhere in Scripture, yet surely it must be fundamental as it directly concerns the legitimacy of the Anglican episcopate" (ibid., 55).

For Jager, no issue was more fundamental than the alleged distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas.⁶⁴ Jager asserted that the distinction was purely Newman's invention and had foundation neither in Scripture nor Tradition. In fact, Jager thought the distinction was diametrically opposed to Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers,⁶⁵ and noted that the distinction was completely unknown before the Reformation. He examined Newman's system in detail, in itself, and in its consequences. He argued that the Protestants' isolation and inability to justify themselves in terms of the Apostles' Creed as a Church One, Catholic, and Apostolic had led to this system of fundamentals and non-fundamentals in order to bring into communion all the various sects with their different dogmas. Jager's strongest statement on the issue was that: "the system of non-fundamental errors leads to the total destruction of Christianity."⁶⁶

Newman, however, claimed that he found the principle that Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation in Vincent. In Jager's view, Vincent did not recommend believing only what is in Scripture, but what is taught by the Universal Church. Jager

⁶⁴ Jager's *Sixth Letter*, however, dealt with Newman's system of fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas because it was a serious issue for all Christians to discover whether they must believe all Christ and the Church have taught or merely certain articles, and whether a sect, if it refused to believe in the totality of dogmas, was to be excluded from the Church or tolerated (ibid., 69).

⁶⁵ Jager gave the following reasons: 1) Jesus Christ told the apostles to teach not part but the whole of what He had commanded (Matt.28); 2) the writings of the Apostles support this: St. Paul warns against "those who make dissensions" (Rom. 16:17); 3) St. Paul (Gal.1:9) and Vincent's interpretation of him (*Commonit. VIII*) show clearly that apostolic teaching condemned all novelties in doctrine and anathematized those who sought to introduce them; 4) the distinction is contrary to the teaching of the Fathers who all insist on perfect unity of thought (ibid., 68-69).

⁶⁶ Ibid., 70-71.

claimed that Tradition and Scripture were in perfect harmony, although there were apparent contradictions and difficulties in them. The Roman Church had never claimed Tradition to be superior; rather, Tradition was not merely oral or a collection of vague memories and popular traditions but was found in books of Christian antiquity and was based “on the consent and unanimity of the Fathers.”⁶⁷

Newman then wrote a *Second Letter*⁶⁸ to Jager emphasizing that Anglicanism is based on the authoritative documents of “three Creeds, the decision of at least the first four general Councils, our Liturgy, the office and the Thirty-nine Articles.”⁶⁹ He observed that the Roman Catholics were not free because they were obliged to maintain infallibility, “a doctrine belied by the facts.”⁷⁰ For him, the Articles were only “*Articles of religion*”⁷¹ and “*Faith* is concerned with what is fundamental, religion is the Prophetical Tradition or the general body of doctrines of which we have already spoken.”⁷² Therefore, the articles of religion were neither fundamental nor necessary to salvation.⁷³ He also reminded Jager: “We have never excluded Roman Catholics from

⁶⁷ Ibid., 73.

⁶⁸ After reading Newman’s *Second Letter*, Harrison was concerned about Newman’s view of fundamentals. On 26/28 November 1835, Harrison wrote to Newman expressing his difficulty: “I have been looking to Waterland’s Disc[ourse] of Fundamentals, & cannot but think he shewn solid objections to the plan of putting forward the Apostles’ Creed as a complete catalogue of fundamentals in controversy with Romanists . . .” (ibid., 154).

⁶⁹ For Newman, “They belong to the most renowned doctors of our Church, even to the ancient doctors whose teachings, as long as it be Catholic, will always have my allegiance” (ibid., 76).

⁷⁰ Ibid., 75.

⁷¹ Ibid., 98.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

the privileges of the law, by means of our articles.”⁷⁴ He also clarified what he meant by fundamentals:

. . . ‘what we mean by *fundamentals*, we answer that we mean such doctrines as are necessary for Church Communion; if we are asked which these are, we answer briefly, the articles of the Creed’. Nonetheless, in spite of these precise declarations, you make me say on almost every page that by the word *fundamental*, I mean *any doctrine which it is necessary to profess in order to be saved*.⁷⁵

Newman found that Jager confused “the word *fundamental* with the word *necessary to salvation*.”⁷⁶ For him, the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines was extremely important: “As for the proof of the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrine, that is a purely historical question, as I have already said . . . My proofs are taken from Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian, which are in harmony with Scripture itself.”⁷⁷ Newman clearly distinguished *condition of communion* and *necessary to salvation*, and also took exception to two of Jager’s tenets: “. . . first, that pure Tradition is a sufficient basis on which the Church may rest in declaring a doctrine necessary to salvation; next, that the Church may impose consent to any article of faith as a condition of communion over and above original fundamentals.”⁷⁸

Jager’s answer to the question: Is Tradition *per se* a sufficient authority for the Church in determining *fundamentals*? was affirmative. But Newman’s answer was negative. Newman declined to admit Jager’s position that “tradition is a sufficient basis

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 75-76.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 97.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 97-98.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 76-77.

for a fundamental doctrine.”⁷⁹ He also reiterated what he meant by fundamental in his *First Letter*: “The fundamentals are the conditions of communion.”⁸⁰ Then he asked: “has the Church the right to refuse communion to those who do not wish to begin by admitting her belief?”⁸¹

For Newman, Jager believed that to reject consciously a part of that Creed of Pius IV was to exclude oneself from salvation;⁸² Newman thought that this was against the apostolic practice.⁸³ In fact, Newman did not find fault with the Council of Trent for “having established dogmas on tradition alone, but for having made them fundamental articles, and insisting on their reception as necessary to be in communion with the Church.”⁸⁴ He insisted that these three terms—“*ultimate appeal, doctrines, and fundamentals*—must be clearly understood.”⁸⁵

⁷⁹ Newman claimed to be consistent with Vincent because “it is the agreed and unanimous voice of Catholic doctors which alone has an obligatory power upon our assent” (ibid., 78).

⁸⁰ “It is necessary to receive the fundamental articles, if one wishes to be a member of the Church” (ibid., 80 and 90).

⁸¹ “Or in other words, is the Church authorized to demand from us, as an indispensable condition for the reception of the sacrament of grace, that we not only believe unhesitatingly and with a filial trust that she will always teach sound doctrines; but also that we should swear to receive as divine everything that she considers as coming directly from the Apostles?” (ibid., 80).

⁸² An English translation of “The Creed of Pope Pius IV” (1499-1565; pope: 1559-1565) is available at: <http://www.the-latinmass.com/id108.html>.

⁸³ Ibid., 81.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 81-82.

After pointing out that Jager often referred to examples of unrelated subjects taken from the Fathers and Councils,⁸⁶ Newman repeated that “the fundamental doctrines of the Church were those upon which the Church is founded, those which all her members must admit, and on which they must take their stand, if they wish to belong to the Church.”⁸⁷ For him, this was how the primitive Church considered them, and that historical proof was sufficient. He believed that any doctrine which is of its nature fundamental is also found in Scripture. But it is not for that reason fundamental, for doctrines which are found in Scripture are not necessarily fundamental. The Church, though disseminated through the whole world, diligently guarded the fundamental doctrines that are in the two Creeds and Scripture.⁸⁸ He also observed that the Church Fathers never excommunicated anyone who accepted the fundamental or baptismal creed of the early centuries.⁸⁹

Newman acknowledged that Anglicans recognized, as did Jager, the “claim that the Church alone has the right to teach, that every man who teaches heresies must be anathematized.”⁹⁰ He maintained as strongly as Jager the overthrow of “the so called right of private judgment, that is, the right to form opinions for oneself by means of

⁸⁶ “You speak, for example, of the infallibility of the Church, of the origin of the corruption of the Popes, of the question of fundamental articles, of the variations of Protestantism, and you produce all kinds of evidence taken from the Fathers and the Councils, of which some are related to the subject and others have no connection with it at all” (ibid., 82).

⁸⁷ Ibid., 83.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 83-84.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 84.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 100.

Scripture.”⁹¹ He also agreed that “to maintain an opinion against the voice of the whole Church stubbornly and publically is of itself without any doubt a mortal sin, and that such was the flagrant sin of the Donatists, as St. Augustine tells us.”⁹²

Newman found that “the Church of Rome errs, not in excluding those who do not have fixed opinions against the truth, but in excluding those who do not have fixed opinions on its details.”⁹³ He reiterated his admiration of, and reverence for, the general Tradition of the Church and regretted that “the great interval of time which has elapsed since the Apostles has rendered it inapplicable and useless in point of fact.”⁹⁴ He also observed different traditions, variations and the development of doctrines down through the centuries of Christian history.⁹⁵ For him, there was a real distinction between the man who cannot subscribe to a certain truth and the man who teaches a completely opposite doctrine.⁹⁶ Since the faith had been given to the faithful once and for all time, new doctrines must be regarded with horror. Newman learned that the primitive Church anathematized and excommunicated those who taught them and he believed that such must certainly be “the constant rule of the Church, today as in the past.”⁹⁷

⁹¹ Ibid., 101.

⁹² Ibid., 103.

⁹³ Ibid., 102.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 104-105.

⁹⁵ “. . . we find in the different traditions on the Lord’s Prayer, as delivered to us by St. Matthew and St. Luke . . . these variations only concern the manner in which the dogmas it contains were developed, and (for the most part) they neither add to it nor take from it anything worthy of note. Thus the article of the African Church, ‘the forgiveness of sins, *through the holy Church*, is only a development of the Roman articles, ‘the forgiveness of sins’” (ibid., 86-87).

⁹⁶ “If the Church alone has the right to teach the truth, . . .”(ibid., 87).

⁹⁷ Ibid., 87-88.

D. The Development of Doctrines

To explain, develop, and defend the Creed, Newman had recourse to the authority of the Church:

The Church was simple and precise in her fundamentals, to include all classes, to suggest heads of belief, to assist the memory, to save the mind from perplexity. However, while thus considerate she has not forgotten her high office, as the appointed teacher of her children. She is the pillar and the ground of the truth, of Christian truth in all its developments, in the interpretation of Scripture, in the exposition of doctrine, in the due appointment of ordinances and their particular application and in the code of moral laws.⁹⁸

Accordingly, the Church is a “superstructure, as being built upon the Gospel doctrine; the pillar, the ground, as being the expounder of it.”⁹⁹ The Church, therefore, requires her members to “subscribe not only to the words of the Apostles’ Creed but also to the particular sense she attached to them.”¹⁰⁰ Because of the sacramental nature of the divine revelation, the Church is responsible to teach it.¹⁰¹

Newman compared the Church to a mother, who instructs her child. The Church neither assumes infallibility nor is infallible. Sometimes the Church makes mistakes in lesser matters, and is set right by her child; yet this neither diminishes her duty to teach, nor the child’s privilege to receive. Like a mother, the Church teaches her children gradually.¹⁰² For Newman, the Anglican Church followed this gradual but progressive

⁹⁸ Ibid., 88.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 89-90.

¹⁰² Ibid., 90.

teaching method.¹⁰³ He concluded: “The Apostles’ Creed is the confession of the Christian, the Church is its legitimate interpreter.”¹⁰⁴ Then he added: “As the Christian develops the Creed, he must receive with trust, and unhesitatingly, the interpretation which the Church gives of it; and if in the end, he differs from her on some points of little importance, he must not raise himself up against her.”¹⁰⁵

Jager found Newman’s claim that the Church had power to draw articles of religion from its fundamental Creed according to time and circumstances totally unacceptable. In his *Sixth Letter*, Jager argued that the Roman Church never claimed such a power and that it was absurd for the Protestant or Parliament to do so. He, however, accepted the Church’s duty to elucidate and to develop points but there must be no change: *Profectus, non permutatio*, as Vincent puts it.¹⁰⁶

Newman rejected Jager’s critique that he granted to the Church the right *to make articles of faith*, according to times and circumstances. He asserted that this power was more than the Anglican Church desired, and more than it could accept. He reiterated his view: “The power *to develop its fundamental Creed* into Articles of *religion*, according to

¹⁰³ Newman explained the Anglican method of teaching: 1) The Church takes care to distinguish clearly what is apostolic from what is ecclesiastical in her doctrine; what carries the sure mark of Christ, from what comes less directly from him; 2) the Church secures to herself the power of accommodating herself to the circumstances, ranks and ages of her children; the rule is the same; the teaching of the Church must be proportionate to their education; 3) the Church is satisfied with the intention which they express to receive them in the first place, an intention which is comprised in their state as children of the Church; 4) children are not supposed to give private opinions out of all proportion or to teach the private opinion of others, and to raise themselves up against the Church (ibid., 90-91).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 91.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 71-72.

times and circumstances; to develop is not to create.”¹⁰⁷ But the controversy on this point continued. In his *Seventh Letter*, Jager challenged Newman to clarify what he meant by development.¹⁰⁸

After reading Newman’s *Second Letter*, Harrison became concerned about Newman’s view of fundamental doctrine essential for Church communion. He pinpointed the ecclesiological issue that was underlying the Newman-Jager debate: “Has the Church the right to enlarge its own foundation?”¹⁰⁹ Harrison believed Scripture and nothing else to be the oracle of God, claiming the joint assent of all Christians to its declarations.¹¹⁰

In his *Seventh Letter*, Jager asserted that by admitting that the Anglican Church is imperfect, Newman had lost all claim for his Church to be called Catholic.¹¹¹ He agreed to follow Newman’s new meaning for “fundamental” and in the future to define it as “the articles contained in the Creed;” the rest (Original Sin, Baptism, Penance, the Eucharist)

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 97.

¹⁰⁸ According to Allen (ibid., 16-20), Jager’s challenges had an effect on Newman’s ideas of Prophetic Office and development.

¹⁰⁹ Harrison added: “But if there be no salvation but in the Church, and no condemnation for them that believe & are baptized in it, may we not make our ‘term of communion’ identical with our ‘articles of Faith’, required to be believed as ‘necessary to salvation’?” (ibid. 155).

¹¹⁰ Harrison recognized the importance of the Creed, the Apostolic Symbol for Church Communion, but believed that Scripture is the only Rule: “Christ is a *lawgiver*, & the Gospel is a New Law, like the Mosaic” (ibid). In another letter to Newman, Harrison stated: “The Divine Message which contains what a Christian must believe in order to salvation is laid down to be ‘*Scripture* & nothing else.’ There is no tradition in the Christian Church, as in the Patriarchal; or it is superseded. Scripture & nothing else is ‘the oracle of God, claiming the joint assent of all Christians to its declarations;’ ‘the exclusive witness of things supernatural, the basis & bond of union between Christians, as far as faith is concerned’” (ibid., 158).

¹¹¹ Ibid., 106.

to be nonessential. However, he found this meaning opposed to Christ's words on Baptism and "how it brings about contradiction within the Anglican faith. Even if the Creed is fundamental, its development, i.e. its real meaning, is not."¹¹² He also reaffirmed his theory that Tradition is a sufficient authority to act as a foundational truth. The Creed is a summing up of the principal truths of religion. For when we believe in a Church, One, Holy, and Catholic, this involves all she teaches.¹¹³ Newman had said it should be possible to differ from the Church without fear of excommunication, and referred to Vincent in support of this idea; Jager pointed out that Vincent was not referring to general heresy.¹¹⁴

E. Apostolic and Prophetic Traditions

Newman summarized the Anglican understanding of Tradition in his *First Letter* on the basis of the arguments of Vincent of Lerins: 1. That Tradition "is secondary to Scripture."¹¹⁵ 2. That Tradition is "interpretative of Scripture."¹¹⁶ 3. That "the

¹¹² Jager thought that the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles on the support of historical proofs such as the testimonies of the Fathers and Vincent was irrelevant because the primitive Church, like the modern Church of Rome required only the profession of the Apostles' Creed at Baptism (ibid., 108).

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ For Jager, individual peculiarities cannot be adopted without risking our eternal salvation; accordingly, he disagreed with the notion of non-fundamentals (ibid.).

¹¹⁵ For Newman, "Tradition is prior to Scripture in *order of time*, both historically, and in its use as respects individual Christians There is great force then in Vincentius' putting the written word first; it was natural to have put Tradition first, had not Scripture been in his opinion first in dignity and consideration" (ibid., 41-42).

¹¹⁶ Since there are different interpretations, it is necessary, as Vincent maintained, that the true interpretation be directed according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and catholic sense (ibid.).

fundamentals of faith are ever one and the same.”¹¹⁷ 4. That “the Church may explain, and develop the fundamentals, though it cannot make new ones.”¹¹⁸ 5. That “these developments are from tradition, or are the work of the existing Church.”¹¹⁹

For Newman, “the corpus of interpretative Tradition is the main practical *teacher* of doctrine, and that the text of Scripture is not such, but only referred to for *proof*.”¹²⁰ He challenged Jager to produce evidence from Vincent for two of his views regarding Tradition: “first, that pure Tradition is a sufficient basis on which the Church may rest in declaring a doctrine necessary to salvation; next, that the Church may impose consent to an article of faith as a condition of communion over and above the original fundamentals.”¹²¹

Anglicans have received the interpretations of the Fathers and considered the truths they contained necessary to salvation because they are interpretations of what actually is in Scripture, the sole authority in fundamentals, rather than independent documents.¹²² However, “Scripture is not the sole authority in matters of conduct.”¹²³

¹¹⁷ “These fundamentals may not be added to by the Church nor may they be curtailed . . . Church has no power over the fundamentals one way or the other” (ibid. 42-43).

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 43.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 44.

¹²⁰ Newman asserted: “Doubtless; Scripture does not teach us the truth or draw it into a system: it is but the document of ultimate appeal, the argumentative basis of the truth” (ibid., 45-46).

¹²¹ Ibid., 45.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid., 46-47.

Rites and ceremonies have been admitted on the authority of tradition.¹²⁴ To those who held that—“if the belief in Scripture is necessary to salvation, so is belief in Tradition”—Newman answered: “it is clear that Scripture alone does absolutely declare belief in its doctrine necessary for salvation; but Tradition does not say so of its own.”¹²⁵ For him, Scripture comes with a demand upon our faith, Tradition does not.

Newman agreed with Jager’s position: “if a doctrine is *Apostolical*, surely it ought to be believed, whether it bears witness to itself or not; that *revelation*, as such, involves the obligation of faith in the recipient of it.”¹²⁶ Though the Unwritten Word claims our assent, Newman denied what Jager called Tradition as the Unwritten Word: “I consider the Unwritten Word, because Unwritten, not to have come down to us in such a shape as to enable us to discriminate and verify it. It is like a stream of fresh water falling into the ocean and mixing itself with it.”¹²⁷

For Newman, Tradition, if ancient yet not universal, cannot come to us with the authority of the written Word. Whether or not it is from the Apostles cannot be certain. “Inspiration which originally gave the Gospel Faith, is the only safeguard of it in oral tradition.”¹²⁸ Newman thought that it would be perverse not to “receive such traditions”

¹²⁴ In Newman’s view the only exception in the Anglican position is in regard to the article about the Canon of Scripture: “Certainly the belief in Holy Scripture is not enjoined by our Church in the same way as the reception of the doctrine of justification etc; for its canonicity is a fundamental verity rather than a doctrine” (ibid., 48).

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 49.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 50.

but he did not understand why the Church had to “impose the belief of it as necessary to salvation or as a condition of Church fellowship.”¹²⁹ He asked:

The blessings of Christianity are a trust given us by the Church to dispense to the world The Church is set upon certain fundamentals; why should we add to them? Rather let us take the reception of such traditionary doctrines, not as a duty, but as a privilege: a privilege which we who receive them enjoy, which those who reject them lose through their folly.¹³⁰

Newman not only rejected Tradition as the sufficient basis for fundamental doctrines and the authority of the Council of Trent to establish dogmas on the basis of Tradition alone,¹³¹ he also challenged Jager to adduce a single proof in his favor from Vincent. For Newman, the decrees of the first four Councils were the rules of orthodoxy. In response, Jager, in his *Fourth Letter*, examined these Councils to prove that their conduct was exactly the same as that followed at Trent¹³² and concluded that the Tradition was the general, perpetual, and uniform rule of the Catholic faith as borne out by the Apostles themselves.¹³³ He insisted that the judgment on dogma was in

¹²⁹ Ibid., 51.

¹³⁰ Accordingly, Newman maintained: “Our Article held that ‘whatsoever is not read in Holy Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation’” (ibid., 51-52).

¹³¹ Dogmata such as Transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, and Indulgences.

¹³² Jager examined the Councils of Nicaea, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Rimini and Seleucia, Jerusalem and Antioch (ibid., 55) and concluded: “In fact, all the acts, definitions, and creeds of the early church are based on tradition. Scripture was nowhere termed the court of ultimate appeal nor was there any distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrine” (ibid., 56).

¹³³ According to Jager, Vincent, following the earlier patristic authorities, held that the Scripture was insufficient and the Tradition of the Universal Church was essential (ibid., 56-57).

accordance with Tradition, which included Scripture, its interpretation, and all Christian doctrine. The Council of Trent followed this Catholic rule of Antiquity.¹³⁴

In his *Second Letter*, Newman claimed that Vincent and the Fathers were of the opinion that the heavenly sense of Scripture should be explained according to this one rule, the Church's understanding of it, principally in those questions on which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine rest. Vincent, however, allowed the right of private judgment in lesser matters. In reply to Jager's objection to private judgment,¹³⁵ Newman argued:

The Apostles' Creed does not come to us by the same tradition as the corpus of theology which contains its development. The Apostles' Creed is a collection of definite articles, passing from hand to hand, rehearsed and confessed at Baptism, committed and received from Bishop to Bishop. This Creed is received on what may be called *apostolical tradition*. Its existence and its preservation in the divine office are guaranteed by the New Testament, where it is called the Hypotyposis, or outline of sound words, that is why we say that it is ultimately based upon Scripture Such then is Apostolical Tradition.¹³⁶

According to Newman, "God placed in his Church first Apostles, secondarily Prophets. Apostles rule, Prophets expound. Prophets are the interpreters of the divine law, they unfold and define its mysteries, they illuminate its documents, they harmonize

¹³⁴ Jager thought that this basic Catholic rule existed within the Anglican Church, but, was not acknowledged by many of its members (*ibid.*, 59).

¹³⁵ Newman wrote: "The Church does not develop articles of faith on her private authority, she only proposes those which exist, and in that she does no more than follow the command she has received from the Apostles: 'keep the deposit, *depositum custodi*, etc.'" (*ibid.*, 94).

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

its contents, they apply its promises.”¹³⁷ He named their teachings, a vast system of truth, as the “Prophetical Tradition.”¹³⁸

This I call Prophetical Tradition, existing primarily in the bosom of the Church itself, and recorded in such measure as Providence has determined in the writings of eminent men. This is obviously a very different kind from the Apostolic Tradition, yet it is equally primitive, and equally claims our zealous maintenance. ‘Keep that which is committed to thy charge, *depositum custodi*,’ is St. Paul’s injunction to Timothy, and for this reason; because from its vastness and indefiniteness the deposit is especially exposed to corruption if the Church fails in vigilance. This is that body of teaching which is offered to every individual according to his capacity and which, as I have already said, but be received with trust and affection, and not be said to err, although it be not necessary to submit to it without proof.¹³⁹

From this view of the Apostolical and Prophetical Traditions, Newman inferred that the Prophetical Tradition may have been corrupted in its details, while the Apostolical Tradition is pure and worthy of Faith.¹⁴⁰ He further explained: “The Church has fixed and perpetuated that Prophetical Tradition, in the shape of formal articles or doctrines, as the rise of errors or other causes gave occasion.”¹⁴¹ Therefore, “it follows that these developed and fixed truths are entitled to very different degrees of credit,

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ “Their teaching is a vast system not to be comprised in a few sentences, not to be embodied in one code or treatise, but consisting of a certain body of truth permeating the Church like an atmosphere, irregular in its shape, from its very profusion and exuberance. That body of Truth is part written, and part unwritten, partly the interpretation, partly the supplement of Scripture; partly preserved in intellectual expressions, partly latent in the spirit and temper of Christians; poured to and fro in closets and upon housetops, in liturgies, in controversial works, in obscure fragments, in sermons” (ibid., 94).

¹³⁹ Ibid., 94-95.

¹⁴⁰ Newman considered Prophetical Tradition ‘like the flesh covering a skeleton’ of Apostolical Tradition (ibid., 95).

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

though always to attention.”¹⁴² Newman argued: “Those which are recognized by the Church at an early date are of more authority. . . . Accordingly we accept the decisions of some Councils, and reject the decrees of some others.”¹⁴³

Newman’s distinction among Traditions of differing credibility was a preparation for the discussion of two topics critical to his debate with Jager—the infallibility of the Church and the Protestant theory of the corruption of Romanism.¹⁴⁴ Newman also expressed his personal impression of the Prophetical Tradition:

As for the Prophetical Tradition, I have only one more thing to say of it, and that is it seems to me to deserve the greatest veneration. And this view I would take even of the decrees of Trent, although I do not receive them as the body of doctrine. They are ruins of primitive antiquity, worthy of respect, although they are in my view often altered, and they introduce great corruption into the practice of Christians who receive them. For the capital fault of that council does not consist, precisely, in the exposition of Christian doctrines (although in many points they are in opposition to antiquity), but in the right it arrogates to itself to impose its belief as being part of the fundamental dogmas of Christianity, and as a necessary condition of being received into the Church.¹⁴⁵

In his *Seventh Letter*, Jager agreed with Newman that there is a difference between apostolic tradition and prophetic exposition. Prophets or doctors have to define, comment on, and develop the mysteries of religion in order to reach the people while preserving the same doctrine, the same sense, and the same judgment:

When you develop a truth, you do not change it, on the contrary you give it more force, more luster, greater scope. The Fathers did this. The Church warned those who strayed from the apostolic doctrine in their explanations, and condemned

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 95-96.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 96.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

them when necessary. So apostolic tradition has remained pure and intact, and will so remain until the end of time.¹⁴⁶

Although he understood Newman's insistence that the Church has the power to develop its fundamental Creed into articles of religion according to times and circumstances, Jager emphasized that if an article is true it belongs to all times and places. Therefore, he pointed to the contradiction in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Creed.¹⁴⁷ He reminded Newman that there is no middle way: "You must be all or nothing."¹⁴⁸ There is no middle course between Catholicism and ultra-Protestantism. That middle course would be a logical absurdity.¹⁴⁹ For Newman, it was possible to deny the non-fundamentals and still belong to the Church of England. For Jager, this view was completely incompatible with unity as defined by the Apostles and the Fathers.¹⁵⁰

Newman considered the principle of deciding by Tradition as inapplicable at a time so far removed from that of the Apostles. But Jager answered, if this were true, "we must destroy the Scriptures and the Apostles' Creed for we have both of them from tradition."¹⁵¹ "The older Tradition grows, the stronger it becomes—its guardians become

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 110.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. 110-111.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. For Jager, the contradiction was that Newman already "admitted the constant rule of the Church in excluding anyone who teaches heresy – and claims this right for the Anglican Church – and is now himself disputing the Church's authority by saying its decisions are not fundamental" (ibid., 112).

¹⁵⁰ Jager pointed out that Newman was mistaken in saying that the Roman Church was wrong to exclude those who had fixed opinions on the details of truth; in fact, the Roman Church does not reject those who did not understand the truths of religion, but those who held fixed opinions against Catholic truth, or who professed novelties (ibid., 113).

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 114.

more numerous and change becomes impossible;” Jager added that “a dogma which has been discussed through the ages becomes clearer—it is elucidated and its universality is established in general councils.”¹⁵² He also faulted Anglicans for resisting the perpetual universality of teaching in the Catholic Church, even though they know the universality of Catholic teaching.¹⁵³ He, therefore, concluded his last *Letter* by warning Newman of schism.¹⁵⁴

F. Scripture as the Rule of Faith

Newman discussed the Rule of Faith, a subject closely connected to “Fundamentals,” in his *Third Letter* (Fourth Reply, Part Two). First, he explained what he did not mean by the “Rule of Faith”:

I will first say what I do not mean by this phrase. I do not mean the theological system of the Church. I do not mean that great body of doctrine which in the foregoing section I have termed Prophetical Tradition, I do not mean the Creed with its developments and supplements. The phrase is often used in this sense, and warrantably; viz as that doctrine which the Church teaches and its members receive, which is scattered without order or system in Scripture, and which is moulded, finished, harmonized by the Church.¹⁵⁵

Newman then explained what he meant by the Rule of Faith:

But I use it in the sense of a touchstone or test of doctrine, the authority on which doctrine is taught; and in this sense we consider that it applies solely to Scripture.

¹⁵² Ibid., 114-115.

¹⁵³ “It has been made manifest by their ancestors, through the medium of all their doctors, of all the bishops in a general council, and by the Catholics who surround them” (ibid., 115-116).

¹⁵⁴ Jager cited Cyprian’s words: “Schism is a stain which not even blood can wash away, a crime which is purged by no suffering. He cannot be a Martyr who is not in the Church; he can never attain to the kingdom, who leaves here, with whom the kingdom shall be (*De unit. eccles.*)” (ibid., 116).

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 117.

We consider Scripture to be the court of ultimate appeal, which has the right of definitely settling all questions of faith.¹⁵⁶

He then contrasted the Rule of Faith with Tradition:

I do not at all mean, while I thus contend that Scripture is the sole test of doctrine, that it is to be contemplated barely by itself, and deductions to be made from it without reference to Tradition. I consider that Tradition is as much necessary to explain Scripture as Scripture to verify and circumscribe Tradition; so that, where possible, neither should be used by itself.¹⁵⁷

Thus, for Newman, “Scripture has the prerogative of being the document of final appeal in controversies” and “it is ever to be honoured with a singular honour, as the formal and authoritative basis of teaching a tradition.”¹⁵⁸ He also showed how the Gospel fits into this system: “God has revealed a certain message, called the Gospel; belief in that Gospel of course is ‘necessary to Salvation.’”¹⁵⁹ Newman then explained the “contrariety” between his views and Jager’s:

That is the difference between us. It is not that you use and we discard Tradition in ascertaining necessary Truth; we use it also. It is not that you deny, and we affirm, the right of individuals to ascertain the Truth for themselves, we are both speaking only of the Church’s means of ascertaining it, and the Church’s preaching.¹⁶⁰

For Newman, the question was simply “whether the Church has warrant for taking mere Tradition, as a sufficient voucher for any part of the gospel i.e. salutary doctrine, *the doctrine to be solemnly enforced and imposed.*”¹⁶¹ Jager affirmed it while Newman answered in the negative. In certain cases, “the Tradition of the Church would

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 117-118.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 118.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

be the guide in matters of faith, for want of a surer.”¹⁶² As far as the articles of the Creed were concerned, Newman thought that “no guide could be surer, than that Tradition.”¹⁶³ However, Scripture being given us and being full, profound, determinate and authoritative supersedes the Tradition.¹⁶⁴ The real nature of Scripture is evident in the words “Testament” or “Will”, by which Holy Scripture is designated.¹⁶⁵ Accordingly, he believed that “we are rid of all à priori questions about the *sufficiency* of Scripture as a document of faith.”¹⁶⁶

In regard to the question whether one book of Scripture is sufficient as a rule of faith and, if not, whether the whole can be now considered sufficient, Newman replied: “We answer that any one book of Scripture would be sufficient for a rule of faith, provided no one other were declared to be so; and that the whole canon, as we have received it, is enough because it is all which is first given us.”¹⁶⁷ Further, Newman maintained that Scripture and “nothing else, is given us as the oracles of God and the law of religious truth.”¹⁶⁸ For him, this admission “involves no disparagement of the distinctness and precision of the Scripture as a document of faith.”¹⁶⁹ The Scripture has

¹⁶² Ibid., 119.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ “Even the Creed has become but a concurrent and second witness to certain truths, which, with much more besides are contained in Scripture” (ibid.).

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ “There is no abstract measure of what is sufficient. Faith cannot believe more than it is told. It is saving, if it believes that, be it little or great” (ibid., 119-120).

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 120.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 120-121.

one and only one sense that is unanimously held in great measure by the whole Church, even now.¹⁷⁰

After tracing the variations in the Creed¹⁷¹ in early times in various places, Newman stated that “Scripture and Scripture only is the rule and canon of faith.”¹⁷² He insisted: “As then I may impose nothing to be believed as terms of communion but the Creed, so may I impose nothing to be believed in order to Salvation, but what is founded on Scripture.”¹⁷³ He expounded his view of the Scripture on the basis of the Anglican Articles and Canons which insisted that the Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation. To him, the Anglican doctrine was clear, not only about the role of Scripture, but also about the role of the teacher of the Scripture.¹⁷⁴

Newman also mentioned the Anglican position regarding Tradition.¹⁷⁵ For Anglicans, “Scripture alone is the basis and bond of union between Christians as far as faith is concerned.”¹⁷⁶ Relying on Scripture and the Fathers of the Church,¹⁷⁷ Newman

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 121.

¹⁷¹ “Of this Catholic Truth, of which Scripture is the depository, a certain portion more or less immediately connected with the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, has from the first, contemporarily with the existence of the New Testament, been taken as the condition of communion with the Church, and called the Creed” (ibid).

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 122.

¹⁷⁴ Newman referred to the Sixth Article and to the Canons of 1571: “It has no reference to any supposed rights or duties of individuals; it gives no countenance to what is called ‘the right of private judgment’, that is, it says not a word on the subject either way” (ibid).

¹⁷⁵ “Further our doctrine does expressly assign to Tradition a definitive and most important office, that of explaining the text of Scripture and ascertaining its doctrines, as is more clearly expressed in the Canon and the Act” (ibid., 123); he added: “Just like the Mosaic Covenant, our Lord first spoke His own Gospel and then it was written” (ibid).

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

concluded: “If the New Law be conveyed in canons and precepts, it is contained in the Gospels, or it is nowhere.”¹⁷⁸ Accordingly, he blamed Jager for giving the impression that the Gospels contain an imperfect revelation of the Christian Covenant.¹⁷⁹

Newman felt vindicated by testimonies of St. John¹⁸⁰ and St. Augustine who held that whatever is written appeared to be sufficient for the salvation of believers.¹⁸¹

Newman’s argument is based on the supposition that Christ Jesus, the Lawgiver of the New Dispensation, has personally delivered the necessary matters of the Law:¹⁸²

It has now been shown that even though Christ be the chief Prophet of the Church, yet his Apostles’ writings may form part of the Rule of Faith as expounders of His divine maxims. . . . as the Apostles are interpreters of the Church’s doctrine, so the Church is after them.¹⁸³

In regard to the canon of Scripture, Newman preferred the authority of the Fathers to other arguments deducible from Scripture on this point.¹⁸⁴ He then answered Jager’s accusation that the Anglicans are inconsistent in receiving the canon of Scripture on the basis of Tradition:

That same Tradition of the Church, which bears witness to the Canonicity of Scripture as the word of God on the authority of the Fathers; on the same

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 123-124.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 124-125.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 126.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 128; the references were to John 21:25, 20:30, 19:35 (ibid., 127, note a).

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Newman concluded: “The revelation as regards its matter was already made, the Gospel committed to them. They had but to preach it in the power of Him who promised to be with them always even unto the end” (ibid., 130); he also answered two objections that could possibly be raised against the above hypothesis (ibid., 128-129).

¹⁸³ Ibid., 131.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 132.

authority, we refrain from appealing to the Fathers themselves. – Tradition, like the forerunner of Christ, declares its own inferiority.¹⁸⁵

Narrating the mode pursued by the early Church in deciding matters of doctrine,¹⁸⁶ Newman reminded Jager again that Vincent considered “Scripture the Canon of Faith, and Tradition but interpretation.”¹⁸⁷ Vincent spoke of universality, antiquity, and consent, in order to ascertain the Catholic sense of Scripture, not in order to discover any Apostolical Tradition distinct from it.¹⁸⁸

Newman referred to a number of testimonies of the Fathers to vindicate his argument that Scripture contained everything necessary for Salvation.¹⁸⁹ He agreed that the Fathers spoke in praise of Tradition and Anglicans do the same. For him, the point at issue was simply whether the Fathers considered Tradition to be a tribunal of ultimate appeal or whether they rested upon it solely as an article of saving Faith. For Anglicans,

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ “When a novel doctrine was started, the first question which the neighbouring Bishops asked each other, was, ‘Has this come down to us?’ The answer being in the negative, they at once put it down. . . . When however the matter came before a Council, when it was discussed, when they reasoned, and proved, they never went in matters of saving faith by Tradition only, but they guided and (if I may so say) steered and studied their course by the written [word]. Tradition was no longer more than a subordinate guide, as explaining, illustrating, reconciling the Scriptures: it was in no true sense a Canon or Rule or oracle of Truth” (Ibid).

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 133.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 134.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 141. Newman based his arguments on the teachings of Fathers from both east and west including Athanasius (ibid., 139), Tertullian, Origen and Cyril of Jerusalem (ibid., 134-136), Basil, St. Augustine, Chrysostom, Anastatius of Antioch, St. John Damascene, St. Athanasius (ibid., 139) and Theodoret” (ibid., 142-143).

the high doctrine of Faith, the saving truths of the Gospel, are contained in Scripture, and nothing besides.¹⁹⁰

3. The Jager-Newman Controversy and the *Prophetical Office*

The Jager-Newman debate came to an end in the spring of 1836, after preoccupying Newman on and off at a very important period of his intellectual development.¹⁹¹ The controversy was clearly linked to the Tractarian Movement and Newman's ecclesiology, especially the role and authority of the Church to teach. Many of Newman's views regarding the prophetical office of the Church were either raised by Jager or used to combat him.¹⁹² Almost ten years later, on 27 January 1846, Newman wrote to Henry Wilberforce:

Now in the year 1834 or 35 my belief even in this theory [the *Via Media*] was so strong, that I recollect feeling an anxiety about the Abbé Jager, with whom I was controverting, lest my arguments were unsettling him and making him miserable. Those arguments were not mine, but the evolution of Laud's theory, Stillingfleet's, etc which seemed to me clear, complete, and unanswerable. I do not think I had that unhesitating belief in it in 1836-7 when I published my *Prophetical Office*, or rather I should say that *zeal* for it—for I believed it fully or at least not conscious I did not. It is difficult to say whether or not a flagging zeal involves an incipient doubt. The feelings under which I wrote the volume will be seen in the commencement of the last Lecture.¹⁹³

The argument that Newman used against Jager was the same as he made in his *Tract No. 15: On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*: "The Church of

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 143-144.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 8.

¹⁹² For Allen, "In particular the amplification of the very notion of prophetical office is given in the dialogue Newman wrote to develop his ideas for Froude, and the idea of prophetical office is clearly most relevant to the growth of the idea of doctrinal development" (ibid., 9).

¹⁹³ Ibid., 10.

England had undoubtedly received its orders from the Church of Rome which is now heretical; but that Church was not heretical in primitive times and had kept the Rule of Faith until that rule was changed and altered by the Council of Trent.”¹⁹⁴

Reviewing his religious development in the third chapter of his *Apologia*, Newman sketched the elements of the controversy between Rome and the Church of England once again. He reiterated that he had not been fundamentally concerned with the issue of the Pope’s position as the center of unity or the source of jurisdiction, but rather with a more general question of the relation between the Faith and the Church:

This was my issue of the controversy from the beginning to the end. There was a contrariety of claims between the Roman and Anglican religions, and the history of my conversion is simply the process of working it out to a solution.¹⁹⁵

Newman acknowledged, in the same chapter of his *Apologia*, that the controversy as he had outlined it in “Home Thoughts Abroad” in terms of two friendly antagonists—one putting forth the Roman and the other the Anglican view—was also an attempt to advance the theory of *via media* that he started in his controversy with Jager.¹⁹⁶ He subsequently developed the theme, the Church of England as the representative of the *via media*—Bishop Jebb’s ‘middle way’—between the exaggerations of popular Protestantism and the corruptions of the Church of Rome, in a series of presentations that began on 23 April 1834 in Adam de Brome’s Chapel in St. Mary’s. These sermons and the letters to Jager eventually became the *Prophetical Office* (1837).¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 11.

¹⁹⁵ *Apologia*, 112.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 113.

¹⁹⁷ See Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 7.

4. A Summary: The Authority of Church in Newman-Jager Controversy

The correspondence was initiated by Jager who was familiar with some of the *Tracts for the Times* that Newman and his friends wrote and their revival of the Anglican *via media* theory, the “peculiar” character of the Church of England. While the Tractarians emphasized the Anglican claim that Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, and what was not in Scripture could not be imposed as an article of faith by the Church, Jager defended the Roman Catholic view that the Church is infallible and has recourse to Antiquity and Scripture because they were the Church’s guides.

Newman reiterated the Anglican principle that Scripture was the *ultimate* basis of proof, the place of final appeal, in respect to all *fundamental doctrine*. For him, Gospel Faith was the foundation on which the Church was built and was prior to the Church. Since the deposit of Faith was entrusted to her, the Church is called the pillar and keeper of the Truth. Therefore, the key point of disagreement between the Anglicans and Jager was the relation of the Church to the two sources of Truth, namely Scripture and Tradition. Newman held that Scripture is the repository of the fundamentals and a body of traditions professedly Apostolic, partly interpretative of Scripture and partly independent of it, and there is also a body of traditions called Prophetic. The Church’s teachings are based on the fundamentals, authoritative, and of an argumentative and systemizing character, rather than on infallible definitions, depending on Scripture and Antiquity.

In the course of controversy, Newman discussed a number of themes including infallibility, private judgment, scripture, tradition, and their relation to the Church. He

introduced new distinctions, principally the ideas of that there are fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, and Apostolic and Prophetic traditions. He discussed the notion of Scripture as the Rule of Faith and introduced the possibility of the development of doctrines.

The controversy led to no definitive conclusions. But for Newman it provided an incentive to continue the ecclesiological conversation he had started in his “Home Thoughts Abroad,” through his tracts and letters, to a series of lectures in Adam de Brome’s Chapel on explicitly ecclesiological themes particularly especially on the authority of the Church. During his correspondence with Jager, Newman received crucial and unforgettable assistance from his close friend, Hurrell Froude—an assistance which will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER SIX: THE CHURCH IN FROUDE-NEWMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE

Undoubtedly, Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-36)¹ influenced Newman in forming his Tractarian principles—especially those principles that were characteristically Roman Catholic. It was Froude who guided Newman during his controversy with Abbé Jager. Froude's critique helped Newman to re-evaluate his positions and formulate his ecclesiological deliberations. Newman's *Prophetical Office* was an attempt to answer the questions raised by Froude in many of his letters.

Many writers have observed that Froude, through his personality, opinions and writings, both while living and posthumously, influenced Newman more than anyone else, and through Newman, the Oxford Movement.² Newman himself told an aspiring chronicler, "You cannot of course do anything in the way of an account of the Oxford

¹ Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-36) was the first of eight children born on 25 March 1803 to Robert Hurrell Froude, the Archdeacon of Totnes, and Margaret, *née* Spedding. Richard was educated at Eton and Oxford. Elected a Fellow of Oriel College, he accepted the office of Tutor, which he held from 1827 until 1830. In December, 1828, he was ordained a deacon, and the following year he was ordained a priest by the Bishop of Oxford. See *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, Vol. 1. 1838 (London: Gilbert & Rivington Printers, 1838), iv-v; hereafter cited: *Remains*. Even as a child, Froude was dedicated to the ideal of personal holiness through his mother's influence; see Piers Brendon., *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (London: Elek Books, 1974), 9; hereafter cited: Brendon, *Froude*. Froude was influenced by his father's Toryism and English gentlemanliness (*ibid.*, 24-25).

² Christopher Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1933), 25, commented: "As the friendship between Keble and Froude prepared the way for the Oxford Movement, so that between Froude and Newman made it reality. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of Froude's influence on Newman during the years from 1829 to 1836 which saw the inauguration of the movement and the ripening of Newman's own genius." Brendon, *Froude*, xix, observed: "[Froude's] correspondence with Newman, over whose mind he held, for a time, unparalleled sway, gives an insight into the internal stresses and developments of that mind between 1829 and 1836."

Movement without going to Froude's Remains."³ Years later, Newman summarized his indebtedness to Froude: "His opinions arrested and influenced me, even when they did not gain my assent."⁴

Newman recalled that Froude was fond of historical inquiry and the politics of religion. He was interested in theology as such and did not place "sufficient value on the writings of the Fathers, on the detail or development of doctrine, on the definite traditions of the Church viewed in their matter, on the teaching of the Ecumenical Councils, or on the controversies out of which they arose."⁵ Froude took an "eager courageous view of things on the whole."⁶

In the summer of 1828, Froude became ill. Seeking recovery of health, he traveled to the Mediterranean with his father and Newman during the winter of 1832-1833 and later to Barbados, West Indies, where he stayed from November 1833 to May 1835; he returned home in 1836.⁷ On Sunday, 28 February 1836, at his father's parsonage in Dartington (Devon), he died at the age of thirty-two.⁸ After learning of his death, Newman wrote:

I have this day heard tidings sadder to me on the whole than I ever can hear – i.e. more intimately and permanently trying, Froude's death. I never can have such a

³ *LD* 14: 49.

⁴ *Apologia*, 24, considered Froude "a man of high genius, brimful and overflowing with ideas and views And he had an intellect as critical and logical as it was speculative and bold."

⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Archdeacon Froude to JHN (Dartington, 18 February 1836), *LD* 5: 239.

⁸ Archdeacon Froude to JHN (Dartington, 28 February 1836), *LD* 5: 245-246.

loss, for no one is there else in the whole world but he whom I could look forward to as a contabernalis for my whole life.⁹

1. Newman and Froude as Fellows and Co-Travelers

In the words of Piers Brendon, “One might say that Newman and Froude had the same *Himmel*- as well as *Weltanschauung*.”¹⁰ The few documented instances of letters between Froude and Newman are the chief sources revealing their common religious and intellectual beliefs, especially their common notions about the Church.¹¹ After meeting Froude as one of the new Fellows of Oriel, Newman wrote his mother: “Froude is one of the acutest and clearest and deepest men in the memory of man.”¹² The acquaintance with Froude led Newman to a new awareness that the intellect needed to be the “attendant and servant of right moral feeling.”¹³

To safeguard the liberty and the spiritual advantages of the Church, Froude supported Newman in his political campaign against the reelection of Sir Robert Peel as a Member of Parliament from Oxford in 1828.¹⁴ On 11 September 1829, while asking whether Froude would be interested in becoming Newman’s associate at St. Mary’s,

⁹ JHN to Samuel Richards (1 March 1836), *LD* 5: 247.

¹⁰ Brendon, *Froude*, 90.

¹¹ There is very little evidence of the early years of their friendship. Many of Froude’s letters home between 1827 and 1829 are lost and his correspondence with Newman hardly began until a certain degree of closeness had developed (*ibid.*, 92).

¹² JHN to Mrs. Newman (31 March 1826), *LD* 1: 281-282.

¹³ Brendon, *Froude*, 93. In his “Autobiographical Memoir” (*AW*, 69), Newman recalled that he emerged from Whately’s influence “when coincidentally with his leaving Alban Hall, he began to know Mr. Hurrell Froude,” who moved into the rooms above Newman in the autumn of 1827. See JHN to Blanco White (1 March, 1828) *LD* 2:59-60.

¹⁴ Brendon, *Froude*, 94-95.

Newman revealed his agreement with Pusey's view of Inspiration.¹⁵ In reply, Froude expressed his agreement with both Newman and Pusey.¹⁶ He also revealed his "intention of working at the Ecclesiastical History of the middle ages."¹⁷ Thus, while Newman was studying the teachings of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, Froude was pursuing medieval religious history.

In many of their letters, Froude and Newman shared their anxieties over intellectual infidelity and indifference to the truth of religion in the contemporary world.¹⁸ At the beginning of Newman's project of *Arians*, Froude expressed his admiration and cautioned Newman against the influence of Richard Whately.¹⁹ Newman consulted regularly with Froude;²⁰ however, Newman never blindly followed his

¹⁵ JHN to Froude (Oriol College, 11 September 1829), *LD* 2: 163-164.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 165. See also Froude to JHN (16 August 1831), *LD* 2: 349.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Another issue that cemented the friendship between Froude and Newman was their view regarding life in Oriol College, especially their uncompromising stand on the tutorship and the shutting of the Chapel. See JHN to Froude (Oriol, 10 September 1830), *LD* 2:287-290, at 289. According to Brendon (*Froude*, 96); "The Tutorship affair marked the final ratification of the Froude/Newman alliance and cleared the path, 'humanly speaking,' for the Oxford Movement." See also *ibid.*, 99, and JHN to Froude (Oriol, 15 December 1833), *LD* 4: 140-142, at 142 and 289.

¹⁹ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 4 October 1831), *LD* 2: 365-366, at 365.

²⁰ JHN wrote to Froude (Oriol College, 8 January 1832), *LD* 3: 3-4: "I am attempting to put the chapter I read to you in better shape, in order to rid myself of the force of your Satire, conveyed, as it was, by you in an apparent compliment." Froude did not hesitate to criticize Newman's *Arians*: "In your *Arians* I have marked some 'buts' and 'yets' which are gross Ferresianisms – also I think you do not account satisfactorily for the Eusebian party – not indeed that you are bound to do so – but in the context you imply that you have. So much for my own criticisms" (Froude to JHN [January 1835], *LD* 5: 17-20, at 19).

advice.²¹ According to Brendon, Froude was “especially likely to have been responsible for Newman’s emphasis on the doctrine of *disciplina arcana* and economy.”²² Another well-documented instance of the way in which these two friends shared their thoughts on divine benevolence occurred in 1832.²³ Their correspondence, which contained the only recorded case of Froude advising Newman about a sermon, typifies the kind of dialogue that ensued when the two men were tête-à-tête.²⁴ Throughout his correspondence with Newman, Froude never hid his skepticism of the Reformation: “Certainly the ethos of the reformation is to me a *terra incognita*, and I do not think that it has been explored by any one that I have heard talked about it.”²⁵

²¹ For example, speaking of the first chapter of Newman’s *Arians*, Froude wrote to Newman (Dartington Parsonage, 10 January 1832), *LD* 3: 4-5, at 5: “if you go on fiddling with your introduction you will most certainly get into a scrape at last; . . .” Newman immediately replied: “Your advice about my work is not only sage, but good – yet not quite applicable, tho’ I shall bear it in mind.” (JHN to Froude [Oriël, 13 January 1832], *LD* 3: 6-7, at 7).

²² Brendon, *Froude*, 105.

²³ Newman sent Froude some notes for a sermon he was about to write and asked for his “imprimatur.” The subject of the sermon was an attack on the Quasi-utilitarian idea of Sir James McIntosh that the moral order of the universe and the moral nature of mankind are based on the ideal of benevolence; McIntosh denied that Benevolence was the main attribute of Divine Governance and asserted that Justice was the more important characteristic (JHN to Froude [Oriël, 5 April 1832], *LD* 3: 35-36). The next day, Froude replied to JHN (Fairford, 6 April 1832, *LD* 3: 37) that he liked both the subject, and the line of argument but he had a few remarks on the arrangement of the sermon. After a few days Newman replied to Froude (12 April 1832, *LD* 3: 44): “As to your ‘Annotationes in Neandri [Newman’s] Homilium’, to be sure, I have treated them with what is now called ‘true respect’ . . .”

²⁴ Newman’s sermons, such as “The Usurpations of Reason may be dated from the Reformation” (December 1831), and “The Reverence due to the Blessed Virgin Mary” (March 1832), may be fruits of Froude’s influence. See Brendon, *Froude*, 109.

²⁵ Froude to JHN (29 January 1832), *Remains* 1: 251-252, at 252.

Mediterranean voyage was a major event in the friendship between the two men.²⁶

Each wrote a number of letters from the Mediterranean recording their observations and impressions.²⁷ Like Newman, Froude was impressed by the observance of fasting and the liturgy of the Greek Church.²⁸ However, he was puzzled by the current situation of monasticism, priesthood, and the worship of images in Italy.²⁹ To a friend, he summarized a common phenomenon in Europe:

the whole Christian system all over Europe ‘tendit visibiliter ad non esse.’ The same process which is going on in England and France is taking its course every where else; and the clergy in these Catholic countries seem as completely to have lost their influence, and to submit as tamely to the state, as ever we can do in England.³⁰

Though he was impressed by his meeting with certain persons in Rome, Froude was disappointed with many things he observed in Italy.³¹ After meeting with Monsignor

²⁶ See Froude to JHN (9 September 1832), *LD* 3: 92; *LD* 3: 93-94, at 93; also *LD* 3: 101 and the Diary on Monday 15 October 1832.

²⁷ See *Remains* 1: 276. Years later, Newman wrote about these letters: “The religious opinions too, found chiefly in the letters from Rome, have a bearing on what I held before and after. Froude’s letters in his *Remains* correct or supplement mine. In the matters of dates I am more likely to be correct than he. My Private Journal will support or correct me in such matters. These letters too may perhaps add accuracy to some minute point in my *Apologia*.” See Newman’s “Memorandum: Letters from Abroad” (26 July 1874), *LD* 3: 121-122. See also *Remains* 1: 263-282, JHN to Harriett Newman (On board the *Hermes*, Malta, 25 December 1832), *LD* 3: 162-163, *LD* 3: 180.

²⁸ *Remains* 1: 287-288.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 293-294.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 296.

³¹ Froude described an English artist who was taken up with Catholic ethos (*ibid.*, 300-301). The Catholic men whom Froude met with at Rome impressed him: “Certainly those C. men are wonderful Fellows; I know no one but ____ that could compete with them at all. They know everything, examine everything, and dogmatize about everything . . .” (*ibid.*, 310).

Wiseman, Froude expressed his continuing ambivalence about Roman Catholics in a way similar to Newman's:

I think that the only *τοπος* now is "the ancient Church of England," and as an explanation of what one means, "Charles the First and the Non jurors." When I come home I mean to read and write all sorts of things, for now that one is a Radical there is no use in being nice.³²

Newman and the Froudes travelled together from December 1832 to April 1833.³³

The Froudes returned home without Newman and their journey through France brought them close to the French High Church Party which was Republican and supported universal suffrage.³⁴ This encounter strengthened Hurrell Froude's view that "the Church must alter her position in the political world."³⁵ He became one of the first among the leaders of the Oxford Movement to expose the "definite contradiction between the principles of the secular organization and the principle of Catholic Christianity."³⁶ Though they came back to England separately, both Froude and Newman reached home with the same burning zeal for renewal of the Anglican Church.

2. Leaders of the Movement for the Church

The Froude-Newman letters reveal both their mutual effort and their differing yet complementary temperaments: Froude's vocal, direct and assertive approach was balanced by Newman's more thoughtful and diplomatic style. Characteristically, Froude

³² Ibid., 306-308.

³³ JHN to John Frederic Christie (Rome, 6 April 1833), *LD* 3: 276-278, at 277: "Next Tuesday, we go our separate ways; the Froudes homeward, . . . I am not sorry to go alone, in order, as Wordsworth would say, to commune with high nature."

³⁴ *Remains*, 1: 312. Newman wanted Froude to write about France and the La Mennais system (JHN to Froude [Oriol, 22/23 August 1833], *LD* 4: 32).

³⁵ Brendon, *Froude*, 120-121.

³⁶ Ibid., 121.

did not wait for Newman's arrival to initiate a campaign for the Church. He encouraged William Palmer and they agreed on the "resolution to unite and associate in defense of the Church, of her violated liberties, and neglected principles."³⁷ However, towards the end of July 1833, a League was formed, first between Newman and Froude.³⁸ Though they were strongly against the idea of forming an association, each wrote to a number of friends to elicit their views and support.³⁹

Froude and Newman complemented each other in their effort of recruiting friends for the Church.⁴⁰ They outlined the common principles for action: 1) the apostolic succession; 2) the prevention of lay interference in spiritual matters; 3) the need to make

³⁷ Ibid. Newman later wrote (*LD* 19: 287): "The original founders [of the Oxford Movement] were the late Mr. Froude and Mr. Palmer . . . to whom Mr. Newman at once joined himself in July 1833." Newman recalled: "I was lowspirited about the state of things and thought nothing could be done, when one whom I will not name, suggested whether something could be done in the way of a Society, Association etc. for the Church purpose – or at least so pressed me to do something, that I thought of it – I forget which" ("Fragmentary Diary," 6 December 1833, *LD* 4:10).

³⁸ Newman wrote: "I wrote to Froude (I think) who was in Essex – and to Keble – urging to the latter the gift we had committed to us in being in Oxford, which was a kind of centre and traditionary sources of good principle. On his doubting about it, I wrote him word, he might join it or not – but the League was in existence – it was a fact, not a project. Froude and I were the only two members at that moment" (ibid., 10).

³⁹ Newman "was strongly against an Association" (ibid., 10). Brendon (*Froude*, 129-130) thought that Newman's antipathy to committees for producing Tracts was probably inherited from Froude; for Froude, Association was of political nature (ibid., 135).

⁴⁰ Froude wrote to Newman: "My own notion is that with the assistance of Miller and others we might start a purely religious periodical of prose as well as verse with Keble's name *Excubiae Apostolicae* exactly on the plan of our present *Lyra* – i.e. generally personal religion and then Ecclesiastical" (Hadleigh, 30 July 1833, *LD* 4:16-17, at 16). Froude also felt, that "Rose has many good notions and I like him much – but he is not yet an Apostolical" (ibid., 17). On the other hand, Froude regarded Perceval as a "thorough going Apostolical" (ibid.). Newman wrote Froude complimenting him for recruiting for the cause of the Church: "He [Golightly] might be useful, tho' not persuasive, among the Evangelicals . . ." (1 August 1833, *LD* 4: 17-18 at 17).

the Church more popular; 4) the duty of preserving the connection between Church and State; and 5) the contingency of separation.⁴¹ Froude recommended the second and third points, but had serious reservations about the fourth principle.⁴² Both men were anxious: “We wish to make the Church more popular than it is—how, is of course a question.”⁴³ Newman stated: “The early Church threw itself on the people – now that the Crown and aristocracy have deserted us, must not we do so too?”⁴⁴

Meanwhile Newman started a series on the Church of the Fathers, on “the principle of popularity as an element of Church Power, as exemplified in the history of St Ambrose.”⁴⁵ He sought Froude’s suggestions for his two essays about St. Ambrose.⁴⁶ When he finished the second part of “Home Thoughts Abroad,” he again asked for Froude’s counsel.⁴⁷ Froude’s response was a typical example of how direct and daring he

⁴¹ Brendon, *Froude*, 130-131. See JHN to Charles Portales Golightly (Oriental College, 11 August 1833), *LD* 4: 28-29.

⁴² Froude preached a sermon (not preserved) at this time on the necessity for providing some kind of ecclesiastical discipline if the Church should separate from the State (Brendon, *Froude*, 131).

⁴³ Newman was confident of his friends and what they could do for their Church: “Surely the Church is not lost, when like yourself show their readiness to act for it and the Lord’s sake . . .” (JHN to Charles Portales Golightly [Oriental, 30 July 1833], *LD* 4: 13-14, at 13; see also JHN to Golightly (11 August 1833), *LD* 4: 28; Brendon, *Froude*, 131.

⁴⁴ *LD* 4:14.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁴⁶ Newman wrote to Keble: “I have written one or two papers on St. Ambrose – but am diffident about them, till F. [Froude] casts his eye over them” (Oriental College, 5 August 1833, *LD* 4: 20-22, at 21).

⁴⁷ Newman wrote to Froude: “Read the enclosed nonsense, and send it back forthwith, as I want to send it to Tyler, if you give your Imprimatur.” (Oriental, 22/23 August 1833, *LD* 4: 32).

was in criticizing Newman's Protestantism.⁴⁸ Froude, then, added his admiration for Rome.⁴⁹ Newman rejected Froude's criticism by insisting Roman idolatry was wrong.⁵⁰

Newman took a more moderate position in regard to Romanism in 1835 when he wrote the second section of "Home Thoughts Abroad." Froude also brought to Newman's attention two important suggestions: 1) the revival of the monastic system or college of unmarried priests for the spiritual care of large populations;⁵¹ and 2) the infallibility of the Church.⁵² Newman was impressed by the idea of college of priests⁵³ and at the end of the final section of "Thoughts," he brought the idea into discussion. Though Froude was never remorseful of his criticism, he encouraged Newman and considered his "Thoughts" new and interesting.⁵⁴ Newman and Froude continued to discuss the future efforts that were to be made by the "Friends of the Church."⁵⁵ Froude

⁴⁸ Froude wrote to Newman: "I only except from this general approbation your second and most superfluous hit at the poor Romanists – you have first set them down as demoniacally possessed by the evil genius of Pagan Rome, but notwithstanding are able to find something to admire in their spirit particularly because they apply ornament to its proper purposes – and then talk of the Churches – and all that is very well and one hopes one has heard the end of the name-calling when all [at] once you relapse into your Protestantism. . . ." (31 August 1833, *LD* 4: 37-38 at 37).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁵⁰ JHN to Froude (Oriël, 2 September 1833), *LD* 4: 38-40, at 38-39.

⁵¹ Froude to JHN (31 August 1833), *LD* 4: 38.

⁵² Froude wrote Newman: "I see Hammond takes that view of the infallibility of the Church which Palmer says was the old one – we must revive it. Surely the promise I am with you always means something" (31 August 1833, *LD* 4: 38).

⁵³ Newman wrote to Froude: "I like your notion of City Colleges of Priests, but there is much to weigh against it.... Where will you get the *spirit*, which alone will make the prospect answer?" (Oriël, 2 September 1833), *LD* 4: 40).

⁵⁴ Froude also conveyed to Newman that his father Archdeacon Froude sympathized with their endeavors (8 September 1833, *LD* 4: 46-47, at 46).

⁵⁵ Newman wrote to Froude about meetings and informed him that Keble has made Palmer and him Secretaries, etc. (Oriël, 9 September 1833, *LD* 4: 47-48, at 47).

provided an “in group” ambiance, a sectarian quality which characterized the Movement.⁵⁶ In many instances, Froude was ideologically forthright and his ideas often steered the direction of both Newman and the Oxford Movement.

A. The Doctrine of the Eucharist

During the initial phase of the Movement, Froude enthusiastically promoted Roman Catholic views. Commenting on the “Suggestions for Formation of an Association of Friends of the Church,” he wrote: “I don’t quite see the good of talking about ‘the continuance and due application’ of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, instead [of], the making of the Body and Blood of Christ.”⁵⁷ Newman, however, seemed taken aback, not by the doctrine but by the lack of discretion.⁵⁸ Froude insisted on the teaching about the Eucharist⁵⁹ and wrote again to Newman, who, at that time, opposed the doctrine of Transubstantiation.⁶⁰

Froude supplemented these deliberations with an air of chivalrous conspiracy, at once exclusive and dangerous: “Why don’t you get him (Rose) and Ogilvie to put their names on the Committee?” (Froude to JHN, 5 September 1833, *LD* 4: 50-51, at 51).

⁵⁶ Brendon, *Froude*, 138-139. See also *Remains*, 328-330.

⁵⁷ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 15 September 1833), *LD* 4: 50-51, at 50. The formula Froude complained about did not appear in the “Suggestions,” though his substitute was not included either (Brendon, *Froude*, 140).

⁵⁸ Newman wrote to Froude: “As to your correction for ‘the continuance and due application of the Sacrament,’ I differ from you in toto. I am rash enough, but you are furious” (Oriel, 18 September 1833, *LD* 4: 51-53, at 52).

⁵⁹ Froude expressed to Newman his disagreement with Keble’s friend Jewel, who denied the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper to be a means of grace (Barbados, 25 January 1834, *LD* 4: 214-215, at 214). To both Keble and Newman, Froude wrote: “We are not ignorant that the Ancient Fathers generally teach that the bread and wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them do become and *are made* the body and blood of Christ” (Froude to Joannibus [sic] Keble et Newman, 8 April 1834, *LD* 4: 254-255, at 254; italics in the original).

⁶⁰ Froude to JHN (January 1835), *LD* 5: 17-20, at 18.

Froude maintained that the mystery of the Real Presence could neither be explained away by Protestants, nor explained by Roman Catholics in terms of their rationalistic formula of transubstantiation.⁶¹ He had a very high conception of the Eucharist and its vital function in the life of the Church.⁶² In his comparative study of the four primitive Eucharistic liturgies, Froude found ample evidence for his Catholic view of the doctrine of the Eucharist.⁶³ He criticized Newman regarding his denial of Communion to the little children, and other issues related to the celebration of the Lord's Supper.⁶⁴ He also hoped that Newman had "not been unnecessarily abusive in [his] French controversy, which I would give much to see."⁶⁵

Even in his last letter to Froude in 1836, Newman tried to answer Froude's critique of his view regarding Transubstantiation because he still had difficulty with it.⁶⁶ Newman, however, might have been persuaded by Froude that the Eucharist was a subject which was "better to admire in silence, than to indulge our invention by putting unauthorized glosses upon it."⁶⁷ Subsequently, Newman claimed that the Anglican

⁶¹ *Remains* 3: 134 & 158.

⁶² Brendon, *Froude*, 161.

⁶³ *Remains* 2: 392-428.

⁶⁴ Froude to JHN (January 1835), *LD* 5: 17-20, at 18.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Newman wrote to Froude: "But, so far I have not changed my mind, viz in thinking Transubstantiation, as held by Rome, involves *in matter of fact* profane ideas" (Oriental, On the Purification 1836, *LD* 5: 225-226).

⁶⁷ *Remains* 3: 142.

Article against Transubstantiation “opposes itself to a certain plain and unambiguous statement.”⁶⁸

B. Church and State

It was to Froude that Newman first revealed his new view of the Church as a popular institution: “Of late month the idea has broken on me, as it did a little before on yourself, that the Church is essentially a popular institution, and the past English Union of it with the State has been a happy anomaly.”⁶⁹ Newman also reflected:

The Fathers seem to keep up as a constant principle the community of goods mentioned in the Acts – i.e. a community, as far as food and raiment etc. go; the Church being the mere dispenser, but influential *as* such (of course). However, it is not enough familia[ri]zed to my mind, or realized in its bearings, to enable me to advocate it yet.⁷⁰

While Newman found allies among the Fathers for his notion of the Church, Froude had new thoughts about Keble’s “distinction between Catholic verities and Theological opinions” and willingness to reckon “all the points of difference as Theological opinions.”⁷¹ It was Froude who brought Newman and Keble together.⁷²

⁶⁸ JHN, *Tract No 90: Remarks on certain Passages of Thirty-Nine Articles*; hereafter cited *Tract 90*; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/viamedia/volume2/tract90/index.html>, 318.

⁶⁹ JHN to Froude (Oriental, 18 September 1833), *LD* 4: 51-53, at 53.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Froude to JHN (Exeter, 29 October 1833), *LD* 4: 81-83, at 83. Froude criticized Keble’s “Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury” and accused Newman of being “bent on it” (Dartington parsonage, 4 November 1833), *LD* 4: 89.

⁷² In his *Apologia* (18) Newman recalled: “. . . he [Keble] was shy of me for years in consequence of the marks which I bore upon me of the evangelical and liberal schools. At least so I have ever thought. Hurrell Froude brought us together about 1828: it is one of the sayings preserved in his “Remains,” – “Do you know the story of the murderer who has done one good thing in his life? Well; if I was ever asked what good deed I had ever done, I should say that I had brought Keble and Newman to understand each other.”

Froude reminded Newman about the non-sense of the misapplication of the liturgy and the inefficiency in the practice of the rubrics of liturgy “without first completing the Ecclesiastical system they presuppose.”⁷³ Newman, on the other hand, took a mild stand on the power of the Church.⁷⁴

Froude had a clear and strong opinion regarding the relationship of liturgy and the Church system: “the powers with which God has entrusted the Spiritual Rulers of the Church, are sufficient for its spiritual Government and that all extra-Ecclesiastical interference in its spiritual concerns is both unnecessary and presumptuous.”⁷⁵

Gradually, Newman came to accept Froude’s demand for an efficient and strong Church system. In his letter to the editor of the *Record*, Newman acknowledged “the necessity of Church discipline on *Scripture authority*.”⁷⁶ He wished for the probability of “an active militant hierarchy, the enforcement of the high spiritual doctrine of Scripture and the Church.”⁷⁷ Newman continued to seek Froude’s advice: “My dear F. – I so fear I may be self willed in this matter of the Tracts – pray do advise me according to your light.”⁷⁸

⁷³ Froude to JHN (Dartington parsonage, November 4, 1833), *LD* 4: 89.

⁷⁴ JHN to Froude (Oriental College, 7 November 1833), *LD* 4: 89-91, at 90-91.

⁷⁵ Froude to JHN (Totnes, 14 November 1833), *LD* 4: 104-105, at 104.

⁷⁶ In a letter to the editor of the *Record* (Oxford, 14 November 1833), *LD* 4: 101-103, at 101, Newman stated; “. . . were the notion of organized body of discipline, of a visible guide, merely human . . . I find that Scripture speaks of a ‘pillar and ground,’ and enforces discipline; that the Apostles made use of an exact organization in preaching the Gospel . . .” (ibid., 102).

⁷⁷ Ibid., 103.

⁷⁸ JHN to Froude (Oriental College, 13 November 1833), *LD* 4: 99-100.

Before leaving for Barbados,⁷⁹ Froude questioned, for the first time, the validity of the Articles and the expediency of “the doctrine necessary to salvation.”⁸⁰ He shared with Newman his thoughts about “a Lay Synod in the room of Parliament”—an idea he considered “so wild” but highly effective in provoking thought.⁸¹ Two years later, Newman asked for Froude’s

view of the extent of power which may be given to the laity in the Church system – e.g., the maintenance of the faith is their clear prerogative – qu. What power may they have in synods? Judicially? In legislation? etc.⁸²

Froude answered Newman:

The phenomena of the heaven are repugnant to Newton, just in the same way as the letter of scripture to the church, i.e. on the assumption that they contradict every notion which they do not make self evident – which is the basis of ‘Bible-Christianity’ and also of Protestantism; and of which your trumpery principle about ‘Scripture being the sole rule of Faith in fundamentals’ (I nauseate the word) is but a mutilated edition without the breadth and axiomatic character of the original.⁸³

⁷⁹ Froude might have left on Saturday, 23 November 1833. See Archdeacon Froude to JHN (25 November, 1833), *LD* 4: 123-124, at 123.

⁸⁰ Froude to JHN (17 November 1833), *LD* 4:112-113, at 112.

⁸¹ Froude wrote to Newman: “I was also goose enough to throw out something about a Lay Synod in the room of Parliament, which they thought so wild that I lost all the ground I have made good. Indeed I am myself out of conceit with old Hooker’s notion of a Lay Synod: it is unecclesiastical –and whig –we must only be popular in the choice of church Officers” (20 November 1833, *LD* 4:122-123, at 122).

⁸² Newman continued in his letter to Froude: “I have heard from Acland this morning – and he wants to know whether Churchmen might not *admit (what the liberals are bent upon)* a subsidiary system of education to the Church system for dissenters. To answer abstractedly, I think they might – but I doubt not irreconcilable difference would arise in the detail. The Church must not recognize it, yet must claim to have some control over it. Think of this, please, and answer me – and do not say ‘the whole system is rotten’ and so dismiss the subject” (Oriell, 11 June 1835, *LD* 5: 79-81, at 79). Acland believed that “the education *ought* to be based on religion and religion on the Church,” however, he was willing to be allowed a secondary system; accordingly, Newman wanted to know Froude’s opinion on the subject (*ibid.*).

⁸³ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 2 July 1835), *LD* 5: 97-98, at 98.

For Froude, the sacramental nature of the Church and the matters of ecclesiastical government had a profound spiritual importance. The Visible Church was part of a “Divine Economy for the salvation of sinners” and Episcopacy was a “Divine Mystery for perpetuating this Church.”⁸⁴ Regarding the role and power of the Laity, he added: “Neither the Laity nor the Presbyters seem to me to have any part or lot in the government of the Church – though of course since heresy is worse than schism, they must act for themselves if they think their governors heretical.”⁸⁵

Froude seemed to be anxious to assert that Christ had deliberately instituted an apostolic polity, in the shape of the Church. The sacramental nature of the Church conferred vital importance on the part of ecclesiastical governance. Christianity, he suggested, was not simply of doctrine and belief; it was the operation of Christ’s Body here on earth.⁸⁶ Therefore, Newman asked Froude: “I wanted to know not, why Scripture was not like the Church-system, but . . . whether somehow or other we could not contrive a way of turning Bible Christians.”⁸⁷

⁸⁴ *Remains*, 3: 41.

⁸⁵ Froude to Newman (Dartington, 2 July 1835), *LD* 5: 97-98, at 98. In another letter written to Newman on July 30, 1835, Froude further elaborated his view “about Laity in convocation”: “I told you I had tried hard to think it admissible – But the (that) Bishop Hicke in his ‘constitution of the Christian Church’ had convinced me that in spirituals each Bishop was absolute in his own diocese except so far as he may have bound himself by ordination oaths to his Primate – so that not only the Laity but presbyters are cut out” (Paignton, 30 July 1835, *LD* 5: 116-118, at 117).

⁸⁶ *Remains*, 3: 126, and 127-132.

⁸⁷ JHN to Froude (Oriol, 16 July 1835), *LD* 5: 99-100, at 99.

C. Apostolic Succession

Froude challenged Newman about his justification of the English ecclesiastical dominance over Ireland and the “Apostolical succession in the English Church.”⁸⁸ In his last letter written to Froude, Newman tried to answer Froude’s objection about his view of apostolic succession. Though Newman held the Anglican claim of apostolic succession, he gradually had abandoned it: “The Apostolical Succession’ etc [Tract for the Times No 15] once suited me. I have outgrown it.”⁸⁹ Froude who “delighted in the notion of a hierarchical system, or sacerdotal power, and of full ecclesiastical liberty,” argued cogently against Erastianism.⁹⁰ He was convinced that if they did “give up a national Church and have a real one,”⁹¹ then the only authority left would be the Apostolical one.⁹²

Newman also thought it advantageous to separate the Church from the State:

The whole Church would be kept in order. Further, it would give rise to a *school of theology* – the *science* of divinity, Councils etc., the *theological law* of the Church must be revived and ecclesiastical law moreover. The effect of this upon the divinity of the clergy would be great indeed.⁹³

⁸⁸ Froude wrote to Newman: “The Patriarch of Constantinople as everyone knows was not one ‘from the first’, but neighboring churches voluntarily submitted to it in the first instance, and then by virtue of their oaths remained its Ecclesiastical subjects; and the same argument by which you justify England and Ireland would justify all those Churches in setting up any day for themselves.” (Dartington Parsonage, 27 January 1836), *LD* 5:202-204, at 203.

⁸⁹ JHN to Froude (Oriental, On the Purification 1836), *LD* 5: 225-226: “It is a stage in the history of my own mind, if you will; which I once thought good, tho’ I do not now, if others do still.”

⁹⁰ *Apologia*, 24. See also Brendon, *Froude*, 144.

⁹¹ *Remains*, 3: 274.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 300.

⁹³ JHN to Froude (London, 18 January 1835), *LD* 5: 9-11, at 10.

Years later Newman claimed that the Tractarians took refuge in the apostolic succession not only because things were true and right but in order to shake off the State.⁹⁴ He believed that if they did not neglect “the real ground on which our authority is built, –our APOSTOLICAL DESCENT,”⁹⁵ state control would be superfluous. While Froude anticipated ecclesiastical disestablishment, Newman worked towards doctrinal development.⁹⁶

D. Growing Love for Roman Catholicism

After reaching Barbados, Froude felt that he was “every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation.”⁹⁷ He also mentioned that the possibility of the “development of doctrine” should be taken into consideration by the Friends of the Church and argued that in matters doubtful, they should conform their “practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken.”⁹⁸ Another of Froude’s letters from Barbados revealed his growing inclination towards Roman Catholicism: “When I got your letter I expect a rowing for my Roman Catholic sentiments. Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and have

⁹⁴ JHN, *Anglican Difficulties* with introduction and notes by Stanley L. Jaki (Pinckney, Michigan: Real-View-Books, 1995), 87.

⁹⁵ *Tract 1*: 2.

⁹⁶ Froude’s historical and theological pursuits, particularly of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, provided him enough material to confirm and to develop his own views. Newman wrote of Froude: “He was smitten with the love of the Theocratic Church; he went abroad and was shocked by the degeneracy which he thought he saw in the Catholics of Italy” (*Apologia*, 24-25).

⁹⁷ *Remains*, 1: 336.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 336.

almost made up my mind”⁹⁹ He also thought that the tracts were too Protestant and wanted to remedy this defect.

Froude used every opportunity to express his discontent with the Protestant reformers and to affirm the unique identity of the English Church: “I have also to grumble at you for letting Pusey call the Reformers ‘the founders of our Church’ in that excellent and much to be studied paper on fasting.”¹⁰⁰ He warned Newman against being “unnecessarily abusive” in his French controversy.¹⁰¹

For the last four years of his life, Froude made it his mission to explode the myth of “our glorious reformation” and to indoctrinate his friends with Catholic views. He objected to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church for “their Protestant rationalizing, their insistence on elucidating sacramental mysteries in terms comprehensible to the human mind.”¹⁰² Following Froude, Newman also raised objections to the Articles in his tract on the theory of the *via media*.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Froude to JHN (26 December 1843?), *LD* 5: 11-12, at 12.

¹⁰⁰ Froude to JHN (January 1835), *LD* 5: 17-20, at 18.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁰² Brendon, *Froude*, 142. Froude wrote to Newman: “Laud used to say that subscribing the Articles meant nothing more than declaring that you would not preach [or] teach against them. must [sic] we come to this? I wish they were [all] swept away and nothing but the Creeds left” (Barbados, 25 January 1834), *LD* 4: 214-216, at 216.

¹⁰³ Newman looked upon the “Articles as in one sense an addition to the Creeds” (*Tract* 38: 32) and “that the Liturgy, as coming down from the Apostles, is the depository of their complete teaching; while the Articles are polemical and for the most part only protests against certain definite errors” (*ibid.*, 33). He repeated the same arguments in other tracts and its full fruition was reached in *Tract* 90.

Froude believed that next to Scripture, the primitive liturgies possessed the great claims on our veneration and study.¹⁰⁴ By comparing the four primitive liturgies with the Prayer Book, Froude demonstrated that when the reformers excluded prayers for the dead, they were rejecting the judgment of antiquity.¹⁰⁵ This study led Froude to conclude that liturgical revision was a first step towards heresy, even towards infidelity. When he came back from Barbados, he continued his discussion about Church matters and the ancient liturgies and supported the Roman Catholic understanding of the “administration of the communion in one kind.”¹⁰⁶ Evaluating Froude’s influence on him, Newman summarized the Roman Catholic characteristic principles that Froude upheld both in his life and writings.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ *Remains* 2: 410.

¹⁰⁵ *Remains* 2: 382. Froude reached the conclusion that there are only four independent forms of Liturgy: “Here, then, we arrive at one remarkable result: it appears, from all we can learn, that throughout the whole world, there neither exist now, nor ever have existed, more than four independent forms of Liturgy; a circumstance which itself, gives some credibility to the supposition otherwise suggested, that these four were of Apostolic origin” (ibid., 390-391). These four liturgies are the following: St. Peter’s Liturgy, St. James’ Liturgy, St. Mark’s Liturgy and St. John’s Liturgy (ibid., 394).

¹⁰⁶ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 11 June 1835), *LD* 5: 77-78, at 78.

¹⁰⁷ Newman later recalled that Froude “professed openly his admiration of the Church of Rome, and his hatred of the Reformers. He delighted in the notion of a hierarchical system, or sacerdotal power, and of full ecclesiastical liberty . . . he gloried in accepting Tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching. He had a high severe idea of the intrinsic excellence of Virginity; and he considered the Blessed Virgin its great Pattern. He delighted in thinking of the Saints; he had a vivid appreciation of the idea of sanctity, its possibility and its heights; and he was more than inclined to believe a large amount of miraculous interference as occurring in the early and middle ages. He embraced the principle of penance and mortification. He had a deep devotion to the Real Presence, in which he had a firm faith. He was powerfully drawn to the Medieval Church, but not to the Primitive” (*Apologia*, 24).

In many of his letters to Froude, while he was in Barbados, Newman reported the progress of the Oxford Movement.¹⁰⁸ He informed Froude about his lectures at St Mary's: "What I have done is to have a Wednesday evening service beginning in April with the long days, which is followed by a lecture (extempore) on the Creed – my present set will do as much as this."¹⁰⁹ Many of their letters reveal the friendship and trust both Newman and Froude had for each other.¹¹⁰ Froude questioned the views of Newman's two tracts:

I have only seen two Numbers which Perceval sent me – which seemed to me too Protestant – Is not 'the ministration of *the word*' a sheer Protestantism? And other phrases which I forget. – Also it said the Church of England taught 'the whole truth'. If so why do we wish to reform it?¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ Newman reported to Froude: "Everything is going on most prosperously We have 12 Numbers out of Records of the Church – and 16 Tracts besides already. –I have lately heard that the Christian Observer has a furious attack upon us, nay upon Oriel, in this last month. Can we have more favorable signs? Men do not cry out till they are frightened. –it is curious (but may be an accident) the British Museum sent for our Tracts about 10 days since" (Oriel College, 15 December 1833, *LD* 4: 140-142). Newman later wrote Froude about the new loyalty and enthusiasm in Oxford which had been "consistently the Champion of the Church" (Oriel College, 14 June 1834, *LD* 4: 268-279 at 268; see *ibid.*, 271). Newman also conveyed to Froude about the new array of converts to the Movement like, Manning of Merton, Le Bas, Harrison and Cornwall et al. (London, 18 January 1835), *LD* 5: 9-11, at 10.

¹⁰⁹ Newman also wrote to Froude about how the Bishop of Lincoln criticized his account of the *Disciplina arcani* (*ibid.*, 275).

¹¹⁰ Newman wrote Froude: "My dear F. be comforted, be sure that I and I doubt not others think of you twice a day" (Oriel, 12 November 1834), *LD* 4: 359-363, at 360). Newman also mentioned that if Froude's health did not improve, he should be a Bishop in India and "there you might be a Catholic and no one would know the difference" (*ibid.*, 362). Newman reported how he was pronounced a "spiritually minded Pelagian" and one who "obscures the doctrine of justification by faith" (*ibid.*, 362). Froude replied with feelings of nostalgia: "Do you know I am hungry and thirsty to hear about you – and whether your health stands in the midst of your occupations – my Father tells me your sermons are talked of in all directions" (23 November 1834, *LD* 5: 7-8, at 7).

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

In another letter, Newman brought to Froude's attention the need to discuss various points such as baptism, ordination and the power of Bishops, etc.¹¹² He informed Froude how the Movement was perceived: "half Papist, half Protestant, half prig, half dandy, a third Papist, a third Protestant, a third Socinian, and a little corpulent."¹¹³

3. Froude's Critique of the Newman-Jager Controversy

On 16 July 1835, Newman wrote to Froude about his controversy with Jager.¹¹⁴ Newman was disquieted by Jager's letter and he felt compelled "to combat the Church of Rome from a position other than that of extreme Protestantism."¹¹⁵ After seeing Newman's opening letter to Jager, Froude dismissed the first part of Newman's letter as a "mutilated edition" of "Bible Christianity" and Protestantism.¹¹⁶ Froude disagreed with Newman's trumpery principle about "Scripture being the sole rule of Faith in *fundamentals*"; indeed, the term fundamental nauseated Froude.¹¹⁷ In another letter, in the form of a supposed dialogue, Froude described the problem he found in Newman's rule of faith in fundamentals, using the doctrine of the Eucharist:

M. l'Abbé. I maintain that the doctrine of the Eucharist is a fundamental.

J.H.N. I deny it.

M.l'Abbé. Why?

J.H.N. Because it cannot be proved from Scripture.

¹¹² JHN to Froude (Oriel College, 9 August 1835), *LD* 5: 118-120, at 119.

¹¹³ JHN to Froude (Oriel, 14 January 1836), *LD* 5: 200-202, at 201.

¹¹⁴ Froude to JHN (23 November 1834, *LD* 5: 7-8, at 7): "I am at present fidgetted with my answer to the Abbé, who is the most ignorant of men and the most inconsequent of reasoners. It is a great bore, yet these sets-off – first it obliges me to get up the controversy – next it shows I am not a Papist" (Oriel, 16 July 1835, *LD* 5: 100).

¹¹⁵ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 7.

¹¹⁶ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 2 July 1835), *LD* 5: 97-98, at 98.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

M. l'Abbé. do [sic] you think this (supposing it granted) a sufficient argument – i.e., do you think it certain that no Doctrine is fundamental which cannot be proved from Scripture?

J.H.N. Yes

M. l'Abbé. Supposing I could show that the early Christians (say of the 2nd or 3rd centuries) regarded the doctrine of the Eucharist as fundamental should you still say that it was not so, because it cannot be proved from Scripture?

J.H.N. No, in the case I should admit that it was fundamental; but you cannot show it

M. l'A. Then you admit your reason for not thinking this Doctrine fundamental is not that it is not proved by Scripture but that it was not held such by the early Christians.

J.H.N. My reason for not thinking it fundamental is that it is not proved by Scripture

M. l'Ab. But in spite of this reason you would think it fundamental if the Fathers thought so – i.e. you admit your own reason to be inconclusive. You admit that even after you had made good your assertion that the Doctrine cannot be proved from Scripture you would also have to make good that the Fathers did not think it fundamental

J.H.N. I admit this but still adhere to my original proposition.

M. l'Ab. You have admitted that it is not enough to show that a Doctrine cannot be proved by Scripture in order to prove it not fundamental. Do you think it enough to show that a Doctrine can be proved from Scripture in order to prove it fundamental?

N. No I do not think that

M. l'Ab. Then you have proposed as a test of fundamentality one which being complied with does not prove Doctrines fundamental and being not complied with does not prove them not so.¹¹⁸

Even before reading Froude's dialogue entirely, Newman attempted to clarify what he considered important in the controversy by introducing the distinction between Prophetical and Apostolical Traditions in another hypothetical dialogue:

N. Scripture forbids admission into the Church to those who disbelieve its doctrines, Tradition does not.

Abbé What? Does Scripture forbid it to those who do not receive (e.g.,) that David reigned 7 years in Hebron?

¹¹⁸ The format is altered for easy reading. See the original in Froude to JHN (Paignton, 17 July [1845]), *LD* 5: 100-102, at 101.

N. No. I mean there are *certain doctrines* in Scripture to which it attaches this sanction, i.e., fundamental doctrines.

Abbé. True but Tradition also has such e.g., the Apostles' Creed.

N. You are using Tradition in two senses.

Abbé. I do not see it.

N. Still so it is. The popular sense of Tradition is the voice of the body of the Church, the received system in the Church, the spirit circulating through it and poured out through the channels of its doctors and writers. Is it not so?

Abbé. Granted.

N. Which I may call *prophetical Tradition*, or the system taught, interpretative, supplementary, illustrative (applicative), of the Scripture doctrine. Now I maintain that Tradition in this sense, and this is the sense in which I contrasted it to Scripture, does not carry with it any witness of its reception being necessary for Church Communion. Its reception is the privilege of the Christian when admitted, not a condition of his admission. <(Disciplina Arcani comes in here.)> Even were the Tradition *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, nothing short of his public disavowal of it and teaching openly contrary to it, would justify his rejection or exclusion from the Church. All I have said then [is] that at the first blush of the matter, if any fundamentals are to be found any where *over and above the Apostle's Creed* (which both of us agree in holding fundamental for communion and about which there is no question) Scripture is likely to be the depository, not tradition – Scripture being an authoritative depository, i.e., speaking by inspiration. Tradition not. I did not use the argument for more than a *prima facie* one and hastened on to others stronger.

Abbé. But you seem to forget that the Apostles' Creed, to which you have alluded, i.e., the very series of articles which you consider to *be* the fundamentals, is received on Tradition not on Scripture.

N. To this I answer, first it is in Scripture too, so that it is not a case in point. And if you wish me to consider the hypothetical case, I will freely confess that were the Apostles' Creed not in Scripture, and only conveyed to us by the prophetical Tradition just described, I do not see there *would* be any reason for considering its articles *the* foundation of church communion. But here we come to the other sense of Tradition, viz that strict Tradition from one hand to another, from definite person to definite person, official and exact, which I may call *Apostolical* or *Episcopal*. I will allow to you that such a Tradition does carry its sanction with it as fully <?> as Scripture does – I will receive as necessary for Church Communion all the articles conveyed by it. *But I do already*. They are the Apostles' Creed, which are the fundamentals even if the Scripture and Church would be at variance. Therefore no wonder scripture agrees with this Apostolical Tradition.

Abbé. But in your letter to me, you were speaking not of the terms of communion, but of doctrines necessary to salvation. True – but it was you began speaking of fundamentals, which to me mean *nothing else* than terms of communion. Drop the

word fundamental and take the latter, and then see what I have said. I quote my words ‘Perhaps you will ask, Why do you Anglicans make such a difference between the written and the unwritten word? If the belief in the one is necessary to salvation so is belief in the other. We answer, first of all, that on the very first face of the matter, it is clear that Scripture does absolutely declare belief in its doctrines necessary to salvation, but Tradition (i.e. Prophetical) does not say so of its own . . . Scripture and Tradition, taken per se, come to us in a different aspect; the one with a demand upon our faith, the other not.’

Froude. But hark back. You said just now that the articles necessary for *Church communion* could not be conveyed by Prophetical Tradition; *need they be contained in Scripture?*

N. Why certainly our articles say nothing on the subject; they only speak of necessary to salvation.

F. Then why not at once maintain that Scripture warrant is not necessary for an article being in your sense (i.e. Laud’s etc) fundamental?¹¹⁹

It was during this controversy with Jager in defense of his theory of Anglicanism as a *via media* that Newman began to consider the role of ecclesiastical tradition as the agency interpretative of Scripture.¹²⁰

First I observe that I *start with* this definition of Tradition (i.e. Prophetical) ‘that which comes without sanction of its necessary importance’ – and fairly, *for it is a matter of fact*; therefore for the Abbé to put the question ‘*Supposing* I could show that the early Christians regarded the doctrine of the Eucharist as fundamental?’ is quite out of place . . . ‘*since* all tradition is in matter of fact of an unauthoritative nature, an *instruction* not a *command*, I am *driven* to Scripture as a denier [derniere?] resource, to find there, *if anywhere*, fundamentals.’¹²¹

¹¹⁹ The format is altered to facilitate reading. See the original in JHN to Froude (Oriel College, 20 July 1835), *LD* 5: 102-104, at 102-103.

¹²⁰ For Newman, there were two kinds of tradition: the first, Episcopal Tradition is official and precise, transmitted from one definite person to another throughout the history of the Church and ultimately derived from the Apostles; the second is the Prophetical Tradition, which is less precise, and popular.

¹²¹ JHN to Froude (Oriel, 20 July 1835), *LD* 5: 102-104, at 103-104.

Again Newman asked Froude for further assistance to mould his arguments.¹²² Froude, however, regarded Newman's distinction of Traditions as an evasion. If Apostolic Tradition agreed totally with Scripture, it could not give independent sanction to doctrine.

It seemed to Froude that Newman was affirming that since all Tradition is of an unauthoritative nature, an instruction not a command, Scripture was the sole source of essential articles of belief. Accordingly, Froude continued his imaginary dialogue:

N. 'since all tradition is *in matter of fact*, of an unauthoritative nature etc.'
Abbé. A large assertion and doubtless if true sufficient for your purpose! But you surely cannot expect me to assent to it, since the very thing I am maintaining is that the traditional doctrine of the Eucharist *is in matter of fact* authoritative i.e. that Fathers not merely assert it but 'regard it as fundamental.'¹²³

Accordingly, Froude reminded Newman that even he may "doubtless be wrong" and Newman could hardly expect to convince Froude "that the Fathers do not insist on *one particular* traditional doctrine as fundamental by asserting that they do not insist on *any* as fundamental".¹²⁴

When you have done this I shall of course succumb and you will have satisfied 'that *all* tradition is in matter of fact of an unauthoritative nature.' But your success will then be of little avail for any controversial purpose since as far as you and I are concerned all controversy will be at an end – and in your controversies with other people you will have to go over all the same ground again – nor will you convince any one of the principle for which you are contending, till you have convinced them every particular point for the sake of which you contend for it.¹²⁵

¹²² "Please to keep this letter – that I may think it over; and help me out of any puzzle, I may have got into. I cannot help thinking you have perverted my meaning in turning a *prima facie* argument into a (suppose) conclusive one" (ibid., 104).

¹²³ The format is altered to facilitate reading; see Froude to JHN (Paignton, 30 July 1835), *LD* 5: 116-118, at 116.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 116-117.

Thus for Froude, Newman's view was neither convincing nor practical. Further, Froude was concerned about Newman's view on "doctrines necessary to salvation" and "terms of communion."¹²⁶ For Froude, "No doctrine is necessary to salvation to those who have not neglected it willfully, and every true doctrine is necessary to salvation to those who if they reject it must reject willfully?"¹²⁷

Newman thought that Tradition as Prophetic Tradition does not carry with it any witness of its reception being necessary for Church Communion. Its reception is the privilege of the Christian when admitted, not a condition of his admission.¹²⁸ Thus for Newman, Prophetic Tradition is less authoritative than Episcopal Tradition. Therefore, the "Most Catholic-hearted brother" that "Tradition (Prophetic) had no innate self-sanction – for (in the Latin Theory) *the Church in Council* (or otherwise) gives that sanction – *till then* this or that tradition has no authority at all."¹²⁹ For Newman,

[t]he Bible then has a sanction independent of the Church, the (Prophetic) Tradition has none – therefore when asked why I make a distinction between the word Written and Unwritten, I answer, that *first* on the face of the matter the Scriptures come with a claim, Tradition does not.¹³⁰

¹²⁶ Ibid., 117.

¹²⁷ Froude continued: "If indeed by 'doctrine necessary to salvation' is meant 'terms of communion' i.e. necessary to *covenanted* salvation; I quite understand the assertion – but if they mean necessary *ἀπλῶς* [without qualification], I think no doctrine necessary except under circumstances which will make every religious truth necessary – i.e. circumstances which would make its rejection an act of willful sin – Q. are we bound to give all the articles an intelligible meaning? I think I understood you to say that you conceived some of them framed with a different view" (ibid., 117).

¹²⁸ JHN to Froude (Oriental College, 20 July, 1835), *LD* 5: 102.

¹²⁹ JHN to Froude (Oriental, 9 August 1835), *LD* 5: 118-120, at 119.

¹³⁰ Newman found support for his findings in the Fathers of the Church (ibid., 119). He explained to Froude how the Fathers convinced him of Scripture as the rule of Faith: "The more I read of Athanasius, Theodoret etc. the more I see that the ancients *did* make Scripture *the basis* of their belief" (Oriental, 23 August 1835, *LD* 5: 125-126, at 126.

Newman then explained the view of the Fathers regarding the Creed, Scripture and the Church:

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 . . . but for the Holy Catholic Church etc [[in it]] is but the *medium* through which God comes to us. Now this *θεολογία* [theology], I say, the Fathers do certainly rest upon Scripture, as upon two tables of stone.¹³¹

Newman reminded Froude how his view of the relationship between Scripture and Church harmonized with Hawkins' view that "Scripture proves, and the Church teaches."¹³² Newman believed that "it would be extremely difficult to show that Tradition is *ever* considered by [Fathers] (in matters of *faith*) more than interpretation of Scripture."¹³³ He explained that when the Church Fathers "met together in Council, they brought the witness of Tradition as a matter of fact – but, when they discussed the matter in council, cleared their view etc etc. proved their point, they always went to Scripture alone."¹³⁴ Nonetheless, in spite of the teaching of the Fathers, Newman remained unsure of the precise relationship between the two kinds of tradition and his notion of fundamental doctrines.¹³⁵

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Newman wrote to Froude: "I am writing so fast, I cannot think what I am saying – but, though I have not yet the clearest and most defined of views, or a *καταληψις* (grasp) as the Stoics called it, I think it is not a mare's nest" (Oriel, 23 August 1835, *LD* 5: 125-126, at 126). After Froude's death, Newman wrote to James Endell Tyler: "The Bishop of Lincoln allows in his work on Tertullian that Tradition, not Scripture was in primitive times the source of the Rule of faith. And the principle itself, that the church

Though Froude continued to struggle with his illness during this period, he was enthusiastic in corresponding with Newman.¹³⁶ Regarding the controversy with Jager, again Froude wrote:

As to our controversies you are now taking fresh ground without owning as you ought that our first basis I dished you. Of course if the Fathers maintain that 'nothing not deducible from Scripture ought to be insisted on as terms of communion' I have nothing more to say."¹³⁷

Froude, however, wondered:

But again if you allow tradition an interpretative authority I cannot see what is gained – For surely the doctrines of the Priesthood and the Eucharist may be proved from Scripture interpreted by tradition; and if so what is to hinder our insisting on them as terms of communion? I don't mean of course that this will bear out the Romanists, which is perhaps your only point; but it certainly would bear out our party in excommunicating Protestants. Also you lug in the Apostles' Creed and talk about expansions – what is to be the end of expansions? Will not the Romanists say that their whole system is an expansion of the H.C.C. [Holy Catholic Church] and the Communion of Saints?¹³⁸

Froude questioned Newman more specifically: "Also what are the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds? Also to which class (i.e. Apostolical and Fundamental, or Prophetical) of tradition do you refer the Athanasian Creed?"¹³⁹ Newman's distinction between Apostolic and Prophetic Tradition seemed to be a mere theory or argument just to safeguard the Protestant doctrine of *sola scriptura* while admitting in a limited degree the Catholic principle of Tradition. Therefore, Newman informed Froude of his plan to

should *teach*, and refer to Scripture for *proof*, is maintained by the Provost" (5 March, 1836) *LD* 5: 252.

¹³⁶ William Froude to JHN (Torrey House, 23 August 1835) and Froude to JHN (Paignton, 3 September 1835), *LD* 5:127.

¹³⁷ Froude to JHN (Paignton, 3 September 1835), *LD* 5:127-128, at 128.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

visit him and to discuss what he had “written to the Abbé” as well as the “Popish question.”¹⁴⁰ Newman wanted to address these issues as early as possible, “adjust my notions to his” and to get as much as one can from him, “*dum licet*.”¹⁴¹ On 15 September 1835, Newman visited Froude at Dartington¹⁴² and gave what turned out to be his last farewell to Froude on Sunday evening, 11 October 1835.¹⁴³

Towards the end of 1835, Newman attempted again to clarify his position on the rule of Scripture and the practice of the Fathers: “*in fact* the Fathers did not deduce from Scripture – and the whole passage on the Disciplina is founded on the hypothesis of Apostolical Traditions co-ordinate with Scripture.”¹⁴⁴ During his visit with Froude, Newman suggested that Froude should write a review of three recent publications by Blanco White, who had now become a Unitarian.¹⁴⁵ Blanco White asserted that Articles,

¹⁴⁰ JHN to Froude (10 September 1835), *LD* 5: 140-141.

¹⁴¹ Brendon, *Froude*, 171.

¹⁴² JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel College, 30 August, 1835), *LD* 5: 132.

¹⁴³ Newman wrote about his visit with Froude: “When I took leave of him, his face lighted up and almost shone in the darkness, as if to say that in this world we were parting for ever” (*LD* 5: 141, note 3). Later Newman wrote to John William Bowden: “Froude is just where he was He is full of thoughts and plans Really I sometimes think, that he is merely kept alive by the prayers of his friends, as the Israelites by Moses uplifted hands” (Dartington, 10 October 1835), *LD* 5:150-151, at 151.

¹⁴⁴ Newman wrote to Froude: “I read somewhere the other day that the Iconoclast Council of Constantinople (?) the 7th Greek Ecumenical, took against the Deutero Nicene the very ground you do – that the Eucharist contains the only visible object of worship under the Gospel” (Oriel, 24 December 1835, *LD* 5: 184-186, at 185).

¹⁴⁵ Froude seized this as an opportunity to assault the principle of Protestantism and Neoticism. As to Blanco White, Froude wrote to Newman: “Poor fellow, he is only a consistent Protestant” (1 November 1835), *LD* 5: 155-156, at 155); then Froude addressed ‘Carissime Newman’: “As to Sabellianism and facts I fear you have been unable to cram me with your views – Your Arians shows in a few lines (what B.W. declares) that Sabellianism is only crypto-Socinianism but how to say more about it I know not.” Froude wanted Blanco White to speak for himself: “What I hope to make

Creeds and even Scripture itself could not elucidate religious truths exactly because these were literally inexpressible and had to be rendered “hieroglyphically” or symbolically. Froude concluded his review by suggesting that as the alternative to the delusive principle of private judgment and reliance on the Bible only, Blanco White was accepting the unerring interpretative authority of the Apostolic Tradition. This *reductio ad absurdum*, for Froude, was the “middle ground” between absolute latitudinarianism and the infallible Roman Church.¹⁴⁶

Lamenting the decision of his brother Francis “to preach the gospel,”¹⁴⁷ Newman wrote: “I do fear his verging towards liberalism. That wretched Protestant principle about Scripture, when taken in by an independent and clear mind, is almost certain to lead to errors I do not like to name.”¹⁴⁸ Newman then added:

Mr. Bunsen has pounced upon our views, gathered from the Arians(!) with singular vehemence – he says that, if we succeed, we shall be introducing ‘Popery without authority, Protestantism without liberty, Catholicism without universality, and evangelism without spirituality.’ In the greater part of which censure doubtless you agree.¹⁴⁹

play about is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Protestant Rule of Faith, which I think B. furnishes me with so completely that I can give it as his view without committing myself to it” (ibid., 155).

¹⁴⁶ Froude to JHN (15 November 1835), *LD* 5: 162; see Brendon, *Froude*, 172.

¹⁴⁷ After resigning his Balliol fellowship in 1830, Francis William Newman (1805-1897) served as a “faith missionary” in Baghdad until 1833; when his ministry in England proved unsuccessful, he became a teacher of the classics.

¹⁴⁸ JHN to Froude (Oriel, 17 November 1835), *LD* 5: 163-164, at 164.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 163. Christian Charles Josias, Baron von Bunsen (1791-1860), a scholar and diplomat, served as Prussian ambassador to Rome (1823-1838).

Newman was not entirely pleased with Froude's critique of Blanco White but thought that it well written and irresistible.¹⁵⁰ The second part of Froude's unfinished review was published in its uncompleted form in his *Remains* under the title "Remarks upon the principles to be observed in interpreting Scripture." Froude made use of every "subject that can be brought to bear against Protestantism."¹⁵¹ Froude was surprised at the audacity of Newman's Noeticism in referring to the destinies of the tribes of Dan and of Judah as instances of "how God's promises even when made apparently to individuals and unconditionally must be supposed really conditional and transferable to others."¹⁵² Newman's reply was, however, amusing: "It is one very great satisfaction to have floored you on the subject of Dan – so much of that I could well afford to give up the *Via Media*, could I."¹⁵³

Until a month before his death, Froude continued to advise Newman and to lead him in a Catholic direction. He protested Newman's cursing and swearing against the Romanist in his first tract on the *Via Media*.¹⁵⁴ Froude's admonitions forced Newman to admit that he had criticized the doctrine of Transubstantiation unfairly, and should have

¹⁵⁰ Newman commented to Froude: "You have been ironical . . . you need not have been hypothetical. I put a flourishing ending full of antitheses about B.W. (Blanco White)'s not knowing the Divine of the 17th. Again I had put 'consecrated' before 'elements', which ought to stand there. However after all, it is capital – well written, well thought out, and irresistible except when people think otherwise" (Oriel, 3 January 1836, *LD* 5: 190-192, at 191).

¹⁵¹ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 12 January 1836), *LD* 5: 192-193, at 192.

¹⁵² Froude to JHN (November 1, 1835), *LD* 5: 155-156, at 155.

¹⁵³ JHN to Froude (Oriel, 17 November 1835), *LD* 5: 163-164, at 163.

¹⁵⁴ Froude to JHN (November 1, 1835), *LD* 5: 155-156, at 156.

written, “Transubstantiation, as popularly held.”¹⁵⁵ Froude remained Newman’s most intimate and trusted counselor until the beginning of 1836, when Froude became too weak even to hold a pen.¹⁵⁶ Recalling Froude’s influence on him, Newman described their relationship:

I should say that his power of entering into the minds of others did not equal his other gifts; he could not believe, for instance, that I really held the Roman Church to be Antichristian. On many points he would not believe but that I agreed with him, when I did not. He seemed not to understand my difficulties. His were of a different kind, the contrariety between theory and fact.¹⁵⁷

4. Froude’s *Remains*

In June 1837, Newman undertook the publication of the first volume of Froude’s *Remains*, a collection of extracts from Froude’s letters, writings, and sermons, etc.¹⁵⁸ Newman told Keble that Froude’s writings “contain very deep truths and valuable remarks, so as to demand publication in themselves –and useful hints too for the Christian practice.”¹⁵⁹ In August 1837, he went through Froude’s private journal and was impressed by its tone of sanctity.¹⁶⁰ After reading it, he persuaded Keble to share in the responsibility for its publication.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁵ JHN to Froude (Oriel, 17 November 1835), *LD* 5: 163-164, at 163.

¹⁵⁶ Newman wrote his parting words to Froude: “I will only say that you are ever in my thoughts and prayers, and (by God’s blessing) ever shall be – may I ever be in yours – Though you are at distance, I feel you are now with me in Oxford” (Oriel College, 20 February 1836), *LD* 5: 240.

¹⁵⁷ *Apologia*, 25.

¹⁵⁸ JHN to Keble (Hursley, 30 June 1837), *LD* 6: 86-87.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁶⁰ As Newman went through Froude’s papers, he mused “upon one who had the most angelic mind of any person I ever fell in with –the most unearthly, the most gifted” (Trevor, *The Pillar of the Cloud*, 182).

¹⁶¹ JHN to Keble (Oriel, 16 July 1837), *LD* 6: 96-97, at 97.

The publication of Froude's *Remains* transformed the climate of Tractarianism. The Tractarians were inspired by Froude's personal example of holiness and his romantic vision of the medieval Church. This opened their minds to his criticisms of the Reformation and his goal to "unprotestantize" the Church. For many, Froude's *Remains* was a road-map in the direction of Rome.¹⁶² For many bishops, the *Remains* was the first solid confirmation of the papistical leaning of the Tractarians.¹⁶³ Many Protestant and even secular journals judged the *Remains* as quite overtly instilling Popish Romanism.¹⁶⁴ For them, the *Remains* provided clear evidence that Froude and his friends had been bound for Rome from the very beginning. For Catholics, *Remains* was a sign that many of the Tractarians were "very nearly ripe and ready for reunion with Rome."¹⁶⁵

Anglican commentators emphasized that Froude had no intention of joining Rome. He was to the last a faithful adherent of the Church of England and his allegiance never wavered.¹⁶⁶ J. B. Mozely, an Anglo-Catholic theologian, who was influenced by Froude's *Remains*, defended Froude "as the great practical exponent of the *Via Media*."¹⁶⁷ The historian, Anthony Froude, his brother, commented that if by any chance

¹⁶² Brendon (*Froude*, 187) observed: "To follow Froude in attempting to restore Anglicanism to Apostolicity without straying into Roman Catholicity was a task to which only a few could dedicate themselves."

¹⁶³ Brendon (*Froude*, 191) claimed: "Even the moderate Archbishop of Canterbury, William Howley, 'mentioned particularly the publications of Froude's *Remains* as one chief point which he regretted' about the Movement."

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ "Froude's own biographer stated that the Tractarian seceders were his true heirs and implied that he would have preceded Newman to Rome" (ibid., 194).

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Brendon, *Froude*, 187. James Bowling Mozley (1813-1878) was Newman's brother-in-law.

Hurrell had succumbed to the lure of Rome, “the Pope would have found him an unmanageable subject.”¹⁶⁸ For many, Hurrell Froude remained a bundle of paradoxes searching for resolutions.¹⁶⁹ But for Newman, Froude seemed to be the Moses who led the Exodus, but never stepped into the Promised Land.

5. Froude and Newman’s *Prophetical Office*

There is no doubt that Froude, first in life and then posthumously, shaped Newman and, in turn, Tractarianism. Froude’s critique of Newman liberated him from the shallow and unimaginative intellectualism of contemporary liberalism. Almost from the beginning, Froude realized that Protestantism and Catholicism were not two elements that could be blended in varying proportions in a composite body, but two different interpretations of Christianity based on diametrically opposite principles.¹⁷⁰ Consequently, the Anglican *via media* was nothing but a theory; Rome, on the other hand, was a reality.¹⁷¹

Newman developed his theological views in dialogue with Froude; these dialogues helped Newman to clarify his own position. For example, the Newman-Froude letters contained Newman’s distinction between the Apostolic Tradition transmitted by

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 195.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Dawson (*The Spirit of the Oxford movement*, 52) observed: “Whether Newman intended it or not, it is impossible not to recognize the views of Froude, and sometimes his very voice and personality, in the anonymous friend of the author who puts the case for Newman’s ideal of the Anglican *Via Media*. The latter, he argues, is nothing but a theory which has slept in libraries, while the actual Church of England has ranked itself with the Protestants.”

¹⁷¹ “Signs of this process are also to be found in those imaginary conversations, held at Rome in 1833, which were finally published in the *British magazine* in 1836 under the title ‘Home Thoughts from Abroad’” (ibid. 51-52).

bishops and the Prophetic Tradition that is the voice of the body of the Church.¹⁷² As

Allen observed:

When he came to publish *Lectures on the Prophetical Office* (1837), not only was his attachment to the Via media cooler, he had also begun to consider the role of ecclesiastical tradition as the agency interpretative of Scripture. . . . He did not have that unhesitating belief in 1836-7 when he published the *Prophetical Office*. Or rather, he adds, he did not have the former unflagging zeal for it, and although he believed it fully he wondered later whether flagging zeal involved an incipient doubt. He concluded by affirming that he thought the theory true, but that all theories were doubtful and difficult, and all reasoning a weariness to the flesh.¹⁷³

Allen added that between “the beginning of the Jager controversy, then, and its termination in book form in the *Prophetical Office*, Newman had sensed a weakening in his adhesion to the middle way of Anglicanism.”¹⁷⁴ Though the truths conveyed by Prophetical Tradition may not have the same compelling force or sanction as those defined by the Episcopal Tradition, Newman felt that the Prophetical Tradition had value as a developing agency.¹⁷⁵

6. Froude’s Critique of Newman’s Ecclesiology: A Summary

From the time he met Froude at Oriel College, Newman was impressed and influenced by Froude in both his philosophical and theological thinking. In fact, Froude was the chief instrument in liberating Newman from many of his earlier influences including evangelicalism, noeticism and unimaginative intellectualism. The Newman-Froude correspondence, along with *Remains*, leaves little doubt that Froude’s constant

¹⁷² Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 7.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 13-14.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 14.

¹⁷⁵ Allen added: “*Pari passu*, he had begun to elaborate the notion of a prophetical office in which lay the seeds of the idea of development. This notion was worked out in a letter to Froude . . .” (ibid., 14).

exhortations led Newman and in turn his *Tracts* in a more decisively Roman Catholic direction. Froude often acted as a kind of censor. He was vigilant to the slightest sign of backsliding; no Protestant tendency or idea escaped him. As the Oxford Movement developed, it was to Froude that Newman looked for guidance even when Froude was abroad from November 1833 to May 1835.

From Froude, Newman gained a deeper understanding of many Roman Catholic practices and principles. These included priestly celibacy, monasticism, infallibility, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, veneration of the saints, devotion to the Virgin and others. Froude disapproved of Newman's prejudices against Roman Catholicism and gradually turned Newman away from his evangelical notions of the Church. Froude's understanding of the sacramental foundation, specifically the Eucharistic foundation, of the life and activities of the Church was a crucial contribution to Tractarianism, especially its ecclesiology. The life of the Church, its hierarchical system, sacerdotal power, and its freedom from the state, depend on its sacramental foundation.

Because of both his sacramental ecclesiology and his experience with erastianism, Froude was unwilling to attribute much power to the laity. For him, Christianity was not simply a doctrine and belief; rather it was the realization of Christ's Body on earth. Froude repeatedly reminded Newman of these dimensions of the Church and gradually convinced him of the impossibility of a middle ground between Bible Christianity and Roman Catholicism.

Froude was Newman's theological consultant during his controversy with Jager. Froude challenged Newman to be clear about his distinction between the Apostolic and

the Prophetic Traditions. Froude considered Newman's distinction to be an attempt to safeguard the Protestant doctrine of *sola scriptura*. Froude also raised questions regarding Newman's views about fundamentals, doctrines necessary for salvation and terms of communion, showing they were unconvincing and impractical.

Froude guided Newman to a wider theological and ecclesiological horizon filled with issues such as sacramental foundation, the state-church relationship, apostolic succession, Scripture, Tradition, infallibility, doctrines and their development. In a nutshell, Froude's critique prompted Newman to discuss and to clarify his understanding of these ecclesiological issues in his *Prophetical Office*, which will be discussed in the following chapters.

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE VIA MEDIA BETWEEN INFALLIBILITY AND PRIVATE JUDGMENT

Beginning in 1834, fueled by his zeal to revitalize the Anglican Church, Newman began a series of lectures, which he characterized as a continuation of the debate he undertook with Jager.¹ Newman identified the topic of these lectures as the “Sacerdotal as well as the Prophetical office of the Church.”² He usually delivered these lectures on Wednesday evenings during the years 1834 and 1836 in the part of St. Mary’s Church, Oxford, known as Adam de Brome Chapel, named after the founder of Oriel who was buried there. These lectures were subsequently published as: *The Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*³ and *The Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. The first series of lectures on the prophetical office were published in March of 1837.⁴

With these lectures, Newman proposed to formulate the impartial truth of the true Catholic Church, the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the Saints, the Pillar of Truth, with a firmer adherence to the “Infallible Rule of Faith,” that is, the Holy Scriptures

¹ JHN, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/viamedia/volume1/lecture3.html>; hereafter cited: *Prophetical Office*. Newman (*Prophetical Office*, xi) wrote: “Great portions of a correspondence which the writer commenced with a learned and zealous member of the Gallican Church are also incorporated in it.” See also the footnote 2, *LD* 6: 53.

² *Prophetical Office*, xi.

³ First, Newman chose the title: ‘Lectures on the Middle Way between Romanism and Popular Protestantism.’ See JHN to Frederic Rogers (Oriel, 7 January 1837), *LD* 6: 7-8, at 8. However, the “title used for publication was *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*.” See Footnote 2, *LD* 6: 8.

⁴ Newman wrote on Saturday 11 March, “My book on Prophetical Office came down.” See *LD* 6: 40. See also Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, 44.

interpreted by the Catholic Church, rather than relying on his own private judgment.⁵

Accordingly he discussed a theology of the Church in fourteen lectures: eight lectures on a *via media* theory between infallibility and private judgment, five on a *via media* theory of the Rule of Faith and the last on the Fortunes of the Church. This chapter analyzes the first eight lectures in which Newman discussed the *via media* between infallibility and private judgment.

1. The Authority of the Church

Newman began the lectures by pointing out that since the word “Church” occurred in the Creed, it was considered a first principle in the Christian religion. In the early Church, he said, it had one definitive and undisputed meaning. However, with passage of time, interminable disputes and hopeless differences had arisen about its meaning.⁶ Thus, Newman considered the first obstacle to any discussion of the Church to be the multiple existing connotations of the word. Secondly, he observed that the majority of educated men were reluctant to acknowledge a “clear view of the original and apostolic doctrine” of the Church.⁷ Accordingly, he thought it useful to promote “sound and consistent” views about the Church and to discuss it principally in its relation to the Roman theory which was considered more systematic than any other.⁸

⁵ *Prophetical Office*, xiii-xiv. Newman intended to be submissive to “the Representative Church, that is, a free General Council, or as General as can be procured; and until then to the Church of England, wherein [he] was baptized, or to a National English Synod” (ibid., xiv).

⁶ Ibid., 3.

⁷ Ibid., 4.

⁸ Ibid., 1-3. Newman also explained the immediate reason that motivated him to give these lectures: “Roman Catholics having ever insisted upon it, and Protestants

In the following Lectures, then, it is attempted, in the measure which such a mode of writing allows, to build up what man has pulled down, in some of the questions connected with the Church; and that, by means of the stores of Divine truth bequeathed to us in the works of our standard English authors.⁹

However, the main object of the lectures was not to refute errors but to establish “a positive doctrine” on “the article in the Apostles’ Creed, which binds them to faith in ‘the Holy Catholic Church’.”¹⁰ Newman argued that if Anglicans denied the Roman Catholic view of the Church, they were obliged to give a more “definite and intelligible doctrine” than the Roman view.¹¹ But Anglicans could not erect their structure of ecclesiology “without partly breaking down [the existing teaching of Rome], partly using what we find upon it.”¹² Thus, the lectures, “so far as their form goes, are directed against Rome, though their main object is not controversy but edification.”¹³ The lectures then were intended “to furnish an approximation in one or two points towards a correct theory of the duties and office of the Church Catholic”.¹⁴

Popular Protestantism does not attempt this at all; it abandons the subject altogether: Rome supplies a doctrine, but, as we conceive, an untrue one. The question is, what is that sound and just exposition of this Article of Faith, which holds together, or is consistent in theory, and, secondly, is justified by the history of the Dispensation, which is neither Protestant nor Roman, but proceeds along that *Via Media*, which, as in other things so here, is the appropriate path for sons of the English Church to walk in? What is the nearest approximation to that

having neglected it, to speak of the Church at all, though it is mentioned in the Creed, is thought to savour of Rome” (ibid., 5).

⁹ Ibid., 5. Newman wanted to be guided by the standard Anglican Divines and selected passages from their writings (ibid., xii).

¹⁰ Ibid., 6.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁴ Ibid., 7.

primitive truth which Ignatius and Polycarp enjoyed, and which the nineteenth century has virtually lost?¹⁵

Subsequently, leaving aside political and ecclesiastical questions, Newman directed his attention to topics connected with the prophetic office of the Church.¹⁶ He, however, observed certain obvious objections to his effort to construct a *via media* theory of the article of the “Church Catholic” such as: 1) being unwanted;¹⁷ 2) being led to Rome;¹⁸ 3) being unseasonable at this time;¹⁹ and 4) being but an eclectic system.²⁰ For Newman, each of these objections involved some fallacy but “incidentally (gave him) an opportunity of defining more exactly what it (was he had) in view.”²¹

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Newman insisted that his intention was to discuss “what concerns the Church’s internal state, her teaching rather than her action, her influence on her members, one by one, rather than her right of moving them as a whole” (ibid., 12). At the same time, he knew that “the distinct portions of the general subject so affect each other, that such points as Church authority, Tradition, the Rule of Faith, and the like, cannot be treated without seeming to trench upon political principles, consecrated by the associations of the Revolution” (ibid.).

¹⁷ Newman explained: “It is urged . . . that the nature and functions of the Church have been long settled in this country by law and by historical precedents, and that it is our duty to take what we find, and use it for the best. . . .” (ibid., 8).

¹⁸ “though the views which may be put forward be in themselves innocent or true, yet under our circumstances they will lead to Rome. . . . again, because the article of ‘the Church’ has been accidentally the badge and index of that system” (ibid.).

¹⁹ “the discussions proposed are singularly unseasonable at this day, when our Church requires support against her enemies of a practical character, not speculations upon her nature and historical pretensions. . . .” (ibid.).

²⁰ “the pretended *Via Media* is but an eclectic system, dangerous to the religious temper of those who advocate it, as leading to arrogance and self-sufficiency in judging of sacred subjects” (ibid.).

²¹ Ibid., 7.

These objections were weighty but natural,²² however, Newman thought it would be better for Anglicans to look after themselves rather than relying upon their enemies or politicians.²³ For him, such self-reliance was the stance of the English Church in the seventeenth century and now “it is our lot to see the result of an experiment which in their days was but in process.”²⁴ Surrendering the Church into the hands of the state was something that had been tried and had failed. Moreover, there was the paradox that “persons unacquainted with the principles of the Church, are better fitted than her proper guardians and ministers.”²⁵

In addition, as a result of liberalism, even men of seriousness and good intentions “feel the same annoyance and impatience at certain parts of that Ancient Religion, of which the doctrine of the Church is the centre, which profligate men manifest towards moral and religious motives altogether.”²⁶ Though secular politicians tried “to impress on those who regard with disgust the range of doctrines connected with the Church,”

²² “When, for instance, the office of Holy Scripture in the divine system, or the judicial power of the Church, or the fundamentals of faith, or the legitimate prerogatives of the Roman see, or the principles of Protestantism are discussed, it is natural to object, that since the Revolution of 1688 they have been practically cut short, and definitely settled by civil acts and precedents” (ibid., 9).

²³ Ibid., 10.

²⁴ Newman stated: “. . . any one of those who afterwards became Non-jurors, or any one of those persons who at this day have the most settled belief in the spiritual powers of the Church, would have thought himself unworthy to be her son, had he not taken his part in a system which he had received and found so well administered, whatever faults might exist in its theory” (ibid., 11-12). The “Non-Jurors” were Anglican clergy who refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, the new monarchs approved by Parliament after the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688, on the grounds that their previous oath to the deposed King James II was still binding.

²⁵ Ibid., 12.

²⁶ Ibid., 14.

Newman knew that “it does not at all prove that those doctrines are fanciful and are uninfluential” because “truth by itself has the power of overpowering the human heart.”²⁷

Newman realized that these objections took another more attractive form in the minds of practical men: “A religion’s principle or idea, however true, before it is found in a substantive form, is but a theory; and since many theories are not more than theories, and do not admit of being carried into effect, it is exposed to the suspicion of being one of these, and of having no existence out of books.”²⁸ He explained:

Protestantism and Popery are real religions; no one can doubt about them; they have furnished the mould in which nations have been cast: but the *Via Media*, viewed as an integral system, has never had existence except on paper; it is known, not positively but negatively, in its differences from the rival creeds, not in its own properties; and can only be described as a third system, neither the one nor the other, but with something of each, cutting between them, and, as if with a critical fastidiousness, trifling with them both, and boasting to be nearer Antiquity than either.²⁹

Newman thereby acknowledged the real problem with his theory of the *via media*.

In order to be the very truth of the Apostles, it needed proofs to show that it is workable

²⁷ Ibid., 15.

²⁸ “The proof of reality in a doctrine is its holding together when actually attempted. Practical men are naturally prejudiced against what is new, on this ground if on no other, that it has not had the opportunity of satisfying this test. Christianity would appear at first a mere literature, or philosophy, or mysticism, like the Pythagorean rule or Phrygian worship; nor till it was tried, could the coherence of its parts be ascertained. Now the class of doctrines in question as yet labours under the same difficulty. Indeed, they are in one sense as entirely new as Christianity when first preached; for though they profess merely to be that foundation on which it originally spread, yet as far as they represent a *Via Media*, that is, are related to extremes which did not then exist, and do exist now, they appear unreal, for a double reason, having no exact counterpart in early times, and being superseded now by actually existing systems” (ibid., 15-16).

²⁹ Ibid., 16.

and not self-contradictory.³⁰ Whether the *via media* is called “Anglo-Catholicism” or “a mere modification or transition-state either of Romanism or of popular Protestantism,” the *via media* needed to be tried.³¹ Moreover, since both Rome and Protestants claimed to be the modern representative of primitive principles, any professed third theory, however plausible, must necessarily be composed of discordant elements and potentially conflicting elements.³² Accordingly, Newman identified three principal parties in the Church of England: the Apostolical, the Latitudinarian and the Puritan.³³

Though the Apostolical could run into Romanism, it did not coalesce with it; there were some real differences between it and the Roman system.³⁴ Newman hoped that his treatment of theory would provide an “irrefragable testimony to the essential difference between the Roman and Anglican systems.”³⁵

. . . if the English Church has the mission, hitherto unfulfilled on any considerable stage or consistent footing, of representing a theology, Catholic but not Roman, here is an especial reason why her members should be on the watch for opportunities of bringing out and carrying into effect her distinctive character.³⁶

³⁰ Newman stated: “To take for instance the subject of Private Judgment; our theory here is neither Protestant nor Roman; and has never been duly realized. Our opponents ask, What is it? Is it more than a set of words and phrases, of exceptions and limitations made for each successive emergency, of principles which contradict each other?” (ibid., 17).

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., 19.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ For Newman, the Latitudinarian and the Puritan were modifications of Socinianism and Calvinism (ibid).

³⁵ Ibid., 19-20.

³⁶ Ibid., 20.

In addition, “there are other circumstances favourable to the preaching of the pure

Anglican doctrine.”³⁷ The *via media* theory would also provide the following support:

. . . Rome will not fail to preach far and wide the tenet which it never conceals, that there is no salvation external to its own communion. On the other hand, Protestantism, as it exists among us, will not be behindhand in consigning to eternal ruin all who are adherents of Roman doctrine. What a prospect is this! two widely spread and powerful parties . . . are deficient in clear views of the truth . . . Here the English theology would come in with its characteristic calmness and caution, clear and decided in its view, giving no encouragement to lukewarmness and liberalism, but withholding all absolute anathemas on errors of opinion, except where the primitive Church sanctions the use of them.³⁸

Finally, Newman attempted briefly to answer the objection that the *via media* was but an eclectic system:

It may appear, then, that there is something in the very notion of examining and completing a doctrine at present but partly settled and received, and in the very name of a Via Media, which is adapted to foster a self-sufficient and sceptical spirit. The essence of religion is the submission of the reason and heart to a positive system, the acquiescence in doctrines which cannot be proved or explained. When . . . we describe Anglicanism as combining various portions of other systems, what is this, it may be asked, but to sanction an eclectic principle, which of all others is the most arrogant and profane?³⁹

Newman answered that “though Anglo-Catholicism is not practically reduced to system in its fullness, it does exist, in all its parts, in the writings of our divines, and in good measure is in actual operation, though with varying degrees of consistency and

³⁷ Newman explained: “English divines were tender of the other branches of the Reformation, and did not despair of their return to the entire Catholic truth . . . and to what theology can the serious Protestant, dissatisfied with his system, betake himself but to the Roman, unless we display our characteristic principles, and show him that he may be Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Roman?” See *ibid.*, 20.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 21.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 22.

completeness in different places.”⁴⁰ There is no room for eclecticism in any elementary matter. No member of the English Church would allow himself to build on any doctrine different from that found in the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Creed or Episcopal authority.⁴¹

Admittedly, another series of unsettled difficulties arose out of the question of education and teaching:

What are the records, what the rule of faith? what the authority of the Church? how much is left to Private Judgment? what are the objects and best mode of religious training? and the like. The subject of Church government opens another field of inquiries, which are more or less unanswered, as regards their practical perception by our clergy. The Thirty-nine Articles supply another.⁴²

All these topics needed to be determined with the “guidance of Anglican standard writers” and we “are bound to consult them, nay, when they agree, to follow them; but when they differ, to adjust or to choose between their opinions.”⁴³ Although Anglican divines had explored “Primitive doctrine for us in every direction, and the original principles of the gospel and the Church patiently and successfully brought to light,”⁴⁴ one thing was still wanting:

We have a vast inheritance, but no inventory of our treasures. All is given us in profusion; it remains for us to catalogue, sort, distribute, select, harmonize, and complete. We have more than we know how to use; stores of learning, but little that is precise and serviceable; Catholic truth and individual opinion, first principles and the guesses of genius, all mingled in the same works, and requiring to be discriminated. We meet with truths over-stated or misdirected, matters of detail variously taken, facts incompletely proved or applied, and rules

⁴⁰ Ibid., 21-22.

⁴¹ Ibid., 23.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid., 23-24.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 24.

inconsistently urged or discordantly interpreted. Such indeed is the state of every deep philosophy in its first stages, and therefore of theological knowledge.⁴⁵

In other words, Newman recognized that what Anglicans needed for their Church's well-being was "not invention, nor originality, nor sagacity, nor even learning in our divines,"⁴⁶ but a recognized theology.⁴⁷

2. Protestant and Roman Errors

Newman devoted his first lecture on "The Nature and Ground of Roman and Protestant Errors" to showing how Protestants and Roman Catholics committed errors in their respective approaches to Scripture. According to Newman, all popular Protestant denominations of his time agreed with Anglicans and differed from Roman Catholics in considering the Bible as the only standard in doctrinal matters: all Protestants accepted the written word of God as the supreme and sole arbiter of their differences.⁴⁸

Controversy with Protestants was easier but not shorter, since they agreed that the Bible was the standard of faith; however, each person made himself its interpreter.

Consequently, what seemed a means of peace, turned out to be the chief cause of discord.⁴⁹ The Bible led to disagreement among Protestants, since it was "not so written

⁴⁵ "Our champions and teachers have lived in stormy times; political and other influences have acted upon them variously in their day, and have since obstructed a careful consolidation of their judgments" (ibid., 24).

⁴⁶ Ibid., 25.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ By popular Protestantism, Newman meant "that generalized idea of religion, now in repute, which merges all differences of faith and principle between Protestants as minor matters, as if the larger denominations among us agreed with us in essentials, and differed only in the accidents of form, ritual, government, or usage" (ibid., xi).

⁴⁹ "The Bible is a small book; any one may possess it; and every one, unless he be very humble, will think he is able to understand it" (ibid., 26-27).

as to force its meaning upon the reader” and so “under such circumstances each naturally prefers his own;—his own ‘interpretation,’ his own ‘doctrine,’ his own ‘tongue,’ his own ‘revelation.’”⁵⁰

Newman believed that such private interpretation had detrimental consequences, leading to a situation in which: “Truth is but matter of opinion; that that is truth to each which each thinks to be truth.”⁵¹ The sectarian “adoption of the latitudinarian notion that one creed is as good as another is an evidence of it.”⁵² Newman emphasized that though Anglicans agreed with Protestants in making Scripture the document of ultimate appeal in matters of faith they did not consider it as the sole informant in divine truths. Anglicans, he said, had another source of information: “we rely on Antiquity to strengthen such intimations of doctrine as are but faintly, though really, given in Scripture.”⁵³

While Protestant denominations⁵⁴ professed to appeal to Scripture, Newman found “the case is different as regards Roman Catholics: they do not appeal to Scripture unconditionally; they are not willing to stand or fall by mere arguments from Scripture.”⁵⁵ Scripture could not be taken as the ground of proof in Anglican controversies with Roman Catholics. Though Catholics admitted Scripture to be the word of God, they openly acknowledged that they also regulate their faith by the existing Traditions of the Church. Roman Catholics maintained that “the system of doctrine

⁵⁰ Ibid., 27.

⁵¹ Ibid., 27-28.

⁵² Ibid., 29.

⁵³ Ibid., 28-29.

⁵⁴ “Whether they be called Independents, Baptists, Unitarians, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, or by any other title” (ibid., 129).

⁵⁵ Ibid., 29.

which they hold came to them from the Apostles as truly and certainly as the apostolic writings; so that, even if those writings had been lost, the world would still have had the blessings of a Revelation.”⁵⁶

Newman argued that though Catholics asserted that the Traditions of the Church were in fact contained in the writings of her Doctors, their real theory was different: “By Tradition they mean the whole system of faith and ordinances which they have received from the generation before them, and that generation again from the generation before itself.”⁵⁷ He then characterized the Roman Catholic notion of Tradition: 1) Tradition is uniform custom. 2) Though it had a beginning, since it was traced back to the Apostles of Christ, it was in consequence of divine not of human authority and was true and intrinsically binding as well as expedient.⁵⁸ 3) These professed traditions were unwritten because “the Christian doctrine as it has proceeded from the mouth of the Apostles is too varied and too minute in its details to allow of it.”⁵⁹ 4) These unbroken and unwritten transmissions of doctrine were without errors, since no error could have arisen in the Church without its being protested and because of the practice of the early Church, which denounced it.⁶⁰

Accordingly, Roman Catholics would account for the indeterminateness of Tradition on the one hand, yet the accuracy and availableness of their existing Tradition or unwritten Creed on the other hand:

⁵⁶ Ibid., 30.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 31.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 32.

It [Tradition] is latent, but it lives. It is silent, like the rapids of a river, before the rocks intercept it. It is the Church's unconscious habit of opinion and sentiment; which she reflects upon, masters, and expresses, according to the emergency.⁶¹

Thus, it would be a mistake to ask for a complete collection of the "Traditions to which the Roman Catholics appeal, whether viewed as latent in the Church's teaching, or as passing into writing and being fixed in the decrees of the Councils or amid the works of the ancient Fathers."⁶² Newman thought that Roman Catholics ought to prove or show that not only was there such a living and operative Tradition that lasted to this day, but also that their own characteristic doctrines were part of it.

For Newman, to deride Tradition "as something irrational or untrustworthy in itself, is to weaken the foundation of our own faith in Scripture, and is very cruel towards the great multitude of uneducated persons, who believe in Scripture because they are told to believe in it."⁶³ Secondly, he thought that if "we would leave ourselves room for proving that Scripture is inspired, we must not reject the notion and principle of the argument from Tradition and from Antiquity as something in itself absurd and unworthy of Almighty wisdom."⁶⁴ He added "that which ascertains for us the divinity of Scripture, may convey to us other Articles of Faith also, unless Scripture has expressly determined this in the negative."⁶⁵

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 33-34.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 34-35.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 35.

For Newman, “the sacred volume itself, as well as the doctrine of its inspiration, comes to us by traditional conveyance.”⁶⁶ He found that “whatever explanations the Protestant in question makes in behalf of the preservation of the written word, will be found applicable to the unwritten.”⁶⁷ Thus, for Newman, the only way to meet the Romanists was on the ground of Antiquity, rather than by merely appealing to Scripture:

Truth alone is consistent with itself; we are willing to take either the test of Antiquity or of Scripture. As we accord to the Protestant sectary, that Scripture is the inspired treasury of the whole faith, but maintain that his doctrines are not in Scripture, so when the controversialist of Rome appeals to Antiquity as our great teacher, we accept his appeal, but we deny that his special doctrines are to be found in Antiquity. So far then is clear; we do not deny the force of Tradition; we do not deny the soundness of the argument from Antiquity; but we challenge our opponent to prove the matter of fact. We deny that his doctrines are in Antiquity any more than they are in the Bible; and we maintain that his professed Tradition is not really such, that it is a Tradition of men, that it is not continuous, that it stops short of the Apostles, that the history of its introduction is known. On both accounts then his doctrines are innovations; because they run counter to the doctrine of Antiquity, and because they rest upon what is historically an upstart Tradition.⁶⁸

Although Newman felt that “this view is intelligible and clear,” it had a major disadvantage: “The Bible indeed is a small book, but the writings of Antiquity are voluminous; and to read them is the work of a life.”⁶⁹ So for two reasons, controversy with Romanists is laborious: “because it takes us to ancient Church history and because it does not allow scope to the offhand or capricious decisions of private judgment.”⁷⁰ However, any controversy with Romanists would more likely come to an end because it

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 36-37.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 37-38.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 38.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

would be based upon facts rather than opinions.⁷¹ The basic controversy between Anglicans and Romanists would be one of doctrine and principle; viz. whether separation of the Roman Communion and Protestants was or was not a sin.⁷²

Newman considered controversies with Rome as arduous but instructive as relating rather to matters of fact than to first principles.⁷³ In contrast, controversy with Protestant sects was more about principles than about facts, insofar as “Romanism holds the foundation, or is the truth overlaid with corruptions.”⁷⁴ Newman knew that the same view of Romanism was implied in Anglican ecclesiastical changes in the sixteenth century Reformation: “In like manner, we Anglo-Catholics do not profess a different religion from that of Rome, we profess their Faith [in] *all but* their corruptions.”⁷⁵

Anglicans confessed that Romanism was a perversion, not a contradiction of Christian Truth. Romanism was to be judged “not by the formal decrees of the Council of Trent but by its practical working and its existing state in the countries which profess it.”⁷⁶ “Truth corrupted” had become a perplexing stigma of the Roman Catholic system and “this peculiar character of Roman teaching, as being substantial Truth corrupted, has

⁷¹ Ibid., 38-39.

⁷² “The only question is, which party committed it; they lay it at our door, we retort it, and justly, upon them” (ibid., 39).

⁷³ Newman explained: “... Romanism may be considered as an unnatural and misshapen development of the Truth; not the less dangerous because it retains traces of its genuine features, and usurps its name, as vice borrows the name of virtue, as pride is often called self-respect, or cowardice or worldly-wisdom goes by the name of prudence, or rashness by that of courage. . . . Rome retains the principle of true Catholicism perverted; popular Protestantism is wanting in the principle. Lastly, virtue lies in a mean. . . .” (ibid., 40).

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 42.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

tended to strengthen the popular notion, that it, or the Church of Rome, or the Pope or Bishop of Rome, is the Antichrist foretold in Scripture.”⁷⁷

Thus, Newman discussed the principles and doctrines of Romanism, not as an existing political sect among Anglicans, but in its abstract system and in a state of quiescence. There were two reasons for this approach: 1) in spite of the violence and rancour of its public supporters, there were many individuals in the Roman communion of gentle, affectionate, and deeply religious minds;⁷⁸ and 2) there was an expectation of a reform of their popular usages and opinions and ecclesiastical policy, that is, a destruction of what was commonly called popery rather than of their abstract principles and maxims.⁷⁹

3. Roman Neglect of Antiquity

Convinced that Anglicans differed from Roman Catholics only in their view of historical facts rather than principles, Newman delivered a second lecture—“On the Roman Teaching as Neglectful of Antiquity”—to show how Roman teaching often neglected Antiquity. In practice, Roman controversialists would often abandon Antiquity in favor of other principles:

The infallibility of the existing Church is then found to be its first principle, whereas, before, it was a necessary, but a secondary doctrine. Whatever principles they profess in theory, resembling, or coincident with our own, yet when they come to particulars, when they have to prove this or that article of their creed, they supersede the appeal to Scripture and Antiquity by putting forward the

⁷⁷ Ibid., 43.

⁷⁸ Similarly, while Newman spoke against popular Protestantism, he acknowledged the personal commitment of individual Protestants (ibid., 46).

⁷⁹ Ibid., 45.

infallibility of the Church, thus solving the whole question, by a summary and final interpretation both of Antiquity and of Scripture.⁸⁰

For Newman, “there is a striking dissimilarity, or even inconsistency between the Roman system as quiescent, and as in action, in its abstract principles, and its reasonings and discussions on particular points.”⁸¹ The doctrine of infallibility, Newman said, is a vivid example of Roman inconsistency:

In the Creed of Pope Pius not a word is said expressly about the Church’s infallibility; it forms no Article of faith there. Her interpretation, indeed, of Scripture is recognized as authoritative; but so also is the “unanimous consent of Fathers.” But when we put aside the creeds and professions of our opponents for their actual teaching and disputing, they will be found to care very little for the Fathers, whether as primitive or as concordant; they believe the existing Church to be infallible, and if ancient belief is at variance with it, which of course they do not allow, but if it is, then Antiquity must be mistaken; that is all. Thus Romanism, which even in its abstract system, must be considered a perversion or distortion of the truth, is in its actual and public manifestation a far more serious error.⁸²

Before illustrating how Romanists substitute the authority of the Church for that of Antiquity, Newman explained how Antiquity is authoritative in religious questions:

Both the Roman school and ourselves maintain as follows:—That whatever doctrine the primitive ages unanimously attest, whether by consent of Fathers, or by Councils, or by the events of history, or by controversies, or in whatever way, whatever may fairly and reasonably be considered to be the universal belief of those ages, is to be received as coming from the Apostles. This Canon, as it may be called, rests upon the principle, which we act on daily, that what many independent and competent witnesses guarantee, is true.⁸³

⁸⁰ Ibid., 47-48.

⁸¹ Ibid., 48.

⁸² Ibid. A Latin-English copy of “The Creed of Pope Pius IV” (1564), also known as the *Professio fidei Tridentina* is available at <http://www.preces-latinae.org/thesaurus/Symbola/Tridentinae.html>; Pius IV (1499-1565) was elected pope in 1559.

⁸³ Ibid., 50.

Thus, Newman asserted that Antiquity was a valuable criterion for doctrine:

“Ancient Consent is, practically, the only, or main kind of Tradition which now remains to us.”⁸⁴ This “Rule or Canon” for him “is best known as expressed in the words of Vincent of Lerins, in his celebrated treatise upon the tests of Heresy and Error; viz. that that is to be received as Apostolic which has been taught ‘always, everywhere, and by all.’”⁸⁵ Therefore, Newman concluded, “Catholicity, Antiquity, and consent of Fathers, is the proper evidence of the fidelity or Apostolicity of a professed Tradition.”⁸⁶ Consequently, Newman considered Councils or individuals authoritative if they were trustworthy witnesses of apostolic tradition.⁸⁷

Newman then illustrated the disrespect of Roman theologians to any systematic discussion of the argument from Antiquity. On the one hand, these Romanists deferred to the authority of the Rule of Vincent as implicitly as the Anglicans did, although Protestants in general had transgressed it. On the other hand, these Romanists were obliged to maintain it by their very pretensions to be considered the One True Catholic

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 51. For Newman, “the Rule of Vincent is not of a mathematical or demonstrative character, but moral, and requires practical judgment and good sense to apply it” (ibid., 55-56). *The Commonitorium of Vincentius of Lerins* (Cambridge: University Press, 1915) is available at: <http://archive.org/details/commonitoriumofv00vinc>.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 51.

⁸⁷ “On the other hand, the most highly gifted and religious persons are liable to error, and are not to be implicitly trusted where they profess to be recording, not a fact, but their own opinion” (ibid., 51-52). Newman gave examples: “Thus Pope Gregory might advocate a doctrine resembling Purgatory; St. Gregory Nyssen may have used language available in defence of Transubstantiation; St. Ephraim may have invoked the Blessed Virgin; St. Austin might believe in the irrespective Predestination of individuals . . .” (ibid., 52-53).

and Apostolic Church. However, there was a remarkable difference, even of theory, between the Romanists and the Rule of Vincent. The Romanists were “altogether silent on the subject of the Pope’s Infallibility, whether considered as an attribute of his see, or as attaching to him in General Council.”⁸⁸ Newman then illustrated how “Romanists reconcile their abstract reverence for Antiquity with their Romanism,—with their creed, and their notion of the Church’s infallibility in declaring it; how small their success is, and how great their unfairness, is another question.”⁸⁹

. . . they extol the Fathers as a whole, and disparage them individually; they call them one by one Doctors of the Church, yet they explain away one by one their arguments, judgment, and testimony. . . . And thus their boasted reliance on the Fathers comes, at length, to this,—to identify Catholicity with the decrees of Councils, and to admit those Councils only which the Pope has confirmed.⁹⁰

Newman also referred to one or two passages from authoritative Roman writers and commented on their disregard for Antiquity; in contrast:⁹¹

. . . the writings of Antiquity are to be considered as limitations and safeguards put upon the Church’s teaching, records by which she is ever bound to direct her course, out of which she ascertains and proves those doctrinal statements in which, when formally made she is infallible.⁹²

Newman also recalled the words of Bellarmine:

We do not impugn, nay we maintain against impugners, that the first foundation of our faith is the Word of God, that is, written and unwritten, ministered by Apostles and Prophets. . . . only we add, that, besides this first foundation, another

⁸⁸ Ibid., 54-55.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 57.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Newman referred to Bossuet and Milner who held that the Catholic Church has always submitted herself to the Scripture and to the sense of the Fathers according to Tradition rather than following the fancies or private judgment of men (ibid., 58-59).

⁹² Ibid., 59.

secondary foundation is needed, that is, the witness of the Church. For we do not know for certain what God has revealed, except by the testimony of the Church.⁹³

Later, Newman turned to further instances of the disrespect shown by Roman theologians towards the ancient Fathers from Bellarmine's celebrated work on the Controversies of Faith.⁹⁴ Newman added instances from Roman Catholic writers, such as Dionysius Petavius⁹⁵ and St. Ambrose, as proofs of the inconsistencies in the practice of the Roman Church. Newman complained that Roman Catholics professed to know better than the

⁹³ Newman commented that the work of Bellarmine that he had received "has written my work (*Prophetical Office*) just published – and it has my lectures on Justification." See JHN to J. F. Christie (Cholderton, 14 June 1837), *LD* 6: 83. Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) entered the Society of Jesus in 1560 and was ordained a priest in 1570; after teaching at Leuven and the Roman College, he was named cardinal in 1599 and served as Archbishop of Capua (1602-1605); among his numerous writings are the three volumes of *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei Adversus Hujus Temporis Haereticos* (Inglostadt: 1586-1593), available at: https://play.google.com/store/books/details/Robert_Bellarmin_Disputationes_De_Controversiis_Ch?id=bgM-AAAACAAJ. Bellarmine was beatified in 1923, canonized in 1930, and named a Doctor of the Church in 1931. According to Bellarmine: "That alone is matter of faith, which is revealed by God, either mediately or immediately; but divine revelations are partly written, partly unwritten. And so the decrees of Councils and Popes, and the Consent of Doctors, . . . then only make a doctrine an article of faith, when they explain the Word of God, or deduce anything from it" (*ibid.*, 59).

⁹⁴ According to Newman, Bellarmine, in his treatise in defence of Purgatory, used severe language against Calvin, who represented the Fathers as speaking doubtfully concerning that doctrine" (*ibid.*, 67). Newman, however, found Bellarmine inconsistent because "he quotes, not the very same sentences both for and against his Church's doctrine, but neighbouring ones" (*ibid.*, 68). Newman reached the conclusion: "A Romanist then cannot really argue in defence of the Roman doctrines. . . . He assumes his Church's conclusion as true; and the facts or witnesses he adduces are rather brought to receive an interpretation than to furnish a proof. His highest aim is to show the mere consistency of his theory, its possible adjustment with the records of Antiquity" (*ibid.*, 68-69).

⁹⁵ Dionysius Petavius, the Latinized name of Denis Pétau, S.J. (1583-1652), was a professor at various French universities and the author of *Opus de theologicis dogmatibus* and *Opus de doctrina temporum*; a crater on the Moon is named in Pétau's honor.

Fathers, indeed ignored the early Fathers, and supposed that the Church was absolutely the author of faith.⁹⁶ He concluded that “her religion is not that of the Fathers” and “her Creed is as novel as those Protestant extravagancies from which in other respects it is so far removed.”⁹⁷ On the basis of comparing Roman and Anglican views, “Ours is Antiquity, theirs the existing Church. Its infallibility is their first principle; belief in it is a deep prejudice quite beyond the reach of anything external.”⁹⁸ Accordingly, he concluded:

[Roman Theologians] are teaching, not disputing or proving. They are interpreting what is obscure in Antiquity, purifying what is alloyed, correcting what is amiss, perfecting what is incomplete, harmonizing what is various. They claim and use all its documents as ministers and organs of that one infallible Church, which once forsooth kept silence, but since has spoken; which by a divine gift must ever be consistent with herself, and which bears with her, her own evidence of divinity.⁹⁹

To illustrate the subject, Newman gave additional instances of varied writings about the system which were noticed by Anglican divines in the controversy:

. . . the pretence of some Roman writers, that the silence of Antiquity on the subject of their peculiarities arises from a *disciplina arcani*, as it has been called, or Rule of secrecy, practised in the early Church, which forbade the publication of the more sacred articles of faith to the world at large. For it has now been seen that, according to the avowed or implied conviction of their most eminent divines, there is much actually to censure in the writings of the Fathers, much which is positively hostile to the Roman system. No rule of secrecy could lead honest men to make statements diametrically opposite to their real belief, statements which are now the refuge of those who resist what Romanists consider the real opinion of the men who made them.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ Ibid., 64-65.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 65.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 70.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 71.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 77-78.

Thus, those who admit the existence of this primitive *disciplina arcani* are making dangerous concessions to the Roman party if they follow their practice in faith and morals:

[F]ar from wishing to become absolute mistress of her faith, as is laid to her charge, she [Rome] has on the contrary done everything in her power to tie up her own hands, and deprive herself of the means of innovation; for she not only submits to Holy Scripture, but in order to banish for ever those arbitrary interpretations, which would substitute the fancies of man for Scripture, she hath bound herself to interpret it, in what concerns faith and morality, according to the sense of the holy Fathers from which she professes never to depart.¹⁰¹

In contrast, Newman believed that Anglicans “have but to remain pertinaciously and immovably fixed on the ground of Antiquity; and, as truth is ours, so will the victory be also.”¹⁰² Thus, Newman considered the Anglican position impregnable both against Rome and against Protestants.

4. The Doctrine of Infallibility

For Newman, two elements were operative within the Roman system: “As far as it is Catholic and Scriptural, it appeals to the Fathers; as far as it is a corruption, it finds it necessary to supersede them.”¹⁰³ Though he was willing to deal with Rome “as if a sister or a mother Church,” he found in her “some things absolutely good, some things only just

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 78.

¹⁰² “Abstract arguments, original views, novel interpretations of Scripture, may be met by similar artifices on the other side; but historical facts are proof against the force of talent, and remain where they were, when it has expended itself” (ibid., 79).

¹⁰³ “Viewed in its formal principles and authoritative statements, it professes to be the champion of past times; viewed as an active and political power, as a ruling, grasping, ambitious principle, in a word, as what is expressively called Popery, it exalts the will and pleasure of the existing Church above all authority, whether of Scripture or Antiquity, interpreting the one and disposing of the other by its absolute and arbitrary decree” (ibid., 83).

tainted and sullied, some things corrupted, and some things in themselves sinful.”¹⁰⁴ The Roman system, however, must be viewed as a whole because all its parts belong “to the whole and in connexion with their practical working and the end which they subserve.”¹⁰⁵ As a practical system, “its main tenet, which gives a colour to all its parts, was the Church’s infallibility, as on the other hand, the principle of that genuine theology out of which it had arisen, was the authority of Catholic Antiquity.”¹⁰⁶

Accordingly, Newman discussed the characteristic moral and political errors of the Roman Catholic doctrine of infallibility in Lecture 3: “Doctrine of Infallibility Morally Considered” and Lecture 4: “Doctrine of Infallibility Politically Considered.”¹⁰⁷ In his third lecture, Newman discussed the moral aspects of the Roman doctrine of infallibility:

That Romanism considers unclouded certainty necessary for a Christian’s faith and hope, and doubt incompatible with practical abidance in the truth; that it aims at forming a complete and consistent theology, and in forming it, neglects authority, and rests upon abstract arguments and antecedent grounds; and that it substitutes a technical and formal obedience for the spirit of love.¹⁰⁸

To draw intelligible lines of demarcation between Roman Catholics and Anglicans, he differentiated various aspects of the Roman teaching about infallibility:

The doctrine of the Church’s Infallibility is made to rest upon the notion, that any degree of doubt about religious truth is incompatible with faith, and that an external infallible assurance is necessary to exclude doubt. “Proof,” or certainty of the things believed, is secured upon two conditions; if there be a God, “who cannot lie,” as the source of Revelation, and if the Church be infallible to convey

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 83-84.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 84.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 85.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

it. Otherwise, it is urged, what is called faith is merely opinion, as being but partial or probable knowledge.¹⁰⁹

In contrast for Anglicans, “religious faith has all it needs in having only the former of these two secured to it, in knowing that God is our Creator and Preserver, and that He may, if it so happen, have spoken.”¹¹⁰ “Scripture is full of instances in point as regards Faith.”¹¹¹

“According to its theory, the [Roman] Church professes to know only what the Apostles knew, to have received just what they delivered, neither more nor less. But in fact, she is obliged to profess a complete knowledge of the whole Dispensation, such as the Apostles had not.”¹¹² For Newman, “to know some things in any subject infallibly implies that we know all things” and “there are no degrees in Infallibility.”¹¹³ He believed that “partial and incomplete knowledge is an inseparable attendant on a theology which reveals the wonders of heaven” because the “human mind cannot measure the

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 85-86.

¹¹⁰ “When we are not personally concerned, even the highest evidence does not move us; when we are concerned, the very slightest is enough” (ibid., 86).

¹¹¹ “Jesus Christ left [inquirers] to gather the great truth for themselves how they could, with whatever degree of certainty, sometimes referring them to His miracles, sometimes to the types or prophecies of the Law, sometimes to His forerunner the Baptist, sometimes urging them to make trial of the truth in practice and so to find it” (ibid., 88). “When St. Thomas doubted of His resurrection, far from justifying his demand for an infallible witness, He declared that He was but diminishing his blessedness by giving him a higher evidence of the miracle than he had already received” (ibid.). “To require definite and clear notices of truth, is to hanker after the Jewish Law, a system of less mysterious information than Christianity, as well as less generous faith” (ibid., 88-89).

¹¹² Ibid., 89.

¹¹³ Ibid.

things of the Spirit.”¹¹⁴ “Surely the Apostles themselves, though infallibly sure of the greater truths, could not determine the limits of their infallibility.”¹¹⁵ To “know all that is revealed with equal clearness implies that there is nothing not revealed.”¹¹⁶ He concluded that the Church of Rome claims to know not only infallibly but also completely:

She begins by claiming the power of infallibly determining throughout the range of the Apostles’ knowledge, of accurate delineation in all such lesser matters as they would not be able to realize to themselves as certain, of rendering equally vivid all those marvellous traces of things invisible, which in the first inspired teachers would gradually melt from distinctness in their outlines into dim distance or into minute intricacy of detail. And, in consequence, she is led on from the profession of uniform precision to that of universal knowledge.¹¹⁷

By professing to be a complete theology, the Roman system “arranges, adjusts, explains, exhausts every part of the Divine Economy. It may be said to leave no region unexplored, no heights unattempted, rounding off its doctrines with a neatness and finish which are destructive of many of the most noble and most salutary exercises of mind in the individual Christian.”¹¹⁸ In fact, it destroys the Mystery:

That feeling of awe which the mysteriousness of the Gospel should excite, fades away under this fictitious illumination which is poured over the entire Dispensation. Criticism, we know, is commonly considered fatal to poetical

¹¹⁴ “Christianity is a supernatural gift, originating and living in the unseen world and only extending into this. It is a vast scheme running out into width and breadth, encompassing us round about, not embraced by us. . . . We are within the Divine Dispensation; we cannot take it in with the eye, ascertain its proportions, pursue its lines, foretell their directions and coincidences, or ascertain their limits” (ibid., 89-90).

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 90.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 89-90.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 90-91.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 99.

fervour and imagination; and in like manner this technical religion destroys the delicacy and reverence of the Christian mind.¹¹⁹

Newman believed that

“so little has actually been revealed to us in a systematic way, that the genuine science of theology carried to its furthest limits, has no tendency to foster a spirit of rationalism. But Rome would classify and number all things, she would settle every sort of question, as if resolved to detect and compass by human reason what runs out into the next world or is lost in this.”¹²⁰

He observed that “Revelation so melts into Providence that we cannot draw the line between them.”¹²¹ While acknowledging that “religion is the great chastiser of human pride,” he found Roman Catholic theology, characterized by pride and self-confidence, “intruding into things not seen as yet, and growing familiar with mysteries; gazing upon the ark of God over boldly and long, till they venture to put out the hand and touch it.”¹²² The doctrine of Satisfaction, according to Newman, was a clear instance of bold speculativeness in Roman theology that led to the loss of more reverent, wondering, and expectant thoughts.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 91.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 91-92.

¹²¹ “Miraculous events shade off into natural coincidences, visions into dreams, types into resemblances . . . all these are questions which man cannot determine, yet such as these Romanists delight to handle” (ibid., 92).

¹²² The concept that “knowledge is power” creates in us the imagination of possessing it completely (ibid., 92-93).

¹²³ For Newman, although “the death of Christ upon the Cross has put away the wrath of God from us, and reconciled Him to us. . . . We do not know how the death of Christ operates for our salvation. . . . Now, while impatience of doubt leads the Protestant of this day to treat all such questions as inherently fanciful, creations of the mind, and not questions of fact, the same impatience leads the Romanist to answer them” (ibid., 93-94). He also gave the example of “Indulgence” (ibid., 95-98).

Newman asserted that another serious evil that followed from the doctrine of infallibility was the “practice of systematizing” which necessarily led to a decision concerning the relative importance of doctrines.¹²⁴ Rome claimed authority over its own framed system and proceeded to judge of it: “the most striking and persuasive proof of the divine origin of Christianity, lies in the harmonious adjustment and correspondence, and the evident meaning of its parts.”¹²⁵ For instance, Newman referred to Wiseman¹²⁶ as the latest advocate of Rome, who claimed “the privilege of criticizing and applauding the Gospel as a system”:

He observes that there is something in Roman teaching “beautifully contrasted to the eye of the philosopher, with the manifest imperfections of” what he calls the Protestant “system. There is a natural and obvious beauty in the simplicity of this basis, which at once gives stability and unity to conviction.” In another place he observes, “the end of every rule and law, and consequently of every rule of Faith,” is “to bring men into a unity of principle and action;” that “the rule proposed by others is proved by experience to lead to exactly opposite results; in other words, that it removes men farther from that union towards which it must be intended to bring them, for it leads them to the most contradictory opinions, professing to be supported and proved by precisely the same principle of Faith;” whereas “the principle” of the Roman system is “fully equal to those objects for which the rule was given.”¹²⁷

¹²⁴ “Of course religion has its greater and its lesser truths; but it is one thing to receive them so far as Scripture declares them to be so, quite another to decide about them for ourselves by the help of our own reasonings” (ibid., 98-99).

¹²⁵ Ibid., 99.

¹²⁶ During his Mediterranean voyage (1831-1832), Newman met Nicholas Wiseman (1802-1865), who was rector of the English College in Rome (1828-1840); he was named a bishop in 1840 and appointed cardinal and Archbishop of Westminster in 1850. Wiseman published his *Lectures on the principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church: delivered at St. Mary's Moorfields during the Lent of 1836*; available at: <http://archive.org/details/a615349800wiseuoft>.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 101.

Newman believed this process was sound when used with limitations and the conclusion was true in its degree. What really concerned him was the Roman Church's "subjecting divine truth to the intellect, and professing to take a complete survey and to make a map of it."¹²⁸ Thus, the real problem was that Roman teaching by its profession of infallibility lowered the standard and quality of Gospel obedience and impaired its mysterious and sacred character in various ways. "When religion is reduced in all its parts to a system, there is hazard of something earthly being made the chief object of our contemplation instead of our Maker."¹²⁹ "The purest religious services are those which are done, not by constraint, but voluntarily, as a free offering to Almighty God."¹³⁰ Thus, Newman found in the Roman system that "there would seem to be little room for this unconscious devotion."¹³¹ Accordingly, he concluded:

If, indeed, there is one characteristic which above others attaches to Roman teaching, it is this, its indulging the carnal tastes of the multitude of men, setting a limit to their necessary obedience, and absolving them from the duty of sacrificing their whole lives to God. And this serious deceit is in no small degree the necessary consequence of that completeness and minuteness in its theology to which the doctrine of Infallibility gives rise.¹³²

Rather than attempting an in-depth discussion of infallibility, Newman differentiated between the Roman and Anglican views. In their abstract and professed

¹²⁸ Ibid., 102.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ "There are certain duties which are indispensable in all Christians, but their limits are left undefined, as if to try our faith and love. . . . This is the true Christian liberty, not the prerogative of obeying God, or not, as we please, but the opportunity of obeying Him more strictly without formal commandment" (ibid., 102-103).

¹³¹ "And Christian holiness, in consequence, loses its freshness, vigour, and comeliness, being frozen (as it were) into certain attitudes, which are not graceful except when they are unstudied" (ibid., 104).

¹³² Ibid., 104-105.

principles, both systems were often the same, but in practice, the doctrine of infallibility created a wide and serious difference between them:

. . . in the Roman Church having adopted a minute, technical, and peremptory theology, which is no part of Revelation, and which produces a number of serious moral evils, . . . and dangerous to the Christian spirit, as encouraging us to ask for more than is given us, as fostering irreverence and presumption, confidence in our reason, and a formal or carnal view of Christian obedience.¹³³

Newman asserted that if the intention of Rome were to teach moral truth, then certainly she had failed; but if her “one and supreme end is to rule the human mind” then “she is most happy in her religious system.”¹³⁴ He was particularly harsh in his fourth lecture, “Doctrine of Infallibility Politically Considered”:

Now the Church of Rome is a political power; and, if she stunts, or distorts the growth of the soul in spiritual excellence, it is because, whether unconsciously or not, she has in view political objects, visible fruits, temporal expediency, the power of influencing the heart, as the supreme aim and scope of her system; because she considers unity, peace, the public confession of the truth, sovereignty, empire, the one practical end for which the Church is formed, the one necessary condition of those other and unknown benefits, whatever these be, which lie beyond it in the next world.¹³⁵

According to Newman, the consequence of the doctrine of infallibility—including its neglect of the Fathers, its abstract reasoning and its attention to system—were conducive to the political character of the Roman system but they morally separated Rome from the Anglican creed. What was morally disadvantageous to Rome was politically a gain.¹³⁶

¹³³ Ibid., 105.

¹³⁴ “Truth in its highest and purest form, like a prophet or philosopher, by her very beauty of holiness and the unconscious rhetoric of her own earnestness drawing up souls to her, rather than by any elaborate device. . . .” (ibid., 106).

¹³⁵ Ibid., 106-107.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 107.

First of all, Roman theologians' "political temper is the cause of their treating the Ancient Fathers with the rudeness and recklessness which has been instanced",¹³⁷ "Rome considers it better to supersede them with fresh luminaries, than doubtingly and painfully to use them."¹³⁸ "Thus while the highest truths remain in those writings immutable, to develop and apply them duly in particulars, is the work of much delicacy, and gives an opening to ingenious perversions of their meaning."¹³⁹

Secondly, Roman theologians had been jealous of the Fathers because they "dreaded the range and complication of materials, when thus made the body of proof, which from the nature of the case might as easily be made a handle for the errors of others, as a touchstone of their own."¹⁴⁰ Anglicans, in contrast, said Newman, took a different but balanced approach:

We, for our part, have been taught to consider that in its degree faith, as well as conduct, must be guided by probabilities, and that doubt is ever our portion in this life. We can bear to confess that other systems have their unanswerable arguments in matters of detail, and that we are but striking a balance between difficulties existing on both sides; that we are following as the voice of God, what on the whole we have reason to think such. We are not bent (to God be the praise!) on proselytizing, organizing, and ruling as the end of life and the summum bonum of a Christian community, but have brought ourselves to give our testimony "whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear," and then to leave the matter to God.¹⁴¹

Newman went so far as to assert that "the advocates of Romanism would easily be reconciled to the loss of all the Fathers, that as far as they agreed with Rome, they were

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 107-108.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 108.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 108-109. Newman did not give any references for these Anglican positions.

superfluous, and where they disagreed, dangerous.”¹⁴² Roman theologians destroyed the Fathers’ writings “by lodging the gift of Infallibility in the Pope rather than in a General Council.”¹⁴³ While conceding that “Principles do often lie hid in single instances [in the texts of Scripture], resemblances argue connexion, and abstract truths admit of development. . . . such a line of proof whatever it merits, is safe,—is necessary for the Romanist,”¹⁴⁴ still he knew:

Religion is too serious a subject to be made to rest on our own inferences and examinations, when it can be settled in any other possible way; and especially when it is to be settled authoritatively for others. It is quite allowable indeed, or rather a duty to deduce from Scripture for ourselves, when we have no other guide; but to enforce such deductions upon others is plainly unjustifiable.¹⁴⁵

In order to avoid misconception, Newman thought it was appropriate to “have clear authority for such inferences, beyond ourselves.”¹⁴⁶ However, the Roman practice of abstract reasoning and the neglect of the Fathers seemed measures of political expediency. Such defects were both the necessary result and the main evidence of Rome’s claim to infallibility:

Rome claims to be infallible; she dispenses with the Fathers, and relies upon abstract reasoning, because she is infallible; but how does she prove she is so? To speak simply, she does not prove it at all. At least, she does not prove it argumentatively, but she acts upon the assumption, she acts as if she were infallible, and in this way persuades the imaginations of men into a belief of her really being so. Perhaps it may be asked, why her theologians claim for her at all

¹⁴² Newman had in mind only the “hardened controversialists,” not Roman Catholics in general (*ibid.*, 110).

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ “Whether, then, abstract arguments be in the particular case sound or not, at least they are unanswerable, and for that reason are peculiarly necessary for an authority that claims infallibility” (*ibid.*, 111).

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 112.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 112-115.

an infallibility, which they cannot prove,—why they are not satisfied she should act as if she possessed it?¹⁴⁷

In effect, “Rome is content to sacrifice logical completeness to secure practical influence.”¹⁴⁸ Rome’s use of the doctrine of infallibility as a symbol or strong maxim emphasized the fact that “the Church is the divinely appointed keeper and teacher of the truth”; however, it scarcely produced “a formal proof of its own truth, being rather a dogma serviceable in practice, though extravagant in theory.”¹⁴⁹

According to Roman theologians, it was the Church that professed infallibility: “She rids herself of competitors by forestalling them” and “she alone of all Churches dares claim it.”¹⁵⁰ Though “it subserves her political purposes,” Newman found “it is but fulfilling her theory; it is but showing herself to be what she claims to be.”¹⁵¹ Since Rome had the gift of infallibility, her various judgments, however unpremeditated, were consistent with each other. Thus, she dressed up a theology in hope that the artificial show of consistency would be taken in evidence of truth.¹⁵² Rome claimed the right to complete the revealed notices of truth and so increased her influence. The doctrines of Penance, Purgatory, and Indulgences were instances “to show how the completeness and consistency of the Roman system tend to create a belief in its Infallibility.”¹⁵³

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 115-116.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 116.

¹⁴⁹ “The human mind wishes to be rid of doubt in religion; and a teacher who claims infallibility is readily believed on his simple word” (ibid., 117).

¹⁵⁰ “Her consistent carrying out of her assumed principle forms a sufficient argument that she has a right to it” (ibid., 117-118).

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 118.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 122.

Newman claimed that not only was the doctrine of infallibility defective in respect to proof, but also in its theory, for two main reasons: 1) “Roman theologians, though claiming for the Church the gift of Infallibility, cannot even in theory give an answer to the question how individuals are to know for certain that she is infallible.”¹⁵⁴ 2) They do not say “where the gift resides” and they “neither determine who or what is infallible, or why.”¹⁵⁵ They attempted to solve this difficulty by boldly maintaining that Christians received such an unerring perception of the whole circle of their doctrines through the Sacrament of Baptism. In response, Newman noted that “it is not an argument tending to prove the point in dispute.”¹⁵⁶ This abstract difficulty was “small compared with that attendant on the seat of infallibility claimed by Romanism.”¹⁵⁷ In fact, Romanists did not agree among themselves where infallibility, the key-stone of their system, was lodged.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Newman claimed that the Romanists insist on “the *necessity* of an infallible guide in religious matters,” but do not explain “how individuals are to know with certainty that Rome *is* infallible” or “what is the particular ground on which her infallibility rests” or “how any ground can be such as to bring home to the mind infallibly that she is infallible.” Newman then added: “what conceivable proof amounts to more than a probability of the fact;—and what advantage is an infallible guide, if those who are to be guided have, after all, no more than an opinion, as the Romanists call it, that she is infallible” (ibid., 122).

¹⁵⁶ “If such inward infallibility be requisite, it were a more simple theory, like enthusiasts, to dispense with the external. . . . We know there are individuals among Protestants who consider themselves to be infallibly taught by a divine light, but such a claim is never taken as a proof that they are favoured in the way they suppose. To consider that Baptism gives this infallible discernment of the infallible guide, is to shift the difficulty, not to solve it” (ibid., 123).

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ According to Newman, Bellarmine observed “by way of meeting this difficulty, that all Romanists are agreed on two points; first, that wherever the infallibility lies, at least the Pope in General Council is infallible; next, that even out of General Council when he speaks *ex Cathedrâ*, he is to be obeyed (for safety’s sake, I suppose,) ”

For Newman, “it is a great inconsistency in it, being what it is, that is, engaging as it does to furnish us with infallible teaching and to supersede inquiry.”¹⁵⁹ He summarized the political difficulties with the doctrine of infallibility:

Roman theology first professes a common ground with ourselves, a readiness to stand or fall by Antiquity. When we appeal to Antiquity accordingly, it shifts its ground, substituting for Ancient Testimony abstract arguments. If we question its abstract arguments, it falls back on its infallibility. If we ask for the proof of its infallibility, it can but attempt to overpower the imagination by its attempt at system, by the boldness, decision, consistency, and completeness with which it urges and acts upon its claim. Yet in this very system, thus ambitious of completeness, we are able to detect one or two serious flaws in the theory of the very doctrine which that system seems intended to sustain.¹⁶⁰

5. The Use of Private Judgment

Newman began his fifth lecture “On the Use of Private Judgment” with a descriptive definition: “By the right of Private Judgment in matters of religious belief and practice, is ordinarily meant the prerogative, considered to belong to each individual

whether really infallible or not” (ibid., 123). Newman continued: “Archbishop Bramhall reckons no less than six distinct opinions on the subject; some Romanists lodging the gift in the Pope speaking *ex Cathedrâ*, others in the Pope in council of Cardinals, others in the Pope in General or Provincial Council, others in the General Council without the Pope, others in the Church Diffusive, that is, the whole company of believers throughout the world” (ibid., 124). Newman added that the theologians of Rome “can determine in theory the nature, degree, extent, and object of the infallibility which they claim; they cannot agree among themselves where it resides . . .” (ibid., 125-126). John Bramhall (1594-1663), an Anglican theologian, was Anglican Archbishop of Armagh.

¹⁵⁹ “After all, then, the baptismal illumination does not secure the very benefit which occasions Roman theologians to refer to it. They claim for it a power which in truth, according to their own confession, does nothing at all for them” (ibid., 125). Newman thought that “granting that infallibility resides in the Pope in Council, yet it is not a matter of faith, that is, it has not been formally determined what Popes have been true Popes; which of the many *de facto*, or rival Popes, are to be acknowledged; nor again which of the many professed General Councils are really so” (ibid.); “such uncertainty as to the limits of Divine Revelation, is no antecedent objection to the truth of the Roman system; it might be the appointed trial of our faith and earnestness” (ibid.).

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 126.

Christian, of ascertaining and deciding for himself from Scripture what is Gospel truth, and what is not.”¹⁶¹ While Romanists held that “nothing is absolutely left to individual judgment” and that “there is no subject in religious faith and conduct on which the Church may not pronounce a decision,” many Protestants considered private judgment “as a sort of sacred possession or palladium.”¹⁶² Between these contrary positions, Newman said, the Church of England followed a middle course:

It considers that on certain definite subjects private judgment upon the text of Scripture has been superseded, but not by the mere authoritative sentence of the Church, but by its historical testimony delivered down from the Apostles. To these definite subjects nothing more can be added, unless, indeed, new records of primitive Christianity, or new uninterrupted traditions of its teaching were discoverable.¹⁶³

Nonetheless, Newman added, the *via media* of the English Church cannot be easily understood because: 1) “it is a mean, and has in consequence a complex nature, involving a combination of principles, and depending on multiplied conditions”,¹⁶⁴ 2) “it partakes of that indeterminateness which . . . is to a certain extent a characteristic of English theology”,¹⁶⁵ 3) “it has never been realized in visible fullness in any religious community, and thereby brought home to the mind through the senses.”¹⁶⁶ Since the *via media* has not been operational and lies open to various objections and suspicions, some

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 128.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 128-129.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 129.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

considered it a “mere theory or fancy.”¹⁶⁷ Accordingly, Newman wanted to describe the Anglican doctrine of private judgment first in theory and then in practice.

In regard to the theoretical notion of private judgment, said Newman, all would agree that “without private judgment there is no responsibility” and that “a man’s own mind, and nothing else, is the cause of his believing or not believing, and of his acting or not acting upon his belief.”¹⁶⁸ Even if “an infallible guidance be accorded, a man must have a choice of resisting it or not.”¹⁶⁹ Both Roman Catholics and Protestants would agree regarding “the means which are to direct our choice, and what is the due manner of using them.”¹⁷⁰ We have been given both internal and external means to form a judgment. The internal means, he elucidated, included common sense, natural perception of right and wrong, the sympathy of the affections, exercises of the imagination, reason, and the like. The external means included Scripture, the existing Church, Tradition, Catholicity, Learning, Antiquity, and the National Faith.¹⁷¹

Newman pointed out that popular Protestantism had made an arbitrary decision to eliminate all these external means except the text of Holy Scripture on the assumption that when God speaks by Inspiration, all other external means are superseded.¹⁷²

Rejecting this view, Newman traced the order in which all the external means address

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 130.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 130-131.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 131.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Ibid.

themselves to the minds of individuals.¹⁷³ As the Sacraments are God's imperceptible means of changing the soul, He employs the external means as His instruments to teach, try, convert and advance the mind. God has given these gifts differently in different circumstances:

To the greater part of the world He has given but three of them, Conscience, Reason, and National Religion; to a great part of Christendom He gives no external guidance but through the Church; to others only the Scriptures; to others both Church and Scriptures Few are able to add the knowledge of Christian Antiquity; the first centuries of Christianity enjoyed the light of Catholicity, an informant which is now partially withdrawn from us.¹⁷⁴

Newman was bold enough to assert that Roman Catholics would simplify matters by removing Reason, Scripture and Antiquity and depend mainly upon Church authority.¹⁷⁵ However, a true Catholic, he said, is one "who takes what God has given him, be it greater or less, does not despise the lesser because he has received the greater, yet puts it not before the greater, but uses all duly and to God's glory."¹⁷⁶ Newman admitted that it is always difficult to combine these several means of gaining Divine Truth and integrating the information gained from each. What comes from God must be

¹⁷³ "Our parents and teachers are our first informants concerning the next world By degrees they resign their place to the religious communion, or Church, in which we find ourselves, while the inward habits of truth and holiness which the moral sense has begun to form, react upon that inward monitor, enlarge its range, and make its dictates articulate, decisive, and various. Meantime the Scriptures have been added as fresh informants, bearing witness to the Church and to the moral sense, and interpreted by them both. Last of all, where there is time and opportunity for research into times past and present, Christian Antiquity, and Christendom, as it at present exists, become additional informants, giving substance and shape to much that before existed in our minds only in outline and shadow" (ibid., 131-132).

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 132.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 133.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

one and the same but because of our infirmity it seems to differ from itself.¹⁷⁷ In order to avoid these extremes, Newman proposed:

- (1) That Scripture, Antiquity, and Catholicity cannot really contradict one another;
- (2) That when the Moral Sense or the Reason of the individual seems to be on one side, and Scripture on the other, we must follow Scripture, except Scripture anywhere contained contradictions in terms, or prescribed undeniable crimes, which it never does;
- (3) That when the sense of Scripture, as interpreted by the Reason of the individual, is contrary to the sense given to it by Catholic Antiquity, we ought to side with the latter;
- (4) That when Antiquity runs counter to the present Church in important matters, we must follow Antiquity; when in unimportant matters, we must follow the present Church;
- (5) That when the present Church speaks contrary to our private notions, and Antiquity is silent, or its decisions unknown to us, it is pious to sacrifice our own opinion to that of the Church;
- (6) That if, in spite of our efforts to agree with the Church, we still differ from it, Antiquity being silent, we must avoid causing any disturbance, recollecting that the Church, and not individuals, “has authority in controversies of faith.”¹⁷⁸

According to Newman, everyone must begin religion by faith and not by controversy, even if the teaching contains a mixture of error: one must begin by obeying.¹⁷⁹ Then as the mind expands by years and education, a number of additional informants will meet it and naturally ought “to exercise itself upon all of these, by way of finding out God’s perfect truth.”¹⁸⁰ “The Christian will study Scripture and Antiquity, as well as the doctrine of his own Church; and may perhaps, in some points of detail, differ

¹⁷⁷ “Even our senses seem at first to contradict each other In like manner, Conscience and Reason sometimes seem at variance, and then we either call what appears to be reason sophistry, or what appears to be conscience weakness or superstition” (ibid., 134).

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 134-135.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 136.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

from its teaching; but, even if eventually he differs, he will not therefore put himself forward, wrangle, protest, or separate from it.”¹⁸¹ Generally, “under whatever system a man finds himself, he is bound to accept it as if infallible, and to act upon it in a confiding spirit, till he finds a better, or in course of time has cause to suspect it.”¹⁸²

The Roman controversialists held that if the right of free judgment upon the text of Scripture were allowed, it would lead to various discordant opinions and “they will fancy they have found out a more Scriptural system even than that of the Church Catholic itself.”¹⁸³ Newman disagreed¹⁸⁴ and was convinced that “not only Scriptures have but one direct and unchangeable sense, but that it is such as in all greater matters to make a forcible appeal to the mind, when fairly put before it, and to impress it with a conviction of its being the true one.”¹⁸⁵ “Little of systematic knowledge as Scripture may impart to ordinary readers, still what it does convey may surely tend in one direction and not in another. What it imparts may look towards the system of the Church and of Antiquity, not oppose it.”¹⁸⁶

The Romanist “continually argued with individuals from Scripture, even in proof of this very doctrine of the Church’s Infallibility, which would be out of place unless the

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 136-137.

¹⁸² Ibid., 138.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Anglican divines noticed some of the expressions and statements made by Roman Catholic writers: “the Scriptures are worth no more than Esop’s fables without the Church’s authority”; “they are like a nose of wax which admits of being pulled and moulded one way and another” (ibid.).

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 138-139.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 139.

passages appealed to bore their own meaning with them.”¹⁸⁷ Newman urged Romanists who confessed that the real sense of Scripture is not adverse to any doctrine taught by the Church, that “it is also the natural sense, as separable from false interpretations by the sound-judging, as a good argument is from a bad one.”¹⁸⁸ Accordingly, “no harm can come from putting the Scripture into the hands of the laity, allowing them, if they will, to verify by it, as far as it extends, the doctrines they have been taught already.”¹⁸⁹ At the same time, the argument could be easily negated by the existence of all kinds of heresies and extravagances that resulted from the general reading of the Bible.

Newman believed that the main reason for heresies and sects was “that the Church’s voice is not heard clearly and forcibly; she does not exercise her own right of interpreting Scripture; she does not arbitrate, decide, condemn; she does not answer the call which human nature makes upon her.”¹⁹⁰ Therefore, Newman wanted a Church, nurtured and trained, “claiming the obedience of its members in the first instance, though laying itself open afterwards to their judgment, according to their respective capabilities for judging.”¹⁹¹ He wanted a Church “claiming for itself that they make a generous and unsuspicious trial of it before objecting to it, and able to appeal confidently for its doctrines to the writings of Antiquity.”¹⁹² He wanted “a Church which taught the Truth

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 140.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Ibid., 140-141.

boldly and in system, and which separated from itself or silenced those who opposed it.”¹⁹³

Newman supported the free reading of Scripture. “When the other parts of the Divine System are duly fulfilled,” he told his audience, “would lead, at most, to diversities of opinion only in the adjuncts and details of faith, not in fundamentals.”¹⁹⁴ He was confident that “Truth has a force which error cannot counterfeit; and the Church, speaking out that Truth, as committed to her, would cause a corresponding vibration in Holy Scripture, such as no other notes, however loudly sounded, can draw from it.”¹⁹⁵ Only God “who alone sees the hearts of men and how mysteriously good and evil are mingled together in this world, would provide in His own inscrutable way for anomalies which His revealed system did not meet.”¹⁹⁶

Newman then insisted on the Anglican *via media* “that however difficult it may be in theory to determine when it is that we must go by our own view of Scripture, and when by the decision of the Church, yet in practice there would be little or no difficulty at all.”¹⁹⁷ “Without claiming infallibility, the Church may claim the confidence and obedience of her members.”¹⁹⁸ “Scripture may be read without tending to schism; minor differences allowed, without disagreement in fundamentals; and the proud and self-willed

¹⁹³ Ibid., 141.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 142.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 142-143.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 143.

disputant discarded without the perplexed inquirer suffering.”¹⁹⁹ If there were schism, “it is not that Scripture speaks variously, but that the Church of the day speaks not at all; not that Private Judgment is rebellious, but that the Church’s judgment is withheld.”²⁰⁰

Newman concluded his fifth lecture: “I do really believe that, with more of primitive simplicity and of rational freedom, and far more of Gospel truth than in the Roman system, there would be found in the rule of Private Judgment, as I have described it, as much certainty as the doctrine of Infallibility can give.”²⁰¹ He then added:

The claim of Infallibility is but an expedient for impressing strongly upon the mind the necessity of hearing and obeying the Church. When scrutinized carefully, it will be found to contribute nothing whatever towards satisfying the reason, as was observed before; since it is as difficult to prove and bring home to the mind that the Church is infallible, as that the doctrines she teaches are true.²⁰²

6. The Abuse of Private Judgment

Newman began his sixth lecture, “On the Abuse of Private Judgment,” by commenting on the popular view of private judgment: “every Christian has the right of making up his mind for himself what he is to believe, from personal and private study of the Scriptures.”²⁰³ Newman also noted that there are impediments to correct use of private judgment: “all may search Scripture and determine or prove their Creed from it—that is, provided they are duly qualified.”²⁰⁴ The inability to read would be an obvious obstacle in the exercise of private judgment; however, there were other less

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Ibid., 144.

²⁰³ Ibid., 145.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 145-146.

obvious but quite serious impediments: “first, prejudice, in the large sense of the word, whether right or wrong prejudice, and whether true or false in its matter,—and secondly, inaccuracy of mind.”²⁰⁵

First, Newman elaborated on inaccuracy of mind as an impediment: “The task proposed is such as this,—to determine first, whether Scripture sets forth any dogmatic faith at all; next, if so, what it is; then, if it be necessary for salvation; then, what are its doctrines in particular; then, what is that exact idea of each, which is the essence of each and its saving principle.”²⁰⁶ Newman thought that “the mass of Christians are inadequate to such a task” and even the greater number of educated persons does not have the accuracy of mind requisite for determining it.²⁰⁷ Since “every Christian is bound to have as accurate notions as he can, many a man is capable of receiving more accurate and complete notions than he can gather for himself from the Bible.”²⁰⁸ However, “it is one thing to apprehend the Catholic doctrines but quite another to ascertain how and where they are implied in Scripture.”²⁰⁹ Though “orthodoxy in its fullest range is the one and only sense of Scripture,” most Christians perusing Scripture by themselves would not have that “nice and delicate critical power” which will prevent them from mistakes.²¹⁰ To “maintain that the mass of Christians are bound to draw the orthodox faith for

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 146.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 146-147.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 147.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 149.

²⁰⁹ “Most men of fair education can understand the sacred doctrine debated at Nicea, as fully as a professed theologian; but few have minds tutored into patient inquiry, attention, and accuracy sufficient to deduce it aright from Scripture” (ibid., 149).

²¹⁰ Ibid., 149-150.

themselves from Scripture” is “to hold an unreal doctrine” and “such Private Judgment is a weapon which destroys error by the sacrifice of truth.”²¹¹

Secondly, Newman considered the effect of prejudice in disqualifying us from searching Scripture dispassionately for ourselves.²¹² Scripture is not so distinct and prominent as to force itself upon the minds of the many against their various prejudices.²¹³ The detailed explanations given by Protestants of specific texts of Scripture often involve inconsistency and want of intelligible principle: “It is very observable how a latent prejudice can act in obscuring or rather annihilating certain passages of Scripture in the mental vision, which are ever so prominently presented to the bodily eyes.”²¹⁴ This is because “they have made up their minds already what the Gospel is.”²¹⁵ Many bring their prejudices and impressions to the written word or in other words, “they think inaccurately; they judge and feel by prejudice.”²¹⁶ Consequently there is “extreme inconsistency in the popular mode of interpreting Scripture.”²¹⁷

Since “Scripture is sometimes literal and sometimes figurative,” Newman thought that “in many cases, the only way of determining when it is one and when the other, is to

²¹¹ Ibid., 150.

²¹² Ibid., 151.

²¹³ “Nor do they prove that all prejudice is wrong;” (ibid., 151).

²¹⁴ Ibid., 154. Newman also claimed that Unitarians have “a preconceived notion in their minds that the substance of the Gospel lies in the doctrine of the Resurrection. This doctrine is their Christianity, their orthodoxy; it contains in it, as they think, the essence of the Revelation” (ibid., 155).

²¹⁵ Ibid., 156.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 157.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 153.

see how the early Church understood it.”²¹⁸ Accordingly, he insisted on the Anglo-Catholic principle: “we do not profess to judge of Scripture in greater matters by itself, but by means of an external guide.”²¹⁹ In contrast, the popular religion of the day “rebels against the voice of Antiquity” and “becomes the victim of prejudice and a slave to Traditions of men.”²²⁰

It is “not that Scripture has no one meaning in matters of doctrine, or that we do not know it, or that a man of high qualifications may not elicit it, but that the mass of men, if left to themselves, will not possess the faculty of reading it naturally and truly.”²²¹ Newman did not deny, but rather conceded that “a religious, wise, and intellectually gifted man will succeed: but who answers to this description but the collective Church?”²²² For him, the “Church Catholic, the true Prophet of God, alone is able to tell the dream and its interpretation.”²²³

Thirdly, Newman examined the argument that “though Scripture may seem to mean anything in matters of faith to unassisted reason, yet that under the guidance of divine illumination it speaks but one doctrine, and is thus the instrument of the Holy

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Ibid., 153-154.

²²¹ Ibid., 154. For Newman, if “Scripture is not so distinct in its announcements,” it is because “Scripture was never intended to teach doctrine to the many”; accordingly, Newman “would not deny as an abstract proposition that a Christian may gain the whole truth from the Scriptures, but would maintain that the chances are very seriously against a given individual” (ibid., 158).

²²² Ibid.

²²³ “The Church Catholic may be truly said almost infallibly to interpret Scripture aright, though from the possession of past tradition, and amid the divisions of the time present, perhaps at no period in the course of the Dispensation has she had the need and the opportunity of interpreting it for herself” (ibid., 159).

Ghost in converting the soul.”²²⁴ In contrast, Popular Protestantism held: “Scripture is the only divine instrument given us; that everything else is human.”²²⁵ For these Protestants, “to inquire about the early Church, the consent of Fathers, uninterrupted testimonies, or the decisions of Councils, to inquire when the Church first became corrupt, or to make the early writers a comment upon the inspired text, are but melancholy and pernicious follies.”²²⁶ In effect, these Protestants devalued the Church: “The Church, according to this view of it, is not, and never was, more than a collection of individuals.”²²⁷

For these Protestants, the “Apostolic Church was not better than the present, nor is of more weight and authority; it was a human system, and an aggregate of fallible men, and such is the length and the breadth of the whole matter.”²²⁸ This Protestant belief was “perfect as a theory” and “it is consistent with itself.”²²⁹ “As Baptismal grace is supposed by Roman Catholics to convey to individuals the evidence of their Church’s Infallibility,” so “a similar divine influence, but not in Baptism, is supposed, according to this popular form of Protestantism, to assure the soul without proof that the Bible is the only instrument of divine knowledge.”²³⁰

²²⁴ Ibid., 159-160.

²²⁵ Ibid., 160.

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Ibid.

²²⁹ Ibid., 161.

²³⁰ Ibid.

Newman observed that Protestants of this outlook “may witness for truth and yet act against it.”²³¹ He also believed that “the concordant assent of Christendom to doctrines so severe and high as the Christian Mysteries, is no slight argument in favour of their Apostolic origin.”²³² “If indeed full information had been promised to individuals from private study of the text of the Scriptures, this indeed might be a reason for dispensing with Antiquity, whatever was its value.”²³³ The doctrine that Scripture was sufficient for teaching the faith failed the Fathers, who are their sole, albeit insufficient resource: “To maintain that the Fathers cannot be trusted, does not prove that one’s own private judgment can be” and “positive reasons are necessary for so serious a claim.”²³⁴

Newman agreed that, with the help of the Holy Spirit that is given to all who ask, we ought to search the Scriptures that contain all saving doctrine. However, he acknowledged that “yet there may not be such connexion between these separate propositions as to make it true that men are led by the Holy Spirit into saving truth through the Scriptures.”²³⁵ Accordingly, he proposed three tenets:

First, “There are texts which bid us ask wisdom of God, and promise that it will be granted. It is true; but this does not show that the private reading of Scripture is the

²³¹ Ibid., 162.

²³² Ibid.

²³³ “Fallible men then may convey truth infallible [sic]; human systems may be instruments of heaven. And he who feels his ignorance will seek for light wherever he can obtain it; he will not prescribe rules to God’s providence; he will not say, ‘Instruct me by inspired oracles or not at all’” (ibid).

²³⁴ Ibid., 163.

²³⁵ Ibid., 164.

one essential requisite for gaining it.”²³⁶ But “[Christ] includes the Church, which is called by St. Paul ‘the pillar and ground of the Truth.’ Our Service applies our Lord’s promise to seeking God in Baptism, and as He may include the use of the Sacraments in seeking, so may He include the use of Catholic teaching.”²³⁷

Second, “no Christian can doubt that without divine grace we cannot discern the sense of Scripture profitably; but it does not follow from this that with it we can gain everything from Scripture, or that the ‘wisdom unto salvation,’ which we thence gain, is theological knowledge.”²³⁸ For Newman, the “grace of God seems to be promised us chiefly for practical purposes, for enabling us to receive what we receive, whatever it is, doctrine or precept, or from whatever quarter, profitably, with a lively faith, with love and zeal.”²³⁹

Third, “there are texts which recite the various purposes for which Scripture is useful; but it does not follow thence that no medium is necessary for its becoming useful to individuals.”²⁴⁰

Newman reached three conclusions in regards to the theory of private judgment:

- 1) “there is neither natural probability, nor supernatural promise, that individuals reading Scripture for themselves, to the neglect of other means when they can have them, will, because they pray for a blessing, be necessarily led into a knowledge of the true and

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid., 165.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Ibid., 165-166.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 166-167.

complete faith of a Christian.”²⁴¹ 2) “the popular theory of rejecting all other helps and reading the Bible only, though in most cases maintained merely through ignorance, is yet in itself presumptuous.”²⁴² 3) a main reason to maintain the notion that truth of doctrine can be gained from Scripture by individuals is that they are unwilling to be led by others blindfolded: “They can possess and read the Scriptures; whereas of Traditions they are no adequate judges, and they dread priestcraft.”²⁴³ Therefore, he proposed the works of the Fathers as a guide.²⁴⁴

Since most of the errors that were connected with Scripture were mentioned by the Fathers of the Church, Newman dedicated his seventh lecture—“Instances of the Abuse of Private Judgment”—to considering instances of abuse of Private Judgment; some examples came from Patristic history and some from the history of Roman theology.²⁴⁵ He mentioned the baptismal controversy in which St. Cyprian held that “persons baptized by heretical clergy, must, on being reconciled to the Church, be re-baptized, or rather that their former Baptism was invalid.”²⁴⁶ In addition, “Arianism certainly professed in its day to be a scriptural religion.”²⁴⁷ Another instance is St. Austin, who was generally known among the ancient Fathers as “the Master of

²⁴¹ Ibid., 167.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 168-169.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 169-170.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 171.

Predestinarianism, that is, of the theological opinion that certain persons are irreversibly ordained to persevere unto eternal life.”²⁴⁸

In addition, there are the two tenets of Romanism which Protestants of every denomination would agree in condemning: Purgatory and the Pope’s supremacy. The existence of the Roman doctrine of Purgatory “is owing to a like indulgence of human reason and of private judgment upon Scripture, in default of Catholic Tradition.”²⁴⁹ However, Newman explained the possible concerns that led to this doctrine and “the universal and apparently Apostolical custom of praying for the dead in Christ.”²⁵⁰ The doctrine of the Pope’s universal bishopric is “an error introduced professedly on grounds of Scripture without the safeguard of Catholic Tradition.”²⁵¹ Newman cited the testimonies of two popes, St. Gregory the Great in the sixth century and Pius II in the fifteenth century: the former “shall witness that it was not a Catholic doctrine, the latter that it was founded on the wrong interpretation of Scripture.”²⁵²

7. The Indefectibility of the Church

In his eighth lecture—“The Indefectibility of the Church,”—Newman found no discord in the respective claims of the Church and Private Judgment in the abstract. On the one hand, the Church accepts Apostolical Tradition as the doctrinal key to Scripture; on the other hand, Private Judgment expatiates beyond the limits of that Tradition: each

²⁴⁸ “He was engaged in controversy with the Pelagians, and it is supposed, that, in withstanding them, he was hurried into the opposite extreme” (ibid., 171).

²⁴⁹ Ibid., 179-180.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 174-175; see also 180.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 180-181.

²⁵² Ibid., 183-185.

acts in its own province and is responsible within it.²⁵³ The Church Catholic is not only bound to teach the Truth, but is also divinely guided to teach it. Her witness of Faith is a matter of promise as well as of duty. Her discernment of Faith is secured by a heavenly as well as a human rule: “She is indefectible in it, and therefore not only has authority to enforce, but also is of authority in declaring it.”²⁵⁴

The “Church not only transmits the faith by human means, but has a supernatural gift for that purpose” and the “doctrine, which is true, considered as an historical fact, is true also because she teaches it.”²⁵⁵ Newman cited two passages in Anglican formularies as proof:

First, the twentieth of the Thirty-nine Article speaks of the Anglican Church having “authority in controversies of faith.”²⁵⁶ For Newman, these words did not merely mean that the Church has authority to enforce historically approved apostolic doctrines, but also that she has “authority in controversies.”²⁵⁷ Accordingly, the Church has “a power which individuals have not,” a “power not merely as the ruling principle of a society to admit and reject members” and “not simply a power of imposing tests, but simply authority in controversies of faith.”²⁵⁸ “Matters of doctrine are not like matters of usage or custom, founded on expedience, and determinable by discretion. They appeal to

²⁵³ Ibid., 189-190.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 190.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 191.

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

the conscience, and the conscience is subject to Truth alone.”²⁵⁹ Accordingly, Newman argued:

To say the Church has authority, and yet is not true, as far as she has authority, were to destroy liberty of conscience, which Protestantism in all its forms holds especially sacred; it were to substitute something besides Truth as the sovereign lord of conscience, which would be tyranny. If this Protestant principle is not surrendered in the Article, which no one supposes it to be, the Church is to a certain point there set forth as the organ or representative of Truth and its teaching is identified with it.²⁶⁰

Second, Newman considered the Anglican reception of the Athanasian Creed as another proof of the infallibility of the Church in matters of saving faith.²⁶¹ In the Athanasian Creed, “it is unhesitatingly said, that certain doctrines are necessary to be believed in order to salvation,” “they are minutely and precisely described” and “no room is left for Private Judgment” for examining Scripture to discover them.²⁶² “Next, if we inquire the ground of this authority in the Church, the Creed answers that the Church speaks merely as the organ of the Catholic voice, and that the faith thus witnessed, is, as being thus witnessed, such, that whoso does not believe it faithfully, cannot be saved.”²⁶³ Newman then claimed that “Catholic” and “saving” were taken as synonymous terms; “in other words, the Church Catholic is pronounced to have been all along, and by

²⁵⁹ “It recognizes and follows nothing but what comes to it with the profession of Truth” (ibid., 191).

²⁶⁰ Ibid.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 192.

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Ibid.

implication as destined ever to be, the guardian of the pure and undefiled faith, or to be indefectible in that faith.”²⁶⁴

Obviously, there is no inconsistency in saying, first, “that Scripture contains the Saving Faith; and, next, that the Church Catholic has, by a Divine gift, ever preached it.”²⁶⁵ However, Newman found “it would be inconsistent to say, first, that the Church Catholic has ever preached the Saving Faith; next, that each individual is allowed to draw his Faith for himself from Scripture.”²⁶⁶ “We do not, therefore, set up the Church against Scripture, but we make her the keeper and interpreter of Scripture. And Scripture itself contains what may be called her charter to be such.”²⁶⁷ Newman then pointed to many texts that described the Church as “the pillar and ground of the Truth”.²⁶⁸

[T]he Church is declared to be the great and special support of the Truth, her various functionaries are said to be means towards the settlement of diversities and of uncertainty of doctrine, and securing unity of faith; and a direct promise is vouchsafed to her that the word of Truth committed to her shall never be lost, and that, in consequence of the ever-present care and guidance of the Holy Ghost.²⁶⁹

Newman also claimed that the scriptural texts he used were considered by Roman theologians to prove the infallibility of the Church in all matters of faith and general morals. He wondered: “if only a visible Church can be a stay and maintenance of the Truth, and if therefore a visible Church is spoken of in this passage, let us reflect how

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 192-193.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 193.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

high an office, how august and magnificent a privilege is there assigned her.”²⁷⁰ He found that both Romanists and Protestants resisted the interpretations of Anglican Divines: “The Protestant of the day considers them to mean nothing; the Romanist sees in them the doctrine of the Church’s abiding and continuous Infallibility.”²⁷¹ The Anglican *via media* was opposed by both the Romanists and the Protestants.²⁷² However, Newman wanted to show that for Anglicans, “the distinctive peculiarities are not matters of words and names, but are realities.”²⁷³

According to Newman, “the Christian Church will ever retain what is called in Scripture ‘the Faith,’ the substance or great outlines of the Gospel as taught by the Apostles, (whatever they are,—which is not the question at present,) and that, in consequence of the Scripture promise that the word of God shall never depart out of her mouth.”²⁷⁴ However, for Roman Catholics, the Church is “pure and spotless in all matters great and small, that she can never decide wrongly on any point of faith and morals, but in every age possesses and teaches explicitly, or implicitly, the whole truth as it was held by St. Paul or St. John, in spite of all deficiencies in written documents or errors in particular writers and periods.”²⁷⁵ Newman agreed with the Romanist view that so “solemn are the promises made to the Church, so ample is the grace pledged to her for

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 194.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 194-195.

²⁷² “The Protestant sectary alleges that we differ from the Romanist only in minute and unintelligible points; the Romanist retorts, on the other hand, that in heart we are Protestants, but in controversy are obliged by our theory to profess a devotion while we evade an obedience to the teaching of Antiquity” (ibid., 195).

²⁷³ Ibid.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 196.

²⁷⁵ Ibid.

their fulfillment, so intelligible are the human provisions appointed in co-operation, that there surely is no antecedent reason why Almighty God should not have designed to bestow on the Church that perfect purity which the Roman School claims for her.”²⁷⁶

However, all “through the inspired history, we have traces of divine intentions mysteriously frustrated.”²⁷⁷ Accordingly, Newman claimed that “the promise that the word of truth should not depart out of the mouth of the Church, is satisfied in what we see fulfilled at this day, viz. in the whole Church in all its branches having ever maintained the faith in its essential outlines; nay, it might be satisfied even in a scantier fulfillment.”²⁷⁸ He then elaborated:

If the Christian Church was intended to come on earth in the power and spirit of Christ Himself, her Lord and Defender, if she was to manifest Him mystically before the eyes and in the souls of men who is on the right hand of God, if her glory was to be like that of heaven, though invisible, her reign eternal, and her kingdom universal, if she was destined to compel the nations with an irresistible sway, smiting and withering them if rebellious, though not with earthly weapons, and shedding upon the obedient overflowing peace, and the holiest and purest blessings, it is not extravagant to suppose that she was also destined to an authoritative, manifold ministry of the word such as has never been realized.²⁷⁹

For Newman, these prospects had been disappointing, perhaps because of the misconduct of her members for they may have forfeited for her in a measure her original privileges.²⁸⁰ The New Testament promises made to the Church actually did depend more or less upon a unity which had been broken for many centuries:

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., 197.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 197-198.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 198.

This condition is Unity, which is made by Christ and His Apostles, as it were, the sacramental channel through which all the gifts of the Spirit, and among them purity of doctrine, are secured to the Church. It is not necessary to do more than touch upon the abundant evidence which the New Testament furnishes on this subject. Unity may be called the especial badge of Christ's disciples and the tenure of their privileges.²⁸¹

Newman interpreted Jesus' words as indicating "a visible unity, a unity such as the world could recognize, whatever depths it has besides, is made the token, or the condition, as we view it, of that glory in which the Church was to be clad."²⁸² Similarly in the Pauline Epistles: "It will be found that the grace of the two Sacraments, the faith of the Gospel, the renewal of the heart, all the privileges given us, are there represented as in connexion with unity; whether as cause, or as effect, or collaterally, matters not to our present purpose."²⁸³ Of course, "these passages of Scripture express most strongly the dependence, nay, considering our Lord's words, the essential dependence of the privileges of the Gospel upon a visible as well as a moral unity."²⁸⁴

In addition, examples in the Acts of the Apostles corroborate unity as an essential aspect of Jesus's teaching:²⁸⁵

The promises therein contained are made to the Church as One, not to two, or three, or a dozen bodies; and here we may make use of the very argument commonly argued by Roman controversialists against us. They ask triumphantly, "which is the One true and Infallible Church?" implying that if Scripture names but one, it must be theirs; but we may answer that, since the Church is now not one, it is not infallible; since the one has become in one sense many, the full prophetic idea is not now fulfilled; and, with the idea also is lost the full

²⁸¹ Ibid., 199.

²⁸² Ibid.

²⁸³ Ibid., 200.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ "The Holy Ghost originally descended, when the Apostles 'were *all with one accord in one place*;'" (ibid., 201).

endowment and the attribute of Infallibility in particular, supposing that were ever included in it.²⁸⁶

Accordingly, “the Church Catholic, being no longer one in the fullest sense, does not enjoy her predicted privileges in the fullest sense.”²⁸⁷ As Newman explained:

And that soundness of doctrine is one of the privileges thus infringed, is plain from the simple fact that the separate branches of the Church do disagree with each other in the details of faith; discordance in teaching, which once was not, among witnesses of the truth, being the visible proof of that truth being impaired, as well as the breach of the condition guaranteeing it.²⁸⁸

For Newman, the unity of ministerial succession was a cause of continuance:

“Again, the unity of the Ministerial Succession may be the tenure on which the sacred mysteries of faith are continued to us, as seems probable both from the history of the Church, and from the circumstance that both to that Ministry and to that fundamental Faith continuance is promised to the end of the world.”²⁸⁹ He maintained:

Higher measures of truth may be attached to a unity of jurisdiction and external order; while the highest of all, amounting to a continual Infallibility, were it ever intended, might require the presence of a superhuman charity and peace, such as has never been witnessed since the time when the disciples ‘continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers’. . . [Acts ii. 42-47].²⁹⁰

As a result, Newman came to the conclusion:

. . . it would follow that the Ancient Church will be our model in all matters of doctrine, till it broke up into portions, and for Catholic agreement substituted peculiar and local opinions; but that since that time the Church has possessed no

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 201.

²⁸⁷ Ibid.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 201-202.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 202.

²⁹⁰ Ibid.

fuller measure of the truth than we see it has at this day, viz. merely the fundamental faith.²⁹¹

Anglican writers had adopted this principle in their disputes concerning the superstructure of faith in which the Anglican Church differs from her sister churches: “They refer to those times when the Church spoke but one language; they refer to Antiquity, as the period when all Christians agreed together in faith.”²⁹² Newman, however, noticed that when Anglicans referred to the silence of Antiquity as to any recognition of the Roman system, Romanists retorted to a similar silence of Anglicans in history concerning its rise.²⁹³ In response to this argument, he wanted to apply “the foregoing considerations on the subject of unity” in regard to the continued divisions among Christians:²⁹⁴

Now it is upon this very fact of the schism that I ground the corruption of doctrine; the one has taken place when and so far as the other has taken place, though the history of both the one and the other be unknown. If asked, then, for the point of time when Christian truth began to be impaired, I leave it for our opponents to answer, when it was that Christian unity began to be compromised.²⁹⁵

Since it is impossible to “trace the formal acts of schism running through the whole Church,”²⁹⁶ Newman considered that it was a mere trifling for Romanists “to insist upon our pointing out the very first rise or the popular introduction of the doctrines

²⁹¹ Ibid., 203.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 203-204.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 204.

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

we condemn.”²⁹⁷ He showed how the Anglican Divines differ among themselves regarding the schism in the Church.²⁹⁸ These Divines agreed in principle but disagreed about when the period of Antiquity ended. He thought that “the principle is clear, the fact obscure.”²⁹⁹ Different judgments may be formed about the precise date when the East and West fell into schism, but that “love is the bond of perfectness” will be admitted by all.³⁰⁰

For Newman, the beginning of the divisions in the Church was not as late as the seventh General Council (Nicaea II in 787), which “has upon it other characteristics, in which it has also been a precedent for the after innovations of Rome. It was the first General Council which professed to ground its decrees, not on Scripture sanction, but mainly on Tradition.”³⁰¹ It was the first Council which framed an article of faith, “worship of image,” whether true or false, besides and beyond the articles of the Apostles’ Creed. To Newman, it was a grievous mistake in ecclesiastical principles that led to the breach of Catholic unity. “A point of doctrine is made necessary to

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 204-205.

²⁹⁸ In Newman’s time (and still today), theologians differed about the date of the separation between East and West: the fourth General Council (Chalcedon, 451), the sixth General Council (Constantinople III, 680-681), the seventh General Council (Nicaea II, 787); Newman listed different Anglican bishops who supported each of these dates (ibid., 205-207).

²⁹⁹ Ibid., 207.

³⁰⁰ “Thus much is plain, that the termination of the period of purity cannot be fixed much earlier than the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, which an historian of the next century names as the commencement of the division, nor so late as the second Nicene or seventh General Council, which was held A.D. 787” (ibid.).

³⁰¹ Ibid., 208.

salvation,—on the one hand without Scripture warrant,—on the other, beyond the Articles of the Creed.”³⁰²

Newman also found that the effects of schism live to this day: “Century after century the Church Catholic has become more and more disunited, discordant, and corrupt.”³⁰³ Under these circumstances, it was a great privilege to know that certain promises were irrevocable and a condition of the Church’s existence: that “the Apostolical ministry was to continue, and the presence of Christ in that ministry, ‘even unto the end of the world.’”³⁰⁴ He also hoped that

what is promised to Apostolic ordinances, we trust is promised as it has hitherto been granted, to the Apostolic faith also. That original Creed, which St. Paul committed to Timothy, and the first ages considered as the fundamental faith, still remains to us, and to all Christians all over the world; the gates of hell have not prevailed against it.³⁰⁵

Newman believed that Anglican differences were not “subtle and nugatory, as is objected to us by opponents. Whether we be right or wrong, our theory of religion has a meaning, and that really distinct from the Roman theory.”³⁰⁶ He summarized the differences between Anglicans and Roman Catholics:

Both we and Roman Catholics hold that the Church Catholic is unerring in its declarations of faith, or saving doctrine; but we differ from each other as to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic. They maintain that faith depends on

³⁰² Ibid., 208-209.

³⁰³ Ibid., 209.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 210-211.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 212. Newman also wrote to Mrs. John Mozley [(St Mark’s 25 April 1837), *LD* 6: 61]: “However, I frankly own that in some important points our Anglican *ηθος* differs from Popery, in others it is like it – and on the whole far more like it than like Protestantism. So one must expect a revival of the slander or misapprehension in some shape or other – and we shall never be free of it, of course.”

the Church, we that the Church is built on the faith. By Church Catholic we mean the Church Universal, as descended from the Apostles; they those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. They consider the see of St. Peter, to have a promise of permanence, we the Church Catholic and Apostolic. Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we what it has actually so declared from the beginning. We hold that the Church Catholic will never depart from those outlines of doctrine which the Apostles formally published; they that she will never depart in any of her acts from that entire system, written and oral, public and private, explicit and implicit, which the Apostles received and taught; we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of discrimination.³⁰⁷

Newman continued:

Again, both they and we anathematize those who deny the Faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic Creed. The creed of Rome is ever subject to increase; ours is fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the Athanasian Creed; they extend it to Pope Pius's. They cut themselves off from the rest of Christendom; we cut ourselves off from no branch, not even from themselves. We are at peace with Rome as regards the essentials of faith; but she tolerates us as little as she tolerates any sect or heresy. We admit her Baptism and her Orders; her custom is to re-baptize and re-ordain our members who chance to join her.³⁰⁸

8. The *Via Media* between Infallibility and Private Judgment: A Summary

In his introduction to the lectures, Newman clearly stated his intention to formulate a sound and consistent Anglican theology of the Church to combat the rival Roman and Protestant ecclesiological views.³⁰⁹ He wanted to explain one of the principal articles of the Creed, “the Holy Catholic Church,” based on the teachings of Anglican divines. He argued that the Anglican *via media* theory was still plausible, though yet to

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 212.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 212-213.

³⁰⁹ Expecting the arrival of his book, *Prophetical Office*, Newman wrote: “Then again the *Via Media* is ever between the cross fires of Papists and Protestants.” See JHN to H. E. Manning (Oriel College, St Matthias’ 24 February 1837), *LD* 6: 34.

be tried; he saw the *via media* position as contrasting with the unwanted, untimely, Romish and eclectic system. Thus, he dedicated his first eight lectures to construct a *via media* theory of the authority of the prophetic office vis-à-vis Protestant and Roman Catholic views.

On the one hand, the Protestant view of Scripture as the only standard of appeal in doctrinal enquiry and the Protestant practice of leaving the interpretation of Scripture to private judgment lead to Latitudinarianism.³¹⁰ On the other hand, Roman Catholics admitted Scripture and Antiquity but insisted on the existing Tradition of the Church. Thus, Romanists often surpassed Antiquity in practice and succumbed to corruptions. In Newman's opinion, the chief reason for the Roman neglect of Antiquity was their doctrine of infallibility, which simultaneously led Rome to moral loss and to political gain. Morally, he said, infallibility led to the destruction of conscious devotion and the Mystery in Christianity by demanding clear, definite, systematic, all-knowing and complete theology. Politically, Newman asserted, the doctrine of infallibility made Rome powerful and attractive, and led her to conquering men. In contrast, Anglicans followed a middle course by both accepting Scripture as the ultimate rule of faith and relying on Antiquity.

While Protestants maintained private judgment as a palladium, Romanists negated the role of individual judgment by advocating infallibility. Avoiding both extremes, Anglicans accepted both internal and external means in the process of knowing the Truth.

³¹⁰ Latitudinarian refers to the position that proposes conformity to Anglican practices, while considering doctrinal matters of relatively little importance.

In practice, Anglicans wanted to obey first and then know the Truth. Claiming neither infallibility that leads to neglect of Antiquity nor private judgment that brings abuses and schisms, Newman argued for a strong indefectible Church that could claim the confidence and obedience of her members. The Church is indefectible. Though she transmits faith through human means, she is also endowed with supernatural gifts. According to the *via media* theory, the Church is strong and authoritative but not infallible. In fact the Church is indefectible and accepts private judgment in minor details since conscience is the subject of Truth.

Both Anglicans and Roman Catholics hold that the Church Catholic is unerring in its declarations of Faith or saving doctrine, but they differ in regard to the relationship between the faith and the Church Catholic. While Rome maintains that faith depends on the Church, Anglicans hold that the Church is built on the Faith and she is the keeper and interpreter of Scripture. However, the Church's claim on the divine sanction regarding faith depends on the condition of unity that is lost now. Newman asserted that only the ministerial succession continues; therefore he relied on the ancient Church as a model.

While Roman Catholics considered the See of Peter to have a promise of permanence and infallibility to be the custodian and the teacher of faith, for Anglicans, only the Church Catholic and Apostolic is indefectible and safeguards the freedom of conscience. Thus, Newman based his *via media* theory of the teaching authority of the Church on the foundation of the Church's indefectibility and her adherence to Antiquity.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE *VIA MEDIA* BETWEEN SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

After presenting the Anglican view of the indefectibility of the Church as a *via media* between the Protestant principle of private judgment and the Roman Catholic doctrine of infallibility, Newman devoted lectures nine through fourteen of the *Prophetical Office* to discussing the Rule of Faith or “the essential doctrine of the Gospel; on determining which will depend the terms of communion, the range of Private Judgment, and the character of the Church’s indefectibility.”¹ These lectures were a painstaking effort to formulate a distinctive ecclesiology in contrast to the Protestant and Roman Catholic understandings of a teaching Church.

1. Creed as the Essentials of the Gospel

Granted that the Church Catholic is indefectible in the fundamentals of belief, she both supersedes private judgment and makes authoritative declarations of Christian truth; in addition, the Church imposes certain teachings as a condition of communion and anathematizes those who deny them. In his ninth lecture—“On the Essentials of the Gospel”—Newman discussed this “saving faith” or “the essential part of the Gospel.”² The essential doctrines of the Gospel are the terms of communion or the fundamentals that “all branches of the Church hold, ever have held, and ever shall hold; and which every individual must profess, in order to be considered a member of the Church.”³

¹ *Prophetical Office*, 214.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

First of all, Newman presented the difficulties confronting Anglicans: They “certainly have a difficulty in the matter, as aiming at truth, as dealing with facts, with the history of 1800 years, and not framing a theory at our pleasure.”⁴ If Anglicans were to make an appeal to Antiquity,⁵ then they have to determine whether all that Ancient Consent has taught is essential and if so, how to ascertain it. If Anglicans select a portion, they are bound to say why and what they selected and why they passed over the rest. As a result of these difficulties, many Protestants have taken refuge in the latitudinarian notion that there are no essentials.⁶

Second, Newman explained what he meant by “fundamental” or “essential.” He did not mean what is “necessary to be believed for salvation by *this particular person or that*” nor did he “enter into the question how much is essential, and how accurately, in the case of a given individual.”⁷ Rather, he explained:

. . . though the clearness or keenness of vision may vary in individuals, there may be some one object, some circle of sacred truths, which they one and all must see, whether faintly or distinctly, whether in its fullness or in outline, doctrines independent and external, which may be emphatically called the Gospel, which have been committed to the Church from the first, which she is bound to teach as saving, and to enforce as the terms of communion; doctrines accordingly, which

⁴ “If they hold all is essential *which Scripture expressly teaches*, then the question is how they draw the line about what is essential, and who is to draw it, amid the present variety of Creeds, and considering the peculiar structure of the inspired Volumes. If they attempt to decide antecedently what is essential and what is not, to judge, criticize, or analyze the Revelation, they fairly expose themselves to the charge of exalting their own reason inconsistently with the very notion of faith, and with a danger to its essential qualities in their minds and tempers” (ibid., 215).

⁵ For Newman, the appeal to Antiquity was the most advisable option (ibid.).

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ “This is not, strictly speaking, a question of Theology; for Theology, as being a science, is ever concerned with doctrines, principles, abstract truths, not with their application” (ibid., 216).

are necessary in themselves for what may be called an abstract Christian, putting aside the question of more or less, of clearness or confusion,—doctrines which he must receive in their breadth and substance, in order to be accounted a Christian, and to be admitted into the Church.⁸

Newman's purpose was not to examine "what doctrines the Church Catholic will teach inflexibly, what doctrines she must enforce as a condition of communion, what doctrines she must rescue from the scrutiny of Private Judgment; in a word, what doctrines are the foundation of the Church";⁹ rather, he argued:

If the Church Catholic is to be inflexible in faith, we have but to inquire what that common faith is, which she now holds everywhere as the original deposit, and we shall have ascertained what we seek. If we adopt this course, we shall find what is commonly called the Creed, to be that in which all branches of the Church agree; and, therefore, that the fundamental or essential doctrines are those which are contained in the Creed.¹⁰

This conclusion was inferred "from the *primâ facie* state of the case" and was "proved to be correct from historical considerations."¹¹ "It was for this reason that the Creed was commonly called the Symbol or Badge, being a mark, such as a uniform or a watchword is in the case of soldiers, distinguishing Christians from infidels."¹² "In like manner it was called the *Regula Fidei*, or Rule of Faith, as the formulary, by which all

⁸ Ibid., 216-217.

⁹ Ibid., 217.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ "It is known to all who are acquainted with Christian Antiquity that at Baptism the candidate made a confession of his faith, before he was admissible to it Whatever that confession might contain, it was, by the force of the terms, the primitive condition of communion, or fundamental faith. Now this confession was what we now call the Creed . . . I say this was done in the Apostles' days; because history bears witness to the fact, calling it 'the Creed,' 'the Apostles' Creed,' the treasure and legacy of faith which the Apostles had left to their converts, and which was to be preserved in the Church to the end" (ibid., 218).

¹² Ibid.

statements of doctrine made in the Church, were to be measured and estimated.”¹³ The early Church considered two important points: 1) “the essential doctrines of the Gospel, (those which must be professed as the condition of communion), were comprised in the Creed” 2) and that “they were regarded as unalterable, can hardly be disputed.”¹⁴

Accordingly, Newman concluded that the substance of the Catholic faith is the Creed that was taught in all places and was required of all Christians on their admission into the Church.¹⁵ The Creed or the rule of teaching, according to the Fathers, is “the Symbol, or Rule, or Summary of Christian doctrine.”¹⁶ It was the substance and center, the measure and analysis of the whole counsel of God, so that nothing could really be added.¹⁷

According to Newman, the Romanists maintained that “the Baptismal creed was but a portion of the sacred deposit specially committed to the Church’s keeping” and were in the habit of excluding from their list of essential and vital truths, what the

¹³ Ibid., 219.

¹⁴ Newman referred to early Fathers such as Irenaeus (ibid., 219-220) and Tertullian, who spoke of the Creed as the Rule of Faith, as “altogether one, sole, unalterable, unchangeable” (ibid., 220-221) and to the “Apostolical Constitutions,” a collection of usages of the Eastern Church, compiled about the end of the fourth century, that contained the profession of the Creed by Catechumens at baptism (ibid., 221).

¹⁵ “It is digested in form, limited in its topics, circumscribed in its range, one and the same everywhere” (ibid., 221-222).

¹⁶ Ibid., 222.

¹⁷ According to Newman, the Fathers did not allow an “addition” or “increase” to the Rule of Faith: “this Rule does not admit of increase; it is, ‘sole, unalterable, unreformable;’ not a hint has been given to us of the Church’s power over it. To guard and to transmit it, not to remodel it, is her sole duty, as St. Paul has determined in his 2nd Epistle to Timothy” (ibid., 224).

Primitive Fathers held and enforced.¹⁸ Thus, the question was not “whether these additions are true or false” but “whether they are so clearly revealed and so powerfully and persuasively recommended to the convictions of individual Christians as to be portions of the *necessary and saving* Catholic Faith.”¹⁹ Newman rejected the claim that “the Papal Church has but acted in the spirit of the Nicene Council in its additions to its Creed”; for him, there was a “difference between adding a word and adding a doctrine, between explaining what is in the Creed and inserting what was not in it?”²⁰

Newman admitted that the “one Faith, cast into one general type, was from the first developed in this or that place with varieties in the detail, according to accidental or other circumstances.”²¹ “[T]he Nicene and the Apostles’ Creed are identical; the latter the Creed of the West, the former of the East, from the beginning; and, as it differs from itself as received in those two great divisions of Christendom in immaterial points, so in turn in the separate countries of East and West, it varies in similar details.”²²

Newman claimed that there was no material interference with the Creed from that time until the Council of Trent when the Creed of Pope Pius IV was imposed as a test of

¹⁸ Ibid., 222. For Newman, a doctrine like Image-worship as saving and the Creed of Pope Pius IV, which was the result of the proceedings at Trent, are violations of the practice of the Fathers (ibid., 224).

¹⁹ Ibid., 224-225.

²⁰ Ibid., 225. In particular, Newman considered it legitimate for the Nicene Council to add the celebrated word “Homoūsius, or, ‘of one substance with the Father,’ when our Lord’s divinity was denied by the Arians” but balked when “Rome has added twelve articles as protests against the heresies of the sixteenth century” (ibid.).

²¹ Ibid., 225-226.

²² Newman explained: “And to this day, as the Creed called Apostles’ is used in Baptism throughout the West, (as among ourselves,) so is the Nicene used on the same occasion in the Greek Church” (ibid., 227-228, see also ibid., 228-230).

Anglicans and Protestants.²³ Newman also claimed that the Church had less power over the Creed now than in the past,²⁴ since “the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, that Faith which is ever to remain in the world, which is the treasure and the life of the Church, the qualification of membership, and the rule of her teaching” is the Creed.²⁵ He then explained:

The Creed commonly so called, not in its mere letter, but in its living sense, is this Faith, ‘the engrafted word, which is able to save our souls;’ to deny or resist which, is no lawful use of Private Judgment, but heresy or skepticism. We find it declared to be all this by the Church in the beginning; we find it actually maintained by all its branches even in this day of division.²⁶

The fact that the Council of Trent introduced other articles into the Creed led Newman to wonder if “a more accurate delineation of the articles of the Creed was not to be attempted but with great caution even by the early Church Catholic, what can be said in defense of the Roman Church, which created at Trent a new Creed, and published

²³ Newman observed Athanasius’ rule of restraining heresy by the existing Creed and the witness of the Church Catholic interpreting and enforcing it rather than “adding to its articles even in explanation or to adhere to the Creed and to anathematize its opposers” (ibid., 230); however, Newman did not consider the *Symbolum fidei* of Leo IX (1058) and the Council of Florence’s professions of faith in its decrees for the Greeks (1439), Armenians (1439) and Jacobites (1442).

²⁴ “Since traditionary teaching has been impaired, it has become almost sacred from being the chief remains left us of apostolical truth . . .” (ibid., 232).

²⁵ Ibid., 233.

²⁶ Ibid.

anathemas against all objectors?”²⁷ Newman’s principal ground of complaint against Rome was this doctrinal innovation, irreconcilable with the spirit of primitive teaching.²⁸

Third, Newman confronted, in his ninth lecture, the Romanist’s objection that “the English Church, having drawn up Articles and imposed them on the Clergy and others, has in fact committed the same fault which her advocates allege against Rome, viz. of adding without authority to the necessary faith of a Christian.”²⁹ Newman replied to this accusation: “The Thirty-nine Articles are ‘Articles of *religion*,’ not of ‘*faith*.’ We do not consider the belief in them necessary to salvation, except so far as they embody in them the articles of the Creed.”³⁰ Rather he believed that “the Church Catholic is inherently strong, can defend herself, and fears nothing.”³¹ For him, “The power of the

²⁷ By the new Creed at Trent, Newman meant, “the addition at Trent of essentially distinct doctrines, of articles about Image-worship, the Invocation of Saints, and the authority of Tradition, and this on the sanction of but a portion of the Church Catholic then in Council represented” (ibid., 232-233).

²⁸ “The faulty principle, involved in the decrees of Trent, is, not the mere publication of doctrines, not contained in the Creed, but the enforcement of these as necessary points of faith” (ibid., 236). According to Newman, Rome also has “cursed those whom God has not cursed, and defied those whom the Lord has not defied” (ibid., 233).

²⁹ Ibid., 234. In his correspondence with Newman, Jager had raised this objection. See Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 98.

³⁰ Newman elaborated: “They are of no divine authority, except so far as they embody these and similar portions of Apostolical Tradition; but they come to us on ecclesiastical sanction; and they have a hold on us over and above this, first because they have been adopted by the Saints of our Church for some centuries; secondly, because in our private judgment we think them scriptural; thirdly, because we have subscribed them. Further, they are not necessary terms of communion in our Church, being imposed, not on all our members, but principally on the Clergy” (*Prophetical Office*, 234).

³¹ Ibid., 235.

keys is the antagonist of Private Judgment The Church is not built upon individuals, nor knows individuals.”³²

Newman considered the Articles as “the provision of the State” and defended his Church for co-operating with the State in exacting subscription to them.³³ He emphasized that the Articles are not adopted by the Church in a sense equal to the peremptory dogmatism of Rome; the Articles are only instruments of teaching of the Catholic faith in revealed truth. Thus, they are quite consistent with the prerogative accorded by Antiquity to the Apostolic Creed and quite distinct from the forcible imposition of the Tridentine Articles by Rome.³⁴ However, he believed that to “collect, systematize, and set forth the Traditions of the Church, is surely a most edifying and important work, and great is our debt to Councils, modern or ancient, in proportion as they have attempted this; even though the direct Apostolical origin of every phrase or view of doctrine they adopt, be not certain.”³⁵

2. Objections to the Creed

According to Newman, Anglicans—unlike those Protestants who considered doctrinal interpretations of Scripture an infringement on the sacred right of Private Judgment—accepted the Creed as a glorious privilege and were ready to battle for it. Eager to secure liberty in religious opinions as the right of every individual, Anglicans

³² Ibid., 235-236.

³³ Ibid., 234-235.

³⁴ Ibid., 237-238.

³⁵ Newman added: “Now the Articles of our Church must be taken as doing this for us in their place and degree” (ibid., 236). In effect, Newman laid the foundation for his later hypothesis about the development of Christian doctrines.

considered it every individual's prerogative to maintain and defend the Creed.³⁶

Newman, however, enumerated four principal objections against the Protestant view of "saving faith" in his tenth lecture, which like its predecessor, was entitled: "On the Essentials of the Gospel."

The first objection was that the Creed does not include all doctrines which are essential; specifically it does not say that Scripture is the Word of God.³⁷ Newman thought that the same objection could be raised against the Roman doctrine of the infallibility of the Church and given the same answer³⁸ that Romanists gave: "It may be something more than a fundamental of faith; it may be the foundation of the fundamentals, and may be passed over in the Creed, as being presupposed and implied in it."³⁹ Newman pressed the point:

This, indeed, is no proof to a Romanist, who denies that the Bible *was* considered by the original framers of the Creed, as the fundamental record of the Gospel: but it goes as far as this, to show that the Bible *may have been* so considered by them, to show that our doctrine is consistent with itself. As far as the facts of the case go, that *may* be, which we say really *is*. The indirect manner in which Scripture is referred to in the Creed, while it agrees with the notion that the Creed contains all the fundamentals, seems also to imply that Scripture is their foundation.⁴⁰

³⁶ Ibid., 239-240.

³⁷ Ibid., 240.

³⁸ "[T]hat the whole Roman system implies and is built upon the principle of Infallibility, that the doctrines which it holds as fundamental could not be such were not the Church an infallible oracle, that every truth must have some truth beyond itself until we come to the ultimate principles of knowledge, that a Creed never could recount all the previous steps by which it became a Creed . . ." (ibid., 241).

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 242.

This position was “not as a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, but as a specimen of a general principle.”⁴¹ Without Revelation, there would be nothing to believe in at all. Indeed by “*necessary* faith, is not meant all that must be believed, but all that must be *immediately* believed, what must be professed *on* coming for admittance into the Church, what must be proclaimed as the condition of salvation.”⁴² Newman did not hesitate “to deny that belief in the Scriptures is, abstractedly, necessary to Church communion and salvation.”⁴³ “The Creed, indeed, can be *proved* from Scripture, which in this sense is its foundation, but it does not therefore follow that it must be so proved by everyone who receives it. Scripture is the foundation of the Creed; but belief in Scripture is not the foundation of belief in the Creed.”⁴⁴ Therefore, it is extravagant and unchristian to consider that “belief in the Bible is the *sole* or *main* condition for a man being considered a Christian” and to be called “Bible-Christians.”⁴⁵

If the Creed does not contain the whole revealed truth, as necessary for salvation, even though it contains its main elements, it leads to a second objection “of considering it only an initiatory formulary, and not an abstract of the whole Gospel.”⁴⁶ Newman argued that there are “minor or secondary points which we may hold to be true without imposing

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., 242-243.

⁴³ Ibid., 243.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 244.

⁴⁵ “Bible does not carry with it its own interpretation” (ibid., 245-246).

⁴⁶ This is a “charge which was brought in the last Lecture 9 against the Romanists, of considering it only an initiatory formulary, and not an abstract of the whole Gospel” (ibid., 246). This charge was also raised against Anglicans since their Articles “undeniably contain doctrines, not developed out of the Creed, but added to it” (ibid., 246-247).

them as necessary” and doctrines may be minor or secondary in two ways: “in their nature and in their evidence.”⁴⁷ As he explained: “Evidence which may be strong enough to make it safer to believe and act than to remain uninfluenced, may yet be insufficient to enable us to preach and impose what it attests.”⁴⁸ “Such is the Creed, and such, in the way of ordinances, are the Sacraments, and certain other rites and usages.”⁴⁹ In fact, there are doctrines which have lesser evidence.⁵⁰ Therefore, “it may be safe or pious to believe, where it cannot be pronounced absolutely necessary, or be made a condition of communion.”⁵¹

Some doctrines are secondary in nature “such as not to demand enforcement.”⁵² Most of the doctrines in the Thirty-nine Articles which go beyond the doctrine of the Creed and many decrees of Roman and other Councils are secondary in nature. Whether true or false, they are at any rate not a part of necessary truth.⁵³ Newman then expressed his understanding of the Creed:

I say, then, that the Creed is a collection of definite articles set apart from the first, passing from hand to hand, rehearsed and confessed at Baptism, committed and received from Bishop to Bishop, forced upon the attention of each Christian, and thus demanding and securing due explanation of its meaning. It is received on what may fitly be called, if it must have a distinctive name, Episcopal Tradition.⁵⁴

⁴⁷ Ibid., 247.

⁴⁸ “The highest evidence of Apostolical Tradition is where the testimony is not only everywhere and always, but where it has ever been recognized as tradition, and reflected upon and professedly delivered down as saving, by those who hold it” (ibid).

⁴⁹ Ibid., 248.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid., 248-249.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 249.

This Episcopal Tradition is “delineated and recognized in Scripture itself⁵⁵ and in the writings of the Fathers”⁵⁶ but is independent of them. This Tradition is formally enunciated and delivered from hand to hand. This is also “independent of the question of the Catholicity or Universality of the rites or doctrines which are thus formally sealed and handed down; a property which in this case attaches to both of them, and becomes an additional argument for their Apostolical origin.”⁵⁷ This Episcopal Tradition is “to be received according to the capacity of each individual mind.”⁵⁸

In contrast to Episcopal Tradition, Newman pointed to Prophetical Tradition,⁵⁹ which “is obviously of a very different kind from the Episcopal Tradition, yet in its first origin it is equally Apostolical, and, viewed as a whole, equally claims our zealous maintenance.”⁶⁰ “This is that body of teaching which is offered to all Christians even at the present day, though in various forms and measures of truth, in different parts of Christendom, partly being a comment, partly an addition upon the articles of the Creed.”⁶¹ Because of its vastness and indefiniteness, this tradition is especially exposed to corruption, if the Church fails in vigilance. This tradition has been corrupted in its

⁵⁵ “[W]here it is called the Hypotyposis, or ‘outline of sound words’” (ibid.).

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 249-250.

⁵⁹ “Almighty God placed in His Church first Apostles, or Bishops, secondarily Prophets. Apostles rule and preach, Prophets expound. Prophets or Doctors are the interpreters of the revelation; they unfold and define its mysteries, they illuminate its documents, they harmonize its contents, they apply its promises . . . This, I call Prophetical Tradition, existing primarily in the bosom of the Church itself, and recorded in such measure as Providence has determined in the writings of eminent men” (250).

⁶⁰ Ibid., 250.

⁶¹ Ibid., 251.

details, in spite of its general accuracy and agreement with Episcopal Tradition.

Accordingly, Newman concluded that “there will be lesser points of doctrine as well as greater points, whatever be their number and limit, from which a person may possibly dissent, as doubting their Apostolical origin, without incurring any anathema or public censure.”⁶²

For a time the whole Church agreed together in giving one and the same account of this Tradition; but in the course of years, love waxing cold and schisms abounding, her various branches developed portions of it for themselves, out of the existing mass, and, according to the accidental influences which prevailed at the time, did the work well or ill, rudely or accurately.⁶³

As a result, these developed and fixed doctrines are entitled to very different degrees of credit, though always to some degree of attention:

Those which are recognized by the Church at an early date, are of more authority than such as are determined at a later; those which have the joint assent of many independent Churches, than those which are the result of some preponderating influence; those that are sanctioned dispassionately, than those which are settled in fear, anger, or jealousy. Accordingly, some Councils speak far more authoritatively than others, though all which appeal to Tradition may be presumed to have some element of truth in them.⁶⁴

For Newman, such was the case with the decrees of Trent: “They claim indeed to be Apostolic; and I would grant so much, that they are the ruins and perversions of Primitive Tradition.”⁶⁵ He also pointed out that there are matters of doctrine in the practices and writings of the Fathers that are true yet not necessary.⁶⁶ For Newman then, it is

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 251-252.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 252.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Newman found a basis in the practices and writings of Athanasius (Ibid., 252-253) and Vincent of Lérins (Ibid., 253-254).

undeniable that there are “greater truths” and “lesser truths,” “points which it is necessary, and points which it is pious to believe,” ‘Episcopal Tradition’ and ‘Prophetical Tradition,’ the Creed and the Decrees of Councils.⁶⁷

This distinction led to a third question: “how the line is to be drawn between them.”⁶⁸ Newman answered that “there is no precise limit; nor is it necessary there should be.”⁶⁹ “It is the duty of every one either to believe and love what he hears, or to wish to do so, or at least, not to oppose, but to be silent.”⁷⁰ He observed that “there is surely a middle state of mind between affirming and denying, and that in many forms; and in one or other of them, it is the portion, in a measure, of all of us.”⁷¹ The Primitive Church “was instituted for the sake of the poor and ignorant” and so “simple and precise” in her fundamentals in order to include all classes:

[The Church] is “the pillar and ground of the truth;” of all truth, Christian Truth in all its developments, in the interpretation of Scripture, in the exposition of doctrine, in the due appointment of ordinances, in the particular application and adjustment of the moral law. She is called a superstructure, as being built upon the great rudiments of the Gospel Doctrine; a pillar and ground, as being the expounder of it. And, in consequence, such being her office towards her children, they are bound, if they would remain her children, as far as their minds attain to her doctrine, to take it on the ground of her Catholicity.⁷²

⁶⁷ Ibid., 254.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 254-255.

⁷⁰ “This distinction between openly opposing and passively submitting to the Tradition of the Church Catholic, is recognized by Vincentius . . . and which easily recommend themselves to the mind” (ibid., 255).

⁷¹ “Either we are ignorant, or we are undecided, or we are in doubt, or we are on inquiry, or we take secret exceptions in one or other part of that extended system which has existed more or less all over the Church, and which I have called the Prophetical Tradition. Unless the Church were thus indulgent to her children, she could not be called Catholic” (ibid., 256).

⁷² Ibid., 256-257. See also Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 89.

For Newman, every word of Revelation is a mystery or Sacrament and has a “deep meaning” which we cannot fathom.⁷³ The “property of faith is the wish to conceive rightly of sacred doctrine, as far as it can conceive at all; and to look towards the Church for guidance how to conceive of it.”⁷⁴ Accordingly, it is the duty of the Church to distinguish essentials and non-essentials:

The Church asks for a dutiful and simple-hearted acceptance of her message growing into faith, and that variously, according to the circumstances of individuals. And, if this be the principle on which the Catholic Church anciently acted, we see how well it was adapted to try the humility of her children, without imposing any yoke upon them, after the manner of Rome, or repressing the elastic or creative force of their minds.⁷⁵

Newman, therefore, emphasized that the Church Catholic is like a mother who neither assumes infallibility nor is infallible but teaches her children the original Creed gradually “by love.”⁷⁶

Newman then turned his attention to a fourth objection—the fact that the theory of fundamentals is baseless: “It will be said that, even if the above theory of Fundamentals is consistent, yet, after all, it is but a theory; a mere shadowy, baseless, ingenious theory, since the division of the East and West, and still more so since the great

⁷³ “It is the outward form of a heavenly truth, and in this sense a mystery or Sacrament. We may read it, confess it; but there is something in it which we cannot fathom, which we only, more or less, as the case may be, not perfectly, enter into” (*Prophetical Office*, 257 and Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 89).

⁷⁴ “This is faith, viz., submission of the reason and will towards God, wistful and loving meditation upon His message, childlike reliance on the guide which is ordained by Him to be the interpreter of it” (*Prophetical Office*, 257).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 258.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 257-259. See also Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 90.

schism of the North and South.”⁷⁷ For Anglo-Catholics, Newman knew the Church is now but “a mere abstract word,” “a generalized idea” and “it is not the name of any one thing really existing.”⁷⁸ Accordingly, he asked: “Where, then, in the English Church is that one eternal voice of Truth, that one witness issuing from the Apostles’ times, and conversant with all doctrine, the expounder of the Creed, the interpreter of Scripture, and the instructor of the people of God?”⁷⁹ Whatever be the truth, Newman believed:

. . . in spite of differences within or without, our own branch may surely be considered as to us the voice of her who has been in the world ever one and the same since Christ came. Surely, she comes up to the theory; she professes to be the Catholic Church, and to transmit that one ancient Catholic Faith, and she does transmit it simply and intelligibly. Not the most unlettered of her members can miss her meaning. She speaks in her formularies and services.⁸⁰

For Newman, there was no doubt about “where the Church Catholic is, and what her teaching.”⁸¹ To follow her is to follow the *Book of Common Prayer* and its words are the accents of the Church Catholic and Apostolic in England.⁸² Newman wanted his Church “to revive all those visible tokens of the Church’s sovereignty, the want of which is our present excuse for disobedience.”⁸³ Surely, “we have but to recognize the Church in faith, and it rises before our eyes.”⁸⁴ He found difficulty not with the various sects, but with the pretensions of those Roman Catholics in England who “profess to be the Church

⁷⁷ *Prophetical Office*, 260.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 260-261.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 261.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 262.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 262-263.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 263.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

and to teach the Catholic Faith,” yet differ materially from the Anglicans.⁸⁵ Nonetheless, Newman managed to find common ground:

. . . Romanists and we are both branches of the one Catholic Church, I say the difference of doctrine between them and us is no practical difficulty in finding what is Apostolical, no drawback upon our people’s certainty and comfort in the Anglo-Catholic communion. Indeed, the two rival systems, Roman and English, agreeing amid their differences in those points which they each hold to be the highest truths, and which sectaries more or less undervalue, afford a remarkable attestation to the Apostolical origin of both. Both profess the Apostles’ Creed. Both use substantially the same Common Prayer, ours indeed being actually but a selection from theirs.⁸⁶

Newman felt, on the one hand, that certain differences and mutual hostility increased the force of unity where it existed yet, on the other hand, “the very fact of those differences throws a corresponding uncertainty over those points which Rome maintains by herself, such as the existence of Purgatory, the supremacy of the Roman see, and the Infallibility of the Church.”⁸⁷ He concluded that “while Rome confirms by her accordant witness our own teaching in all greater things, she does not tend by her novelties, and violence, and threats, to disturb the practical certainty of Catholic doctrine, or to seduce from us any sober and conscientious inquirer.”⁸⁸

3. Scripture: Record of Faith and Document of Proof

Newman discussed “the Rule of Faith” in Lecture 11 (“On Scripture as the Record of Faith”) and Lecture 12 (“Scripture as the Record of Our Lord’s Teaching”).⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 264.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 264-265.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 265.

⁸⁹ In these two lectures, Newman developed what he already wrote in his third letter to Jager (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 117-144).

He explained how his view of Catholic Tradition and the Fundamentals of the Church was consistent with the supremacy of Scripture in questions of faith, not only on the basis of mere appeal to authority, but also on the grounds of reason. Lecture 11 began by stating the Anglican Sixth Article: “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”⁹⁰ This was a plain and clear statement except for one point: “who is to be the *judge* what is and what is not contained in Scripture?”⁹¹ The Anglican Church was “silent on this point,—very emphatically so” because it “holds a middle course between extreme theories.”⁹²

While “both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic hold the existence of an authoritative judge of the sense of Scripture, each makes itself judge in its own cause, and places the ultimate appeal in its own decision,”⁹³ the Sixth Article preserved a significant silence on the subject:

For, in truth, we neither hold that the Catholic Church is an infallible judge of Scripture, nor that each individual may judge for himself; but that the Church has authority, and that individuals have liberty to judge for themselves outside the range of that authority. This is no matter of words, but a very clear and practically important distinction⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Ibid., 226-227.

⁹¹ Ibid., 267.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Roman Catholics consider that the Church Catholic is an infallible Judge of controversies and the Pope, in General Council, can infallibly decide on the meaning of Scripture, as well as infallibly discriminate between Apostolic and spurious Traditions; Protestants maintain “the existence of a judge of Scripture doctrine, but not one and the same to all, but a different one to each individual” (ibid., 267-268).

⁹⁴ Ibid., 268.

Newman asserted that “the Church is not a judge of the sense of Scripture in the common sense of the word, but a witness.”⁹⁵ Both Protestants and Romanists “consider their supposed judge to be a judge” having “a direct power over Scripture” through the “gift of divine illumination.”⁹⁶ Anglicans, in contrast, “consider the Church as a witness, a keeper and witness of Catholic Tradition, and in this sense invested with authority”⁹⁷ and “not a judge.”⁹⁸ The “Church bears witness to a fact, that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received and came from the Apostles.”⁹⁹ The proof lies “first in her own unanimity throughout her various branches, next in the writings of the Ancient Fathers.”¹⁰⁰ Accordingly, the Anglican position basically differs from both the Protestant and the Romanist: “We, on the contrary, consider Antiquity and Catholicity to be the real guides, and the Church their organ.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁵ Newman clarified his claim that the Church is not a judge: “If, indeed the word judge be taken to mean what it means in the Courts of Law, one vested with authority to declare the received appointments and usages of the realms, and with power to enforce them, then the Church is a judge,—but not of Scripture, but of Tradition” (ibid.).

⁹⁶ “Whether any such gift was once destined for mankind or not, it avails not to inquire; we consider it is not given in fact, and both Roman Catholics and Protestants hold that it is given” (ibid., 268-269).

⁹⁷ “. . . just as in political matters, an ambassador, possessed of instructions from his government, would speak with authority. But, except in such sense as attaches to an ambassador, the Church, in our view of her office, is not a judge” (ibid., 269).

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ “The Protestant, indeed, and the Romanist may also use Antiquity; but it is as a mere material by which the supreme judge, the spiritual mind, whether collective or individual, forms its decisions,—as pleadings in its court, itself being above them, and having an inherent right of disposing of them” (ibid.).

Newman concluded that the present Church in her office “is not so much a judge of Scripture as a witness of Catholic Truth delivered to her in the first ages, whether by Councils, or by Fathers, or in whatever other way.”¹⁰² Then if the Church “does not claim for herself any gift of interpretation, in the high points in question, much less does she allow individuals to pretend to it.”¹⁰³ He then summarized the meaning of the Sixth Article: “The sole question, I say, in the Articles is *how the Church is to teach*.”¹⁰⁴ He then discussed how the Church exercised her function of teaching.¹⁰⁵ Although the Church is a witness and a keeper of Scripture, it should not decree anything against the Scripture or enforce anything to be believed as necessary for salvation.¹⁰⁶ In brief, “neither individual, nor Bishop, nor Convocation, nor Council, may venture to decline the *Catholic interpretation* of its sacred mysteries.”¹⁰⁷ For Newman, Scripture is an

¹⁰² Ibid., 270.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 270-271.

¹⁰⁴ “The Church has a prior claim to do so, but even the Church asserts it not, but hands over the office to Catholic Antiquity. What our Articles say of Holy Scripture as the document of proof, has exclusive reference to the mode of teaching. It is not said that individuals are to infer the faith, but that the Church is to prove it from Scripture; not that individuals are to learn it for themselves, but that they are to be taught it. The Church is bound over to test and verify her doctrine by Scripture throughout her course of instruction. She must take care to show her children that she keeps Scripture in mind, and is ruling, guiding, steadying herself by it” (ibid., 271).

¹⁰⁵ “In Sermons and Lectures, in catechizing and controversy, she must ever appeal to Scripture, draw her arguments from Scripture, explore and develop Scripture, imitate Scripture, build up her form of doctrine on Scripture rudiments; and though individuals have no warrant to set themselves against her particular use of Scripture, yet her obligation to use it is surely a great practical limitation of her power” (ibid.).

¹⁰⁶ For Newman, both the Sixth and Twelfth Articles maintain that “it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s word written . . . the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ’ ought not ‘to decree anything against the same’” (ibid., 271-272).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 272.

infringement on our private judgment.¹⁰⁸ This is true only of “*necessary* doctrine, or the Faith once delivered” and “in matters of inferior moment, both the Church and the individual have room to exercise their own powers.”¹⁰⁹

Newman felt he had “cleared the way to another important principle of the Anglo-Catholic system, in which with equal discrimination it takes middle ground between Roman teaching and mere Protestantism,” namely, that the “Church adheres to a double Rule, Scripture and Catholic Tradition”:¹¹⁰

[The Anglican Church] considers that in all matters necessary to salvation both safeguards are vouchsafed to us, and both the Church’s judgment and private judgment superseded; whereas the Romanist considers that points of faith may rest on Tradition without Scripture, and the mere Protestant that they may be drawn from Scripture without the witness of Tradition.¹¹¹

For the Anglican Church, the phrase “Rule of Faith” belongs to the Bible and Catholic Tradition: “These two together make up a joint rule; Scripture is interpreted by Tradition, Tradition is verified by Scripture; Tradition gives form to the doctrine, Scripture gives life; Tradition teaches, Scripture proves.”¹¹² Accordingly, “Scripture, when illuminated by the ‘Catholic Religion,’ or the Catholic Religion when fortified by

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 272-273.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 273.

¹¹¹ “That she requires Scripture sanction is plain from the Articles; that she requires Catholic sanction is plain from the Athanasian Creed, which, in propounding the necessary faith of a Christian, says not a word about Scripture, resting it upon its being Catholic; that she requires both is plain from the Canon quoted more than once, which declares nothing to be the subject of religious belief except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Bible, and collected out of it by the Catholic doctors” (ibid., 273-274).

¹¹² “And hence both the one and the other have, according to the occasion, sometimes the Catholic Creed, sometimes Scripture, been called by our writers the Rule of Faith . . .” (ibid., 274).

Scripture, may either of them be called the Gospel committed to the Church, dispensed to the individual.”¹¹³

After stating the Anglican doctrine regarding the grounds on which Catholic Tradition is authoritative, Newman inquired into the reasons for considering Scripture as the document of proof. First, against the Protestant and Roman positions that the Word of God must necessarily be written, Newman sided with Bishop Butler who held that, “*We are not in any sort able to judge*” whether “the Revelation should have been committed to writing,”¹¹⁴ and Chillingworth who thought that “the Scripture is a sufficient rule” but not necessarily plain.¹¹⁵ Accordingly, it is “presumptuous for a creature” to say, “I will believe nothing, unless I am told in the clearest conceivable form.”¹¹⁶ Second, there are those who “have considered that Scripture bears witness to its own sufficiency and perfection in matters of doctrine.”¹¹⁷ For Newman, however, “Scripture speaks of the divine inspiration of its writers, yet it nowhere says that it, by itself, contains all necessary doctrine.”¹¹⁸ Third, there are others who argue “from the analogy of the Jewish Law that the Christian Law also must be written;”¹¹⁹ but for Newman, “the analogy of the Jewish Law is an insufficient ground on which to reject

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 275-276. Joseph Butler (1692-1752), Anglican Bishop of Bristol (1738-50) and Durham (1750-52), was the author of *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed* (1736).

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 275. William Chillingworth (1602-1644), like Newman a scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, was the author of *The Religion of Protestants* (1638).

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 276.

¹¹⁷ “And to prove this, they bring forward such texts as 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, ‘All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,’ &c.” (ibid., 277).

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 277-278.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 278.

Tradition from the Gospel Revelation, considering that it is a means of Truth, ample and adequate in its nature, and already employed by Providence in conveying to us the New Testament itself.”¹²⁰ Fourth, the “acuter line of argument is to call on those who deny it to prove their point;—if there be anything besides Scripture equal to Scripture, to produce it, and give reasons in its behalf.”¹²¹ Newman, however, followed the Anglican theologian, Richard Hooker (1554-1600), who held the view that “Tradition is inadmissible, viz., not in the abstract, and before inquiry, but in the particular case.”¹²²

Yet, Hooker’s understanding of the Sixth Article leads to two serious objections: 1) “the matter of fact is not at all made out that there are no Traditions of a trustworthy nature”;¹²³ Newman believed that “the Sixth Article only means to say that for proving the Articles of the Creed we do not want Tradition, but Scripture is enough.”¹²⁴ 2) the Romanist raised another difficulty by adding the particular structure of the New Testament;¹²⁵ however, Newman held: “These are disproofs, it may be said, of any intention, either in the course of Providence, or in the writers, that the very books of

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid., 278-279.

¹²² Because “in matter of fact, certain given Traditions, (so called,) as the Roman, after inquiry, turned out not to be Traditions” (ibid., 279). Richard Hooker (1554-1600), Anglican priest and theologian, was the author of *A Learned Discourse of Justification* (1585) and a multi-volumed *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

¹²³ Newman recalled a number of traditions independent of Scripture that are accepted by many of the Anglican Divines: “. . . our divines, such as Bramhall, Bull, Pearson, and Patrick, believed that the Blessed Mary was ‘Ever-Virgin,’ as the Church has called her; but Tradition was their only informant on the subject” (ibid., 280).

¹²⁴ The “Article speaks, not as if narrating a matter of history, but of doctrine, not a conclusion to be arrived at, but a principle to start with” (ibid., 281).

¹²⁵ “They observe it is but an incomplete document on the very face of it. There is no harmony or consistency in its parts . . . Nor were they generally received as one volume till the fourth century” (ibid., 281-282).

Scripture, though inspired, should be *the* Canon of faith, that is, that they should [bind] and complete it.”¹²⁶ In addition, “the office of the Church as the ‘keeper of Holy Writ,’ seems to make it probable that she was intended to interpret, perhaps to supply what Scripture left irregular and incomplete.”¹²⁷ Newman then concluded that “the circumstance that religious truths can be conveyed by ordinances, or by Catholic Tradition, as well as by writing, seems an intimation that there is such a second Rule of Faith, equally authoritative and binding with Scripture itself.”¹²⁸

For his argument that “the Bible contains all truth necessary to be believed in order to [achieve] salvation,” Newman sought support from the writer of “the first Homily”¹²⁹ and in “Consent of Catholic Fathers”.¹³⁰

Stronger evidence for its truth is scarcely conceivable; for if any but the Scriptures had pretensions to be an oracle of faith, would not the first Successors of the Apostles be that oracle? must not they, if any, have possessed the authoritative traditions of the Apostles? They surely must have felt, as much as we do, the unsystematic character of the Epistles, the silence of Scripture about its own canonicity, or whatever other objections can be now urged against our doctrine; and yet they certainly held it.¹³¹

¹²⁶ Ibid., 282.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Newman’s line of argument was one that many Anglican Divines had pursued (ibid., 283-284). *The Book of Homilies*, officially titled *Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches* (1547, 1562, 1571) consisted of 33 sermons whose reading was mandated by Article 35 of the *Thirty-nine Articles*; the First Homily, whose author was not identified, is “A Fruitful exhortation to the reading of Holy Scripture”; available at: <http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk1hom01.htm>.

¹³⁰ “. . . we receive it simply on historical evidence. The early Fathers so held it, and we throw the burden of our belief, if it be a burden, on them. It is quite impossible they should so have accounted it, except from Apostolic intimations, that it was so to be” (ibid., 284).

¹³¹ Ibid.

Newman thought that this line of argument countered the Romanists' complaint of Anglican inconsistency: "We do *not* discard the Tradition of the Fathers; we accept it; we accept it entirely; we accept its witness concerning itself and against itself; it witnesses, to its own inferiority to Scripture; it witnesses, not only that Scripture is the record, but that it is the sole record of saving truth."¹³² Newman also observed the great stress which the Fathers certainly laid on the authority of Tradition and accepted the Fathers' conduct "as a vestige and token of some Apostolic appointment, from its very singularity."¹³³ The fact that the Fathers accepted the canonicity of Scripture on faith resolved all questions about the abstract sufficiency and perfection of Scripture, as a document of saving truth: "There is no abstract measure of what is sufficient. Faith cannot believe more than it is told. It is saving, if it believes as much as that, be it little or great."¹³⁴

Finally, in regard to the silence of the Thirty-nine Articles regarding Catholic Tradition,¹³⁵ Newman concluded: "In truth, we must take the Articles as we find them; they are not a system of theology on whatever view, but a protest against certain specific

¹³² Newman rejected the allegations of Roman theologians who "are accustomed to taunt us with inconsistency, as if we used the Tradition of the Church only when, and as far as, we could not avoid it; for instance, for the establishment of the divinity of Scripture, but not of the Creed" (ibid., 285).

¹³³ "[Christ] has vouchsafed us two informants in saving truth, both necessary, both at hand, Tradition for statement, Scripture for proof; and it is our part rather to thank Him for His bounty, than to choose one and reject the other" (ibid., 286-287).

¹³⁴ Ibid., 287.

¹³⁵ Newman raised a counter question: "why the Articles contain no recognition of the inspiration of Holy Scripture" (ibid.)

errors, existing at the time when they were drawn up. There are, as all parties must confess, great truths not expressly stated in the Articles.”¹³⁶

Newman considered the controversy between England and Rome about whether Scripture, or Scripture and Tradition is the record and rule of faith, one of a verbal character.¹³⁷ Anglicans “by allowing that Scripture requires an interpreter, do necessarily agree with Catholics in denying that Scripture is the one authoritative informant.”¹³⁸ “They also agree with Catholics in holding Tradition as well as Scripture to be a substantive and independent informant.”¹³⁹ In contrast, in the case of Protestants, the issue was by no means verbal.¹⁴⁰

4. Scripture as Jesus’ Teaching and the Sole Canon of Faith

In his twelfth lecture—“On Scripture as the Record of Our Lord’s Teaching”—Newman stated the following reasons why “Scripture is on principle and not only by accident, the sole Canon of our faith.”¹⁴¹ First, the “New Testament is called by the name

¹³⁶ Ibid., 287-288.

¹³⁷ In a “Note on Lecture 11,” Newman added a comment from his “Letter to Dr. Pusey” (1865, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/anglicans/volume2/pusey/index.html>): “You allow that there is a twofold rule, Scripture and Tradition, and this is all that Catholics say. How then do Anglicans differ from us here? I believe the difference is one of words. Catholics and Anglicans, in the controversy as to whether the whole faith is or is not contained in Scripture, attach different meanings to the word ‘proof’ . . .” (ibid., 288).

¹³⁸ Ibid., 287-289.

¹³⁹ Newman claimed that Anglicans follow Vincent of Lérins, Athanasius and Theodoret in holding that Tradition guides and decides the interpretation of Scripture (ibid., 289; see 321-387).

¹⁴⁰ “[F]or they consider, in opposition to Catholics, that Scripture is the one authoritative informant about revealed doctrine, independent and exclusive, and that Tradition is no informant at all.” See ibid., 287.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 290.

of a testament or will.”¹⁴² “It evidently is a mark of special honour; and it assigns a most significant purpose to the written Word, such as Tradition, however clearly Apostolical, cannot reach.”¹⁴³ Secondly, Newman learned from “the testimony of the early Church, that Scripture and Scripture only is inspired.”¹⁴⁴ Tradition does not convey any sacramental words or sustained discourses, but ideas and things only.¹⁴⁵ Thirdly, “Scripture alone contains what remains to us of our Lord’s teaching.”¹⁴⁶

Newman also discussed the peculiar character of Jesus’ recorded words and works when on earth: “everything our Saviour did and said is characterized by mingled simplicity and mystery”¹⁴⁷ and “are the tokens of a supreme Teacher and Prophet.”¹⁴⁸ Newman then referred to the Fathers’ witnesses of Jesus’ teaching,¹⁴⁹ recalling the striking instance of Jesus’ discourse to the Jews in the fifth chapter of St. John’s Gospel,

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 291.

¹⁴⁴ “This explains how it may be called in an especial manner the Testament or Will of our Lord and Saviour. Scripture has a gift which Tradition has not; it is fixed, tangible, accessible, readily applicable, and besides all this perfectly true in all its parts and relations; in a word, it is a sacred text” (ibid.).

¹⁴⁵ “A new heresy, for instance, would be refuted by Tradition negatively, on the very ground that it was new; but by Scripture positively, by the use of its text, and by suitable inferences from it” (ibid., 291-292).

¹⁴⁶ “Now this special revelation is in Scripture, and Scripture only; Tradition has no part in it” (ibid., 292).

¹⁴⁷ Newman added: “His emblematical actions, His typical miracles, His parables, His replies, His censures, all are evidences of a legislature in germ, afterwards to be developed, a code of divine truth which was ever to be before men’s eyes, to be the subject of investigation and interpretation, and the guide in controversy” (ibid., 292-293).

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ ““His sayings,” observes St. Justin, ‘were short and concise; for He was no rhetorician, but His word was the power of God.’ And St. Basil, in like manner: ‘Every deed, and every word of our Saviour Jesus Christ is a canon of piety and virtue And Cyprian says, ‘Whereas the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came to all men, and, gathering together learned and unlearned alike . . .’” (ibid., 293-294).

he concluded: “Every verse is a canon of Divine Truth.”¹⁵⁰ “Of this teaching, remarkable both from its Author and its style, Tradition contains no remains. The new Law is preserved by the four Evangelists alone.”¹⁵¹ Thus the distinction between the written and the unwritten word is: “Whatever be the treasures of the latter, it has not this pre-eminent gift, the custody of our Lord’s teaching.”¹⁵² The Gospels remain the sole record of Jesus¹⁵³ and “their containing so much is, as far as it goes, a presumption that they contain all; they seem to tend towards completeness.”¹⁵⁴ Thus “Scripture is intended to be that which it is actually, the record of the greater matters of the Law of Christ.”¹⁵⁵

Newman challenged the Romanist position that “the New Testament consists of merely accidental documents, and that our maintenance of its exclusive divinity is gratuitous and arbitrary”¹⁵⁶ by raising two objections: “first, that it does not avail except by narrowing the Canon of Scripture within the limits of the Gospels, to the exclusion of the Old Testament and the Apostolic Epistles; next, that after all, the characteristic doctrines of Christianity are found in the Epistles, not in our Lord’s teaching.”¹⁵⁷ “The doctrines of our faith *are* really promulgated by Christ Himself. There is no truth which St. Paul or St. John declares, which He does not anticipate.”¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 294; see also *ibid.*, 297.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 297.

¹⁵² Ibid., 298.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 298-299.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 299.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 299-301.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 301.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 302.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

To Newman, the promise of the Holy Ghost meant that “the Comforter would use and explain Christ’s own teaching; not begin anew, but merely develop it.”¹⁵⁹ The promise that the “[Holy Ghost] will show you things to come,” was “to complete the description of the inspiration which the Apostles received; viz., understanding in our Lord’s words, and the gift of prophecy. Their writings are actually made up of these two, prophecy and doctrine”.¹⁶⁰

They are on the whole an inspired comment upon the Gospels, opening our Lord’s meaning, and eliciting even from obscure or ordinary words and unpretending facts, high and heavenly truths. On the other hand, our Lord’s teaching in the Gospels acts as a rule and key to the Epistles; it gives them their proportions, and adjusts their contents to their respective place and uses . . . Christ is the great Prophet of the Church, and His teaching is as truly her law, as His death and intercession are her life. In that teaching the whole canon centres, as for its proof, so for its harmonious adjustment. Christ recognizes the Law and the Prophets, and commissions the Apostles.¹⁶¹

Accordingly, for Newman, these are

some presumptions in favour of attributing a special sacredness to the New Testament over and above other sources of divine truth, however venerable. It is in very name Christ’s Testament; it is an inspired text; and it contains the Canons of the New Law, dictated by Christ, commented on by His Apostles and by the Prophets beforehand.”¹⁶²

Though “the Romanists object, it be incomplete in form, it is not in matter; it has a hidden and beautiful design in it.”¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 304.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 307-308.

¹⁶² Ibid., 308.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

5. Scripture as the Document of Proof in the Early Church

In his thirteenth lecture—"On Scripture as the Document of Proof in the Early Church"—Newman discussed how the Fathers testified that Scripture is the "Rule of Faith": "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, that is, either as being read therein or deducible therefrom."¹⁶⁴ In this regard, Anglicans differed from Roman teaching not in denying the value of Tradition, but in maintaining that Tradition does not by itself, without Scripture warrant, convey any article necessary to salvation. It is "not a rule distinct and co-ordinate, but subordinate and ministrative."¹⁶⁵ This position was based on the testimony of the Fathers.¹⁶⁶ Since "Scripture does not interpret itself, or answer objections rising out of misinterpretations," we "must betake ourselves to the early Church, and see how she understood the promise."¹⁶⁷

Newman cited a number of proofs from the Fathers—which he had previously used in his third reply to Jager.¹⁶⁸ Newman also used a number of excerpts from the writings of the Fathers.¹⁶⁹ He referred to Vincent, who claimed that Faith is fortified in

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 309.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 310.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 310-312. See also Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 132.

¹⁶⁸ For instance, Newman recalled the witness of Tertullian, who, on the one hand, preferred Tradition to Scripture as a means of silencing heresy, but on the other hand, held that "the Church, being considerate and long-suffering towards her members, allows herself to dispute and argue, and she argues from Scripture . . ." (ibid., 313).

¹⁶⁹ For Newman, Origen in like manner, stated: "It is necessary to take the Holy Scriptures as witnesses; for our comments and statements without these witnesses are not trustworthy" (ibid., 315). "The light in which St. Cyprian regarded Holy Writ, is shown by his books of Testimonia, or Scripture Proofs . . ." (ibid., 315-316). St. Optatus (A.D. 360), argued: "Now He whose testament we speak of, is alive in heaven; therefore His will must be sought for, as in a testament so in the Gospel" (ibid., 317). Cyril of

two ways: “first, by the authority of the Divine Law, next, by the Tradition of the Catholic Church.”¹⁷⁰ His “submission even to Catholic Tradition, is simply and merely as it subserves the due explanation of Scripture.”¹⁷¹ From these excerpts, it was clear that “the authors of them looked upon Scripture as the public standard of proof, the tribunal of appeal, in controversy, however conclusive the argument from Catholic Tradition might be for private conviction.”¹⁷² Accordingly, Newman concluded: “But when we find this appeal to Scripture repeated again and again in various shapes, and no similar appeal to Tradition, the argument for Scripture being at that time accounted the record of saving faith, becomes a strong one.”¹⁷³

6. The Fortunes of the Church

In his fourteenth and final lecture—“On the Fortunes of the Church”—Newman, however, expressed his incipient doubt about the theory of *via media* that he painstaking

Jerusalem held: “As regards the divine and holy Mysteries of faith, it is necessary that not even a chance word should be delivered in our tradition without the warrant of divine Scripture, to the exclusion of mere probabilities or skilfully contrived arguments” (ibid.). St. Basil forbade adding to, or detracting from, the inspired Scriptures (ibid., 317-318). St. Chrysostom compared a heretic to a robber who “enters not by the Scriptures” (ibid., 318). John of Damascus (A.D. 730) taught: “It cannot be that we should preach, or at all know, anything about God, besides what the divine oracles of the Old and New Testaments have divinely set forth, said, or manifested to us” (ibid., 320).

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 322.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 323.

¹⁷² Ibid., 327. According to Newman, Athanasius distinguished: “Tradition as teaching, and Scripture as proving, verifying doctrine” (ibid., 323). Newman then wrote: “Now how strikingly coincident with this view are the words of our Articles! ‘Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that’ (i.e. in such sense that) ‘whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man.’ The Article is altogether of a polemical character” (ibid., 328).

¹⁷³ Ibid., 324. Newman also cited Theodoret: “To add anything to the words of Scripture is madness and audacity; but to open the text, and to develop its hidden sense, is holy and religious” (ibid., 327).

tried to construct: “what has been said is but a dream, the wanton exercise, rather than the practical conclusion of the intellect”.¹⁷⁴

Without some portion of that Divine Philosophy which bids us consider “the kingdom of God” to be “within us,” and which, by prayer and meditation, by acting on what is told us, and by anticipating sight, develops outwardly its own views and principles, and thus assimilates to itself all that is around us,—not only the Church in this age and country, but the Church Catholic anywhere, or at any time, Primitive, Roman, or Reformed, is but a name, used indeed as the incentive to action, but without local habitation, or visible tokens, “here or there,” “in the secret chambers,” or “in the desert.” After all, the Church is ever invisible in its day, and faith only apprehends it.¹⁷⁵

Newman justified his doctrine of Church and recalled the most plausible objection raised by Romanists that “we are what they call a Parliamentary Church, a State Creation or Establishment” while “the True Church is built upon the One Faith, transmitted through successive generations.”¹⁷⁶ Romanists rejected the Anglican claim:

. . . the Church is by office, and in her very definition, “the pillar and ground of the Truth,” that “God’s Spirit which is upon her, and His words which He has put in her mouth, shall not depart out of her mouth, nor out of the mouth of her seed, nor out of the mouth of her seed’s seed, from henceforth and for ever;” that “*all* her children are taught of the Lord, and great is the peace of her children.”¹⁷⁷

If the Church was by office and definition the pillar and ground of truth, then the “Faith committed to the Church is represented, not as a secret and difficult doctrine, but as clearly proclaimed, indefectibly maintained, and universally acknowledged.”¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 331.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 331-332.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 332.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 332-333. Newman did not give a reference for this Romanist rejection of Anglicanism.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 333.

Newman, however, found hardly any doctrinal agreement among the clergymen of his Church. Along with variations in interpreting the official teaching of the Church of England, Anglicans did not agree among themselves “whether there be any Church at all, that is, One True Church, commissioned and blessed by Christ.”¹⁷⁹ In fact, many ecclesiastical decisions, such as the appointment of bishops and the administration of sacraments, were corrupted by the intervention of laymen in Parliament.¹⁸⁰ Nonetheless, Anglicans, on the whole, essentially taught one and the same doctrine and so made valid the claim that the Anglican Church is a branch of the One Church Catholic.¹⁸¹

Newman thought that even if the Church of England denied her own powers, it did not mean that she had lost her gifts.¹⁸² Those gifts remain, though as a burden and as a witness on the last day: “The Church does not become a mere creation of man, though she sell herself to be his slave.”¹⁸³ He thought that the “parallel of the Jewish Church will afford a sufficient answer to all that has been objected.”¹⁸⁴ He paralleled the present disorders in his Church to two other periods which occurred “in the history of Israel: their

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 333-334.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 335.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² “Whether or not there are cases in which a branch of the Church, as an individual Christian, may utterly exhaust itself of grace and become reprobate, at least St. Paul expresses the rule of God’s dealings with us in his Epistle to the Romans; ‘the gifts and calling of God are without repentance’” (ibid., 337).

¹⁸³ Ibid., 338-339.

¹⁸⁴ “. . . the Israelites were especially raised up to be witnesses for the One True God against idolatry, and had the doctrine of the Divine Unity set before them . . . also that they remained God’s peculiar people till Christ came; and yet, as every one knows, there were even long periods in their history during which the whole nation was sunk in idolatry or lingered on in decay, captivity, or dispersion” (ibid., 336).

captivity in Egypt and their captivity in Babylon.”¹⁸⁵ Then from Jewish history, he moved to Christian times that afforded another parallel: the Middle Ages of “the general disorganized and schismatical state of the Church, her practical abandonment of her spiritual pretensions, the tyranny exercised over her by the civil power, and the intimate adherence of the worst passions and of circumstantial irregularities, to those acts which are vital portions of her system.”¹⁸⁶

Even the early Church was not altogether free from those errors and disorders which were the scandal of modern times. Newman recalled various examples: two or three bishops of Antioch at once in the fourth century; the Donatists, in the time of their power, having as many as four hundred bishops, that is, as many within sixty or seventy as the Catholic Church in Africa; etc.¹⁸⁷ He observed that the whole course of Christianity from the beginning is but one series of troubles and disorders.¹⁸⁸ The Church

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 343.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 334.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 351- 352. Newman cited a number of instances in Christian history: the third General Council of Ephesus (431) that dealt with the Nestorian heresy; the history of Vigilius, the Bishop of Rome, in the following century; feudal bishops in the tenth and eleventh centuries; and the great Western Schism in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (ibid., 345-351).

¹⁸⁸ For Newman, there were testimonies of “two Bishops of the Church in ages and countries far removed from each other, and under circumstances widely different, in proof of this one fact, that there have been junctures in the history of the Dispensation before our own, in which contemporaries thought they saw the utter confusion and the destruction of all that was sacred, venerable, or precious,—the immediate extinction of that Truth which has lasted centuries after them”: “The first of these writers is St. Basil, Exarch of Caesarea, in the fourth century; the other is the famous Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury in the twelfth. Of these the former thus writes concerning the state of Asia Minor and the East, where the Arians had for some years been spreading their heresy:— ‘The doctrines of godliness are overthrown; the laws of the Church are in confusion . . .’ Eight hundred years afterwards, an Archbishop of Canterbury, who at

is ever ailing and lingers on in weakness, “always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in her body.”¹⁸⁹

Newman ended his series of lectures by trusting in God’s will: “gathering in His elect, first one and then another, by little and little, snatching them from the surge of evil” and observing that “the most important points in the Christian system have been publicly canvassed in detail, and settled once for all; but in the first age of the Church there was more room than now, not for practical uncertainty where men were teachable, but for inquiry where they were restless, and for controversy where they were stubborn.”¹⁹⁰

7. The *Via Media* between Scripture and Tradition: A Summary

For Newman, the Church is indefectible in saving faith or fundamentals and supersedes private judgment. Consequently, it is important to identify this saving faith or fundamentals or essential part of the Gospel. Fundamentals are what Scripture expressly teaches, what the Creed states or what Antiquity taught as essentials. The Fathers of the Church regarded the Creed as a symbol, as a rule, as “essential” and “unalterable”

least is an authority with Romanists, writes as follows: ‘The king of England,’ he says, in a letter concerning Henry II, addressed to the Roman Cardinals, ‘has seized, and is every day seizing the property of the Church, subverts her liberty, stretches out his hands against the anointed ones of the Lord, against the clergy, without limit of place or selection of persons, imprisoning some, beheading others, tearing out the eyes of others, forcing others to single combat, others to the ordeal, that the Bishops may not pay obedience to their Metropolitan, nor the Clergy to their Bishops, nor account themselves excommunicated when they have been duly excommunicated’” (ibid., 352-354).

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 354.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 354-355.

doctrine.¹⁹¹ The Church teaches the Creed, enforces the Creed as a condition for communion, and indefectibly rescues the Creed from the dangers of private judgment.

Since Roman Catholics regarded the Church as infallible and faith dependent upon the Church, they overpowered the Creed and enforced other articles of faith, such as the Tridentine Creed, against the spirit and practice of the primitive Church. In contrast, the Anglican Articles were only provisions of the state and were necessary for communion only as far as they embodied the Creed. Newman, however, believed that to collect, systematize, and set forth the Traditions of the Church, was an edifying and important work.

The Anglicans accepted the Creed as a glorious privilege and were ready to battle and suffer for it. Their understanding of the Creed as the fundamentals, however, could be considered baseless because the Creed neither includes all doctrines nor the whole of the Gospel, nor did they explain how to draw the line between the essentials and non-essentials. Newman argued that the Creed could be proved from Scripture and there were lesser and greater truths; in addition, it was the duty of the Church Catholic to draw a line between the essentials and non-essentials. However, Anglicans did not consider the Church as a judge but as a witness and keeper of Divine Word. Antiquity and Catholicity were the real guides and the Church was their organ.

¹⁹¹ However, in 1877, Newman wrote: “In my ‘Prophetical office’ I had taken the usual Anglican view of it (Ephesine prohibition: “The Council of Ephesus forbade the composition of a further creed. Denzinger-Schönmetzer, 265). –but, under date of July 15, 1839, only 2 years after my book came out, I find I had made this pencil note in the margin – ‘I very much doubt, having now read the Acts and History of the Council of Chalcedon, whether my use of it here is fair’.” See JHN to Robert Charles Jenkins (The Oratory, Rednall, 27 February 1877), *LD* 28: 172. See also the Footnote 1 (*ibid.*).

Following the Anglican Divines and the Church Fathers, Newman argued that the Church should adhere to a double rule of faith: Scripture and Catholic Tradition. Scripture being the testament, the law of Christ, was the sole Canon of Faith; accordingly, Anglicans did not devalue Tradition but maintained that Tradition by itself, without Scriptural warrant, could not convey any doctrine necessary for Salvation. In fact, Catholic Tradition served Scripture.

The Church should not add to, but develop, the words of Scripture. Since the Church, by office and definition, was the pillar and ground of truth, the faith committed to her was to be clearly proclaimed and indefectibly maintained. Even though the English Church denied her own powers, she still did not lose the gifts given to her. Though she struggled like the churches of early ages and the middle ages, she still continued to be a branch of the One Catholic Church.

CHAPTER NINE: PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION OF THE *PROPHETICAL OFFICE* – 1877

After his entrance into the Roman Catholic Church in 1845, Newman continued his discussion of the articles of the Creed and the nature of the Catholic Church via a number of essays, tracts and controversies.¹ In 1877, Newman decided to re-publish his *Prophetical Office* and drafted a new Preface to the third edition, in which he made a number of revisions, retractions and amplifications of his Anglican ecclesiology.²

1. The Aftermath of the Lectures on the Prophetical Office

The theory of the *via media*, which Newman tried to expound in his original lectures on the prophetical office, was a work that occupied him for three years: from the beginning of 1834 to the end of 1836. His interest started with his correspondence with Jager, which was re-cast into lectures, which were re-written with considerable revision for publication in 1837 and 1838.³ For Newman, to commence “a system of theology on the Anglican idea and based upon Anglican authorities” was “cut and hewn upon ground,

¹ Perhaps the most notable of these controversies centered on the question of infallibility, which Newman discussed in his correspondence prior to, during and after the First Vatican Council (1869-1870); he eventually published his views as *A Letter Addressed to the Duke of Norfolk on Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation* (available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/anglicans/volume2/gladstone/index.html>); hereafter cited: *A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*. For a detailed discussion, see John R. Page, *What Will Dr. Newman Do? John Henry Newman and Papal Infallibility, 1865-1875* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994).

² The first edition of the *Prophetical Office* was published in 1837 and the second edition the following year; see: Vincent Ferrer Blehl, *John Henry Newman: A Bibliographical Catalogue of His Writings* (Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, University Press of Virginia, 1978), 45.

³ *Apologia*, 64.

the past toil of great divines.”⁴ An important incentive that prompted Newman’s publication of his lectures was Nicholas Wiseman’s lectures in London in 1835 that discussed the same issues that Newman had raised against Roman Catholic teachings in his lectures on the prophetic office.⁵

For Wiseman, the Oxford men were looking for something—they did not know what, and he “meant to ask them if perchance it was the religion of their forefathers.”⁶ Wiseman delivered two lectures each week addressed to Catholics and Protestants alike in the Sardinian Chapel in Lincoln’s Inn Fields,⁷ London. The lectures were well attended and both enhanced Wiseman’s reputation and marked the beginning of a serious

⁴ Ibid., 64-65. Consonant with his arguments in the *Prophetic Office* Newman’s opinion that the appointment of Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1836 was an attempt to introduce undogmatic and latitudinarian views. Newman insisted that “dogmatic formulas do require a guarantee higher than human reason can give: in the Catholic Church, her God-guaranteed actually operative power of infallible definition provides it” (Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, 54). Newman argued again for the use of apostolic tradition and an authoritative Church in “The Brothers’ Controversy,” published as “Article III. Apostolical Tradition,” *British Critic*, July 1836; available at <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/essays/volume1/apostolical.html>.

⁵ *Apologia*, 64. Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman claimed descent from Capel Wiseman, Anglican Bishop of Dromore, the third son of Sir William Wiseman, Bart, and great-grandson of Sir John Wiseman, one of the Auditors of the Exchequer in the reign of Henry VIII. James Wiseman, the Cardinal’s grandfather, was a merchant resident in Waterford and a Catholic. See Wilfrid Ward., *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1897), 1: 1; hereafter cited: Ward, *Wiseman*.

⁶ According to Ward, “Newman’s movement at Oxford—avowedly provoked by the growth of Popery and Dissent and by the religious shortcomings of the Church of England—had yet to show whether it could engraft itself on the then existing English Church” (ibid., 1: 229-230).

⁷ The Sardinian Chapel in Lincoln’s Inn Fields—an embassy chapel which recalled the days when all other Catholic chapels were illegal—was at that time served by the Abate Baldachin, who invited Wiseman to take charge of the Church during a visit to Italy. Wiseman consented and went there in November 1835, after returning from his round of visits in England (ibid., 231).

revival of Catholicism in England.⁸ The fame of the lecturer was so widespread that Bishop Bramston⁹ urged him to repeat the experiment at the more spacious Church of St. Mary's, Moorfields, the following Lent of 1836.¹⁰

Wiseman was mindful of the hostility and irritability of English non-Catholics and disclaimed at the outset any desire for controversy. Accordingly, his method was, first of all, more “*demonstrative* than controversial.”¹¹ Second, the lectures were “essentially *inductive*—that is to say, will not take any one single principle for granted, which will possibly bear a dispute.”¹² Third, his arguments were based on Scriptural teachings.¹³ Purportedly indifferent “regarding what any sect or section of Christians believes,” he wanted to set forth “what the Catholic doctrine is” and its proofs.¹⁴ He

⁸ Ibid., 233.

⁹ A convert to Roman Catholicism in 1790, James Yorke Bramston (1763-1836) studied theology at the English College in Lisbon prior to his priestly ordination in 1801; he was appointed Coadjutor Vicar Apostolic of the London District in 1823 and became Vicar in 1827.

¹⁰ Wiseman consented to this second venture which was even more successful: “The spacious church of Moorfields was thronged on every evening of Dr. Wiseman’s appearance Among the most constant listeners was Lord Brougham” (ibid., 235). These Lectures were later published in two volumes as *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, delivered at St. Mary’s, Moorfields during the Lent of 1836, by Nicholas Wiseman, D.D. They were republished without alteration in 1843.

¹¹ Throughout his lectures, Wiseman was very sensitive to the various shades of English opinion. The persuasiveness in Wiseman’s preaching was quite new and the lectures were simple and designed partly for the uneducated. See Nicholas Wiseman, D.D., *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church* (London: Charles Dolman, 1855), 1: 20-21.

¹² Ibid., 1: 21.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., 1: 22.

acknowledged two works of particular use in preparing these lectures: “the Symbolik of his friend Prof. Möhler” and the compilation of the Fathers by Kirk and Berington.¹⁵

Wiseman began his lectures by mentioning the contemporary religious revival in Germany and France.¹⁶ At the very outset, he marked out the “*one*” fault commonly attributed to Catholics: “the great besetting sin of the Catholic Church is, having rejected God’s written word in His Scriptures as the only rule and authority of faith”¹⁷ and consequently maintaining that “besides the written word of God, an infallible authority exists, and always has existed, in the Church.”¹⁸ Christianity “was considered by them as a system, intended to meet the wants of all mankind, so that its true evidence resided in the mind of every individual, as well as in the general feelings and cravings of the entire human race.”¹⁹

Accordingly, Wiseman examined the relative value of the “RULES OF FAITH; to see whether the Catholic is not fully justified in the admission of the principle, that God has appointed His Church, the infallible and unfailing depository of all truth.”²⁰ He

¹⁵ Ibid., 1: viii. Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838), a professor of theology at the University of Tübingen, published *Die Einheit in der Kirche, oder das Princip des Katholicismus* (Tübingen, 1825) and *Symbolik, oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnisschriften* (Mainz, 1832). John Kirk (1760-1851) and Joseph Berington (1746-1827) were the authors of *The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church* (London, 1813).

¹⁶ Ibid., 1: 236.

¹⁷ The different accusations against Rome “have only been produced by the admission of the false principle, as it is called, of human authority; and that consequently, all other accusations are but minor points, which merge entirely in this one” (ibid., 1: 3).

¹⁸ Ibid., 1: 4.

¹⁹ Ibid., 1: 15-16.

²⁰ Ibid., 1: 20.

presented “the Church as essentially comprehensive, and in the best sense liberal—as co-extensive with human life and aspiration.”²¹ “It is the acceptance of the living Authority of a Teaching Church as the divinely appointed guardian of religious truth which makes a man a Catholic.”²²

Wiseman also contended that “private judgment was *in fact* hardly ever the basis of any one’s belief.”²³ Apart from the admitted diversity as to the way Church Authority came to be acknowledged, once it was reached, it was the real basis of the acceptance of specific doctrines by every Catholic throughout the world. “It has the *prima facie* claim that it is a really existing foundation of religious belief, which private judgment—whether in the ultra-Protestant or in the Anglican form—is not.”²⁴

Wiseman then proceeded in subsequent lectures to show how this fact, which often disguised itself among hereditary Christians, was brought into patent relief when the rival principles of Authority and Private Judgment were used for the instruction of the converted heathen: the principle of Authority has practically succeeded; the principle of Private Judgment has failed.²⁵ The second volume of Wiseman’s lectures started from

²¹ Ibid., 1: 237.

²² Ward, *Wiseman*, 1: 240. Wiseman stated: “. . . whereas, on the contrary, it was impossible for any man to be brought to the Catholic religion, or to adhere to it, upon any principle whatever, without, in the act of entering it, embracing, and identifying with his conscience and conviction, the fundamental principle of Catholicity. For no one is, or can be, a Catholic, but by his entire submission to the authority of his Church” (Wiseman, *Lectures*, 1: 27). About half of the lectures were devoted to the exposition of Authority.

²³ “Men unconsciously accepted the authority of their parents, of English tradition, of early education—the profession that they judged for themselves came from a faulty analysis of their own minds” (1: 240-241).

²⁴ Ibid., 141.

²⁵ Ibid.

the principle of Church Authority. These lectures were devoted to explaining those doctrines which had been almost universally misrepresented in England—penance, purgatory, indulgences, the invocation of saints, reverence to images and relics, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation.²⁶

One notable response to Wiseman's lectures was an essay written by Newman in the *British Critic* in December 1836: "We are no friends to Popery, as our readers will bear us witness; yet, we confess, we were not displeased at the publication of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures."²⁷ The keynote of the essay was struck in the following passage:

. . . we hear with great equanimity the rumours of the impression which Dr. Wiseman's lectures have made upon the mixed multitude of London. Romanism has great truths in it, which we of this day have almost forgotten, and its preachers will recall numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters to an acknowledgment of them: Dissenters who never had them will embrace them in their Roman form; Churchmen who have received, but forgotten them, will discern them, and use them in the Church.²⁸

Newman surmised that for the majority of English Churchmen, the effect of Wiseman's victory over Protestantism was to awaken the Catholic principles dormant in the Established Church—to help forward the Catholic Movement *within* her pale, rather than to lead to secessions.²⁹ Commenting on Wiseman's important treatment of "the Rule of Faith," Newman remarked: "Dr. Wiseman would make it appear as if there were

²⁶ Ibid., 334.

²⁷ Newman, "Article VI: Lectures on the Principal Doctrine and Practices of the Catholic Church by Nicholas Wiseman, D.D.," *British Critic* 19 (October, 1836); hereafter cited "Article VI: Lectures by Wiseman"; available at <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/britishcritic/wiseman.html>, 373-403, at 373.

²⁸ "Article VI: Lectures by Wiseman," 376.

²⁹ "They would consider this as all one with recommending Popery; but if so, how is our Church's doctrine a *via media*? quite as fairly, to say the least, might they be called Dissenters for circulating the peculiar works above mentioned" (ibid., 376-377).

no medium between the two alternatives above stated; between an infallible living guide, and no guide besides Scripture itself.”³⁰ For Newman, there was a *via media* because “English theology does admit a guide, though not an infallible one, but subordinate to Scripture” and whether it can be maintained or not, there is “a middle between the two extremes.”³¹ He added: “Nothing can be clearer; the English doctrine does not encourage private judgment in matters of (necessary) faith, but maintains the Church’s authority.”³²

According to Newman, Anglicans did not deny that many things may be true which were not in Scripture but did “deny such are points of what is emphatically called the *faith*, i.e. points necessary to be believed in order to salvation.”³³ The Roman Church admitted that she determined doctrines from Tradition and not from Scripture.³⁴

Accordingly, Newman insisted: “The Church must not enforce beyond Scripture; it may decree, i.e. pronounce, beyond it, but not against it.”³⁵ This was another evidence for him

³⁰ Ibid., 377.

³¹ “The 20th Article expressly declares, that the Church ‘hath authority in controversies of faith’” (ibid).

³² Ibid., 378.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ “For instance, the Council of Trent makes it necessary to salvation to believe that it is ‘good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints,’ and this on the ground of its being ‘juxta Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ *usum* à primævis Christianæ religionis temporibus receptum, sanctorumque Patrum *consentionem*, et sacrorum Conciliorum decreta;’ not a word being said of *Scripture* sanction” (ibid.). Newman was quoting the Council of Trent’s decree, *De invocatione, veneratione et reliquiis Sanctorum et sacris imaginibus* (1563); an English translation is available at: <http://www.ewtn.com/library/councils/trent25.html>.

³⁵ According to Newman, “the Church Catholic, has absolute authority in matters of necessary or saving faith, and supersedes so far private judgment upon the text of Scripture—that, as ruling herself by Scripture and antiquity, she may securely and implicitly be trusted in all matters of necessary doctrine; nay further, we may even grant (to imitate Dr. Wiseman’s mode of varying his proposition, p. 30,) she literally cannot,

that “the Church of Rome is not the Church Catholic, but a particular Church; because she has avowed and used a different rule.”³⁶ He further argued that the doctrine “that the Church Catholic is indefectible in matters of necessary and saving truth, will, perhaps, startle some persons till they are assured that it is taught by our Principal divines.”³⁷

Newman pointed out the characteristic difference between the English and Roman doctrine: “Both parties consider ‘the faith’ to be *necessary to salvation*; but we say the faith is prior to the Church; they, the Church is prior to the faith.”³⁸ While Wiseman claimed only “to his Church, which he identifies with the true one, the power of *adding* to the fundamentals,” Newman considered “its fulfillment to lie in there having been ever in *all* places, perfect maintenance of *fundamental* doctrine.”³⁹ He then re-stated his *via media* ecclesiology: “The Romanist gives to the existing *Church* the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith; the Ultra-Protestant to the *individual*; and the

that is, she has a promise that she never will, enforce any thing as a point of necessary faith which is not at once Scriptural and primitive, and that so she is a sure authority. As it is her duty ever diligently to study Scripture and antiquity, so it is her privilege to be assured she shall be kept ever from departing from these two joint guides” (ibid., 379).

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ By “the Church Catholic,” Newman meant the whole Church, all over the world, which would never agree to teaching and enforcing what is not true (ibid., 380). He referred to various Anglican divines, the teaching of Ancient Fathers and Vincent’s rule as proof of the Church “always holding indefectibly, or knowing infallibly, those doctrines which are the fundamentals of faith; from which position its absolute authority in respect to them necessarily follows” (ibid., 380-382).

³⁸ “. . . that Romanists conceive that the Church may create articles of necessary belief; that what was not necessary to be believed in order to salvation before her decision, becomes so afterwards; whereas we consider that the one saving faith has, from the first, been ever promulgated; that the Church does not, by her decision, make any part of it saving, but merely declares it: in other words, they consider the Church an infallible arbiter *pro re natâ*; we, a faithful and indefectible guardian of what was, in the first instance, *given* as saving” (ibid., 383).

³⁹ Ibid., 384.

Anglican to *antiquity*, giving authority to the Church, as being the witness and voice, or rather the very presence of Antiquity among us.”⁴⁰

Newman next corrected Wiseman’s misunderstanding of Anglican doctrine.

Wiseman had stated that: “the fundamental principle of Protestantism, as *recognized in the English Church* (for he speaks of us Anglicans all along) is, that ‘the Word of God alone is the true standard and rule of faith.’”⁴¹ Newman responded: “[The Bible] is our sole document, basis of proof, record, standard of appeal, touchstone of the faith, not the sole guide, for the Church is a guide, having ‘authority in matters of faith.’”⁴² He added:

For ourselves, we confess, we are willing to dispense with the phrase ‘Rule of Faith,’ as applied to Scripture, on the ground of its being ambiguous; and, again, because it is then used in a novel sense, for the ancient Church made the Apostolic Tradition, as summed up in the Creed, and not the Bible, the ‘Regula Fidei’ or Rule.⁴³

He admitted that Anglican “divines use it without any fixed sense, sometimes for Scripture, sometimes for the whole and perfectly adjusted Christian doctrine, sometimes for the Creed.”⁴⁴ But these variations “show not only what the Anglican doctrine is, but, in particular, that the phrase ‘Rule of Faith’ is no symbol with us, appropriated to some one sense; certainly not, as a definition or attribute of Holy Scripture”,⁴⁵ thus, Scripture “is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith.”⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., 385.

⁴³ Ibid., 386.

⁴⁴ Newman mentioned that various Anglican divines used “Rules of Faith” in several degrees and sorts (ibid., 386-388).

⁴⁵ Ibid., 388.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

Newman then pointed out that though he *both* avowed his own belief in Church authority and acknowledged its actual existence in the early Church: “Wiseman quotes him [Newman] only in evidence of the latter fact, not in any sense as an indication (as far as an individual can be) of the *doctrine* of his Church.”⁴⁷ Newman also maintained that the scriptural references for the Apostolic Commission that Wiseman used “to prove the absolute *infallibility* of the Church” were also quite as clearly and fully satisfied to prove “the indefectibility of the *whole* Church, whether united to Rome or not, in fundamentals.”⁴⁸ However, evaluating Wiseman’s observation about “the practical success of the Protestant (Ultra-Protestant) or Catholic (Roman) Rule of Faith (i.e. mode of teaching) in converting heathen nations,”⁴⁹ Newman admitted that “Romanism has a success among the heathen” and blamed the British government for weakening the English Church.⁵⁰

Though Newman remained secure and unwavering in his opposition to Rome, his tribute to Wiseman’s lectures offended some of his friends in Oxford. S. F. Wood, uncle of Lord Halifax, communicated to Newman the disgust of the editor of the *British Critic*.⁵¹ In 1837, the *British Critic* launched a violent attack on Wiseman.⁵² Newman’s article was both a testimony to the power of Wiseman’s lectures and a reminder of the

⁴⁷ Ibid., 392.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 395. See also *ibid.*, 397.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 397.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 400.

⁵¹ Wood to JHN (Temple St Thomas’ Eve, 20 December 1836), *LD* 5: 396.

⁵² Dr. Turton, Dean of Peterborough and Professor of Divinity at Cambridge published *The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist Considered* (Ward, Wiseman, 1: 243).

quicksand on which many Anglican Churchmen were standing.⁵³ The success of his lectures, as well as his keen interest in the Oxford Movement, prompted Wiseman to collaborate with the foundation of a new Roman Catholic publication, the *Dublin Review*.⁵⁴

On 8 May 1838, Newman began a series of twelve lectures in the Adam de Brome chapel, where he had delivered his lectures on the *Prophetical Office*. Of these twelve “Lectures on the Scripture Proof of the Doctrines of the Church,” eight of these were later published as *Tract 85*.⁵⁵ This tract acknowledged that while there really is a true Creed or system in Scripture, it is latent and implicit; the Bible contains all that is necessary to salvation but it derives its authority from its witness to the apostolic tradition: “Love of God led St. Peter to follow Christ, and love of Christ leads men now to love and follow the Church, as His representative and voice.”⁵⁶

⁵³ Ward observed that Wiseman’s lectures attracted special notice in the Protestant press: “Men of position or distinction were received into the Roman Church, and among them the celebrated architect Augustus Welby Pugin. Wiseman’s movements began to be chronicled in the daily papers” (ibid., 244). The line of argument developed by Wiseman with an abundance of illustration, and the letters, created a profound impression as masterpieces of a clean and unanswerable argument (ibid., 248).

⁵⁴ Ibid., 248-249.

⁵⁵ See Ker, *A Biography*, 160, and Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, 56, including footnote 15.

⁵⁶ JHN, *Tract 85*, 252; available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/arguments/scripture/lecture8.html>.

2. The Collapse of Newman's *Via Media*

When Newman's book, *Prophetical Office*, came out in print, it sold well.⁵⁷

Naturally, Newman assumed: "It only shows how deep the absurd notion was in men's minds that I was a Papist; and now they are agreeably surprised Anyone who knew anything of theology would not have confounded me with the Papists; . . . confusing the Sun and the Moon."⁵⁸ However, the book was received with mixed reviews.⁵⁹ During 1837 and 1838, Newman published nothing controversial or polemical about the Church

⁵⁷ Newman wrote: "My new book is selling very well" (JHN to Mrs John Mozley [Oriol, 29 March 1837], *LD* 6: 49-50, at 50). "I am pleased at your liking the book . . . I am glad to hear it is selling" (JHN to John Keble [31 March 1837], *LD* 6: 50-51, at 51).

⁵⁸ JHN to Mrs. John Mozley (25 April 1837), *LD* 6: 61. Newman wrote: "The truth is, people have been persuading each other that I am a Papist, and wondering what I *can* say for myself, and then when they find I am after all just what they ought from the first to have believed me to be, they are much struck; think it very wonderful; and that there is a great deal in it. However it is good luck for me" See also JHN to Miss M. R. Giberne (Oriol, 3 May 1837), *LD* 6: 63-64, at 64 and JHN to Mrs. John Mozley (Trinity College, 19 May 1837), *LD* 6: 70-71, at 71. "They are said to prove me to be not a Papist" (JHN to Giberne [24 July 1837], *LD* 6: 103-104, at 104).

⁵⁹ John Keble was pleased with the *Prophetical Office* and wished he had "seen the Lecture on the Rule of Faith before I wrote that Sermon of mine." See JHN to John Keble (Oriol, 31 March 1837), *LD* 6: 50-51, at 51. Newman wrote to Mrs. John Mozley (25 April 1837): "What you say about my book is very gratifying . . . I hear the same in various other quarters – and it is selling very well." See *ibid.*, 61. "[James H. Todd] had read Newman's *Prophetical Office* 'with much pleasure and instruction', but could not agree that there had not been hitherto in England a theology Catholic but not Roman, or that 'the *Via Media* has NEVER existed except on paper' He wrote again on 22 May, more reconciled to Newman's words, and admitting that the Church of England, both at the Reformation and at the Revolution, had shown an injurious 'tenderness' towards Protestants at home and abroad. He repeated the charge that Bellarmine and other Romanist writers quoted spurious works of the Fathers when it suited them, and repudiated them when it did not." See Footnote 1, *LD* 6: 63. "A review of *Prophetical Office* in *Brit. Mag.*, May 1837, pp. 546-7, expressed a reservation about 'the allegation that the church-of-England system (the *Via Media*) is only a *theory*, existing in the writings of certain excellent divines, but never tried as a practical system'. . . ." See Footnote 2, *LD* 6: 77.

of Rome. While studying the Monophysite controversy in 1839, he was “struck by two ‘very remarkable features’ of the Council of Chalcedon—‘the great power of the Pope (as great as he claims now almost), and the marvelous interference of the civil power, as great almost as in our kings’.”⁶⁰ During the course of this reading, for the first time, he had doubts about the tenableness of Anglicanism:

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 now is; and the Protestants were the Eutychians.⁶¹

Newman had hardly finished his analysis of Monophysitism, friends who were more favorable to the cause of Rome than Newman himself gave him a copy of the *Dublin Review* of that same August:

There was an Article in it on the “Anglican Claim” by Dr. Wiseman It was on the Donatists, with an application to Anglicanism. I read it, and did not see much in it But my friend, an anxiously religious man, now, as then, very dear to me, a Protestant still, pointed out the palmary words of St. Augustine, which were contained in one of the extracts made in the *Review*, and which had escaped my observation. “Securus judicat orbis terrarum.” He repeated these words again and again, and, when he was gone, they kept ringing in my ears. “Securus judicat orbis terrarum;” they were words which went beyond the occasion of the Donatists: they applied to that of the Monophysites. . . . they were like the “Tolle, lege,—Tolle, lege,” of the child, which converted St. Augustine himself. “Securus judicat orbis terrarum!” By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverized.⁶²

⁶⁰ Ker, *Biography*, 177.

⁶¹ *Apologia*, 114. This passage describes Newman’s recollections in 1864, a quarter-century after the event.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 114-115.

Newman realized that Wiseman's argument about the principle of Catholicity, *securus judicat orbis terrarum* (the whole world is a safe judge) was an integral aspect of the early Church and the Church of England was a minority holding out against the rest of the Church. It was self-contradictory for Anglicans to maintain Antiquity as a rule and at the same time deny the Catholicity so central to the early Church. These patristic examples effectively ended Newman's espousal of the *via media* theory (1833-1839).

3. 1877 Preface to Third Edition

Towards the end of November 1876, Newman began to re-edit his two volumes of the *Via Media*.⁶³ The first volume was to be his third edition of the *Prophetical Office*.⁶⁴ On Monday, 26 February 1877, he went out to Rednal to prepare a Preface for this first volume.⁶⁵ As Ker observed: "The resulting essay was to be his last great contribution towards a theology of the Church."⁶⁶ The *Month* (November, 1877, pp. 372-73), called the Preface:

one of the most important papers which have proceeded from the pen of its illustrious author for many years, and explained that it was 'intended to meet many difficulties . . . with regard to alleged inconsistencies between doctrine and practice, as to the acts of Popes in the government of the Church, the toleration of

⁶³ See *LD* 28: xxii. Newman wrote on Saturday 6 January 1877, "I was employed on my *Via Media* this month and Christmas time." See *ibid.*, 28: 156. See also *ibid.*, 165.

⁶⁴ As Gilley (*Newman and His Age*, 385) has pointed out: "The second volume [of the *Via Media*] was an assemblage of eleven more occasional pieces, spanning his tract on the Church Missionary Society of 1830 to his retraction of his anti-catholic statements in 1841, and including a good deal of the documentation of Tract 90"; see also Ker, *Biography*, 701.

⁶⁵ See *LD* 28: 171.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 701.

excesses in devotion . . . the policy of the Holy See in temporal matters, and the like.⁶⁷

Newman answered the objections he had once raised, and admitted his embarrassment in his Preface.⁶⁸ With notes added to the main body of the text and certain rhetorical anti-Roman sentiments eliminated, Newman re-published his *Prophetical Office* in *Via Media*, Volume I.⁶⁹ It was well reviewed immediately.⁷⁰ Newman explained his choice of the title, *Via Media*, on 18 December 1877 in a letter to H. P. Liddon:

⁶⁷ See Footnote 2, *LD* 28: 263. See also JHN to Henry James Coleridge (The Oratory, 5 November 1877), *LD* 28: 263 and the Introductory Note, *LD* 28: xiv.

⁶⁸ See the Introductory Note, *LD* 28: xiv.

⁶⁹ Though Newman approached Rivington (JHN to John Rivington [10 March 1877], *LD* 28: 179) to republish the “‘Prophetical Office of the Church,’ and other writings in defence of the Church of England in two volumes; and since they were originally published by [him],” Rivington declined (Footnote 1, *LD* 28: 179). However, “Pickering had agreed to publish *V. M.*” See Footnote 2, *LD* 28: 182. On Friday 16 March 1877, Newman “sent up *Prophetical Office* for the Printer” (*LD* 28: 182). “The one which is all but finished consists of the ‘Prophetical Office’ published in 1837 and a new Preface” (JHN to B. M. Pickering [The Oratory, 9 July 1877], *LD* 28: 221 and also 224). The second volume contained articles and tracts written from 1833 until the end of Newman’s formal involvement in the Oxford. See Weidner, *Via Media*, xxxviii.

⁷⁰ “This was ‘A Self-Refutation’, the *Contemporary Review* (No. 1877) pp. 1093-8, reviewing *V.M. I*. It began: ‘Dr. Newman, who as a controversial champion may boast to have slain his thousands in his day, has now added one more, and not the least illustrious, to the long list of his victims – his former self.’ It added: ‘That Dr. Newman is much stronger and on surer ground as a critic and assailant of the Anglican *via media* than as its expounder and defender must, we should say, be generally allowed; and now that we have an opportunity of comparing his style . . . we cannot but be struck with an advance and development even in this respect. It is richer, freer, more agile . . . There can be very few . . . who can doubt that Dr. Newman, exceptional as his experience may be, has found the air of Rome intellectually bracing and invigorating, and the strict dogmatic system to which he has bowed his neck a support, not a cramping restraint.’ The review went on to praise the new Preface to the *Via Media*, which, it thought, ‘will rank with the most brilliant achievements of his genius.’ The anonymous reviewer was William Brightly Rands. See *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals II*, corrections to Volume I” (Footnote 1, *LD* 28: 263).

The Volumes are directed against myself, against my defence of the Church of England, against my assault upon the Church of Rome. Via Media is my own term. Of course I had chosen it, not as original with me, but as Hall's and many others'. . . . And my argument founded on the term 'Via Media' did not lie so much in Anglicanism as being in the middle, as in 'Romanism' being in the extreme. I did not argue, nor fancy Hall etc. to argue, 'That which is in the middle must be right, Anglicanism is in the middle, Ergo, but 'Rome is wrong because it is so extreme.'⁷¹

Newman was concerned with the "positive phenomenon in Rome, not the negative phenomenon in England."⁷² However, he "thought that moderation which was the Anglican characteristic was a 'proprium' in favour of Anglicanism."⁷³

A. Newman's Review of the Lectures

Forty years after the original publication of his *Prophetical Office*, Newman needed to consider what argumentative force these lectures bore upon the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, against which they were more or less directed. He also needed to decide what answer could be given to his main charges against the Roman Catholic Church.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Newman to H. P. Liddon (The Oratory, 18 December 1877), *LD* 28: 282-283, at 283; Joseph Hall (1574-1656), Bishop of Exeter (1627-1641) and Bishop of Norwich (1641-1656), was one of the Caroline divines, but with Puritan leanings and an opponent of Papists; he was the author of *Via Media, the Way of Peace*.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ *Prophetical Office*, xv. Newman's answer was not to deny many of the abuses, but to deny the conclusions drawn from their existence. This concession was not new to his Roman Catholic writings; he had, for instance, granted it in his "Essay on Consulting the Faithful" by reminding his readers that during the Arian crisis, it was the laity who preserved orthodoxy, while the bishops wavered or fell into heresy. In his *Letter to the Duke to the Norfolk*, he vouched for both the "pure and serene atmosphere" on the summit of the Rock of St Peter, as well as for a "great deal Roman malaria at the foot of it" (Weidner, *Via Media*. xlii).

Subsequently, Newman decided to deal with incidental objections and matters of detail in bracketed notes at the foot of each page, as they occurred.⁷⁵ He reminded his readers that the formal purpose of the lectures was not an attack upon Roman Catholic teaching, but rather the establishment of the Anglican doctrine of the *via media*,⁷⁶ which “only indirectly comes into collision with the theology of Rome.”⁷⁷ The immediate reason for discussing the Church was not to refute error, but to establish truth, the meaning of the article of the Creed, “the Holy Catholic Church.”⁷⁸ To do this effectively, Newman felt that he needed to attack Romanism. Thus his original lectures on the *Prophetical Office* were chiefly written against Romanism, though their main object was not controversy but edification:⁷⁹ “the large portions of these Lectures are expositions, nay, recommendations of principles and doctrines, recognized in the Catholic Church.”⁸⁰ In those portions, when Newman as a Roman Catholic, reviewed them afresh, he had nothing or little to change.

Newman then outlined the content of each of his fourteen lectures.⁸¹ At least half of them were taken up with an unexceptional advocacy of Catholic principles and

⁷⁵ *Prophetical Office*, xv.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ In fact, Newman “acted far more as an assailant of the religion of the Reformation than of what he called ‘Popery’” (*ibid.*).

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, xvi.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, xvi-xvii.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, xvii.

⁸¹ Newman organized the lectures as follows: Lecture I: the material on the subject of Tradition is acceptable to Catholic teaching with very little “correction or addition”; Lecture II: “the cogency of Ancient Consent or of the testimony of Antiquity” is accurately expounded and affirmed as far as both Roman and Anglicans go in theory; Lectures III & IV are anti-Catholic from beginning to end, and constitute the special

doctrines; the other half addressed serious matters. Accordingly, he wanted to distinguish between those statements which were argumentative and those which were not.⁸²

B. The Main Elements of the Lectures

Newman pointed out three main elements to controversial writings: hypothetical, rhetorical and argumentative (truths and facts together with deduction from them). This last element was the logical one; however, the first two elements, which were usually important in controversy, were more or less rhetorical and had a considerable place in his lectures but not in this Preface.

portion of the Volume which is antagonistic to the Roman Church. These two Lectures are mainly focused on tracing the supposed evils which come of the doctrine of Infallibility, though in a latter Lecture the author seems to consider that privilege as having been intended by Divine Providence for His Church, and as actually enjoyed by her for some centuries. Lecture V, on Private Judgment, is a delineation and defence of the *Via Media*, for which on the whole it is little more than an apology, confessing it to be, as a doctrine, wanting in simplicity, hard to master, indeterminate in its provisions, and without a substantive existence in any age or country. Lecture VI, on the abuse of Private Judgment, might have been written by a Catholic, and so might the first part of the Lecture VII, until the argument passes on to an attack upon the doctrines of Purgatory and Papal Supremacy. Lectures VIII, IX & X, amid much which a Catholic would condemn and protest allow that the Church, which the Apostles founded, is “ever divinely guided to teach the truth,” is “indefectible in her witness of the Christian faith,” “has a supernatural gift” for the purpose of transmitting it, and is “unerring, infallible, in matters of saving faith.” Lectures XI, XII & XIII are “on Scripture as the Rule of Faith, are as such wisely guarded and explained, as virtually to admit, while denying, the authority of Tradition, and are for the most part in accordance, or reconcilable, with Catholic belief on the subject, in spite of some misconception of our teaching, and of language which needs correction.” Lecture XIV, “like the Introduction, is a candid confession of the shortcomings and reverses of the Anglican Establishment, and only so far injurious to the Catholic Church as it is an attempt to shelter such misfortunes, past or present, behind those scandals, of which the Church herself has been from time to time the victim” (ibid., xvii-xix).

⁸² Ibid., xix-xx.

Newman insisted on the free use of hypotheses as substitutes for direct evidence and hard reasoning in support of propositions:⁸³ “such hypotheses are altogether legitimate, and often necessary.”⁸⁴ For him, the *via media* was such an hypothesis:

Such is an hypothesis; and, to come to the subject of these Lectures, such also is the *Via Media*, a possible road, lying between a mountain and a morass, to be driven through formidable obstacles, if it is to exist, by the boldness and skill of the engineers. It is projected and planned for a definite necessity, the necessity of the Anglican position, except for which it would never have been imagined; and, as many other projects and plans, it may be made to look very fair on paper.⁸⁵

Newman claimed that this hypothesis was reasonable and true because two things were necessary for the defense of the Anglican Church: “a broad, intellectual, intelligible theory, and a logical and historical foundation for that theory.”⁸⁶ He was content to attempt the former, taking the latter for granted: “Proof was not the main object of his book; as far as he aimed at proof in behalf of Anglicanism, he insisted on its

⁸³ Newman explained the meaning of “hypothesis”: “I mean, a suggestion of views more or less probable or possible, and either consistent, or not inconsistent, or perhaps in actual concurrence, as ideas, with the facts of the case; and this, in order to reconcile difficulties and answer objections, to supplement what is obscure or deficient, to bring together into one separate matters which seem to be without a meaning, and to assign a law for them, where none was suspected” (ibid., xx).

⁸⁴ Newman added: “[F]or representations may be true, which nevertheless are not or cannot be proved; and probabilities, when accumulated, tell, and new openings for thought and for discovery are sometimes the issue of what is in the first instance little more than a conjecture. Still such hypotheses appeal to the imagination more than to the reasoning faculty; and, while by their plausibility, ingenuity, or brilliancy, they may gain from the reader more sympathy than is strictly their due, they do not admit, and on that account cannot demand, a logical refutation. Reason cannot be called on to demolish what reason has not even professed to establish” (ibid., xxi).

⁸⁵ Ibid., xxii.

⁸⁶ Ibid., xxiii.

reasonableness and consistency: and this, though at the same time he was accusing the theology of Rome of basing itself on consistency to the neglect of truth.”⁸⁷

Even in 1877, Newman found much truth in Anglican teaching, but he could no longer support the Church of England insofar as much of its teaching and many of its teachers no longer knew anything about the *via media*.⁸⁸ For him, the innate persuasiveness of the *via media* was his main reason for continuing the controversy. Passing over patristic literature and history, he argued that his theory had never been realized and that for 1800 years, the true Gospel, as regards this special aspect of it, had never been preached to the world.⁸⁹

For instance, Newman remarked in his fifth lecture, “On the Use of Private Judgment,” “it is scarcely more than a gratuitous hypothesis from beginning to end, supported neither by Scripture, nor Antiquity,—and an intricate hypothesis, as the Author confesses.”⁹⁰ He described it, first in theory, and then in practice. He had neither proved it from the Fathers nor from the nature of the case. When he had finished his sketch of this lecture, he acknowledged that “‘*he really does believe,*’ that in point of ‘primitive simplicity, rational freedom, truth and certainty,’ his rule of determining revealed doctrine is better than the Roman.”⁹¹ Even on the question of the indefectibility of the Church, he was far more interested in distinguishing between the Roman and the

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid., xxiv.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid., xxv.

⁹¹ Ibid., xxvi.

Anglican teaching on the subject, than in proving the Anglican to be true.⁹² To draw out these distinctions, which are non-logical aspects, was his primary reason for writing about the Roman Church.

In regard to the “rhetorical element” of his *Prophetical Office*, Newman acknowledged his use of “the coarse rhetoric of hard names and sweeping imputations in advance of proof, proof not only not adduced, but not even promised.”⁹³ He also admitted: “It is at times, and in a measure pardonable, when it stands for a token or symbol of earnestness in an assailant, and of confidence in the goodness of his cause.”⁹⁴ He wished his lectures had not furnished so many instances of reprehensible polemic such as “Romanism,” “Romanist” and “Romish”⁹⁵: “The more a writer revered that wonderful See and followed its teaching . . . the more he had these feelings towards it, the more he needed a word which would distinguish what he accepted from what scandalized him.”⁹⁶

In his Preface, Newman emphasized the contrast between the theological side of Roman teaching and its political and popular side; it was the latter which he primarily had in mind when he spoke of Romanists and Romanism:⁹⁷ “Worse than the use of this

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid., xxvii.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ “It is not the worst, first from the great need there is of some word to take its place in the case of an Anglican controversialist, who could not consistently with his own pretensions use the right words Catholic and Catholicity. And again the offensive word had a specific and definite meaning, convenient in polemical writings, even if elsewhere improper” (ibid., xxviii).

⁹⁶ Ibid., xxix-xxx.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

word, are the vague charges, and random reproaches, and scornful epithets indulged in by the Author, keenly alive as he was to the vulgarity of the Exeter Hall⁹⁸ eloquence of the day.”⁹⁹ He also acknowledged that he went out of his way to aim a side-blow at Rome, by using violent words to cover some quasi-Catholic statements, which were likely to be unpalatable to his readers.¹⁰⁰ The most serious of these passages was at the beginning of the third lecture, which attributed derangement or a worse calamity to the Roman Church. Accordingly, he included a list of retractations in the second and third editions of the lectures.¹⁰¹

Newman also reviewed the “argumentative elements,” mainly found in his second, third and fourth lectures:

And I shall have no difficulty in admitting on the whole the definite facts and statements which are there made the ground of charges against Catholic teaching. Those alleged facts and statements were the result of a careful and not unfriendly study of Bellarmine’s great work, and are in substance accurate.¹⁰²

Newman intended to systematize what the Anglican divines had variously put forth as *via media* teaching and to assist the formation of a recognized Anglican theology.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ Exeter Hall (dedicated 1831, demolished 1907), The Strand, London, with an auditorium seating 4,000 people, was used for religious and political purposes, such as anti-slavery meetings, etc.

⁹⁹ “Thus we are told of ‘the bold speculativeness of Romanism,’ ‘the bold exactness of Romanism,’ ‘the presumptuous dogmatism of Rome,’ ‘the reckless conduct of Rome,’ and of ‘that venturesome Church.’ . . . that ‘Romanism makes the Church the instrument of a double usurpation,’ and as to Roman Divines, ‘as in the building of Babel, God has confounded their language’” (ibid., xxx).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., xxxi.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., xxxi-xxxii.

¹⁰² Ibid., xxxii-xxxiii.

¹⁰³ Ibid., xxxiii.

In the years which followed the publication of this Volume, in proportion as he read the Fathers more carefully, and used his own eyes in determining the faith and worship of their times, his confidence in the Anglican divines was more and more shaken, and at last it went altogether.¹⁰⁴

Even though some of these argumentative charges against Rome were reproduced in these lectures, Newman thought that two of them were of special importance. The first dealt with the charges centered concerning Roman infidelity to the ancient Church, which his *Essay on the Development*, originally published in 1845, had answered. His second charge—that the Roman Catholic Church was unfaithful to its own principles—received a response in his 1877 Preface.¹⁰⁵

4. Prophetical, Regal and Priestly Church: A New Ecclesiology

Newman knew that many of his contemporaries were unable to profess Christianity.¹⁰⁶ However, there were some who would become Catholics, if their consciences would let them:

[F]or they see in the Catholic Religion a great substance and earnest of truth; a depth, strength, coherence, elasticity, and life, a nobleness and grandeur, a power of sympathy and resource in view of the various ailments of the soul, and a suitability to all classes and circumstances of mankind; a glorious history, and a

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ “I address myself to this latter objection in particular, because I have made it on many occasions and in many ways. I am not undertaking here to defend the Catholic Church against all assailants whatever, but against one, that is, myself. I say this lest readers should consider I have done nothing unless I refute such allegations as these—that Rome dwarfs the intellect, narrows the mind, hardens the heart, fosters superstition, and encourages a blood-thirsty, crafty, and bigotted temper,—these are charges which this Volume does not contain” (ibid., xxxv).

¹⁰⁶ For example, William Froude (1810-1879), brother of Hurrell Froude and a prominent scientist, carried on an extensive correspondence with Newman about Christian faith; however, Froude died an agnostic, while his wife became a Roman Catholic. Froude’s correspondence with Newman is reflected in the *Grammar of Assent*.

promise of perpetual youthfulness; and they already accept without scruple or rather joyfully feed upon its solemn mysteries, which are a trial to others¹⁰⁷

Such people, however, could not enter its fold because of great difficulties which blocked their way. Newman recalled that for many years he had found himself faced with similar difficulties: “Union with Rome is impossible.”¹⁰⁸ Many people then looked upon the Roman Church “with their ingrained prejudices against her” and were unable to convert.¹⁰⁹

As a result, Newman brought two broad charges against the Catholic religion in these lectures and in some of his tracts and other papers: 1) The contrast which modern Catholicism was said to present with the religion of the Primitive Church, in teaching, conduct, worship, and polity, which he discussed and explained at great length in his *Essay on the Development*,¹¹⁰ and 2) the equally obvious and serious charges, about the difference between its formal teaching and its popular and political manifestations.¹¹¹ Since Newman had not previously treated this alleged discordance from a Catholic point of view, he wanted to take this opportunity to explain his position.

In answer to these concerns, Newman presented a new understating of the Church as “gifted with those various prerogatives, and charged with those independent and conflicting duties.”¹¹² Accordingly, the Church has a complex structure:

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., xxxvi.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., xxxvii.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., xxxvii.

¹¹¹ Ibid., xxxvii-xxxviii.

¹¹² In Newman’s judgment, both Anglicans and Roman Catholics recognized the various prerogatives and duties belonging to the Church (ibid., xxxviii).

Her organization cannot be otherwise than complex, considering the many functions which she has to fulfill, the many aims to keep in view, the many interests to secure,—functions, aims, and interests, which in their union and divergence remind us of the prophet's vision of the Cherubim, in whom "the wings of one were joined to the wings of another," yet "they turned not, when they went, but everyone went straight forward."¹¹³

Since they are human, the rulers and authorities of the Church on some occasions have come short of what was required of them. They have given occasion to criticism, just or unjust, as a result of the special antagonisms or compromises through which the Church's many-sided mission had been carried out under their guidance.

Newman's ecclesiology rests on the divine origin of the Church understood as the representative of Jesus Christ:

When our Lord went up on high, He left His representative behind Him. This was Holy Church, His mystical Body and Bride, a Divine Institution, and the shrine and organ of the Paraclete, who speaks through her till the end comes. She, to use an Anglican poet's words, is "His very self below," as far as men on earth are equal to the discharge and fulfillment of high offices, which primarily and supremely are His.¹¹⁴

As Christ's representative, the Church carries out the very ontological functions or offices of Christ:

These offices, which specially belong to Him as Mediator, are commonly considered to be three; He is Prophet, Priest, and King; and after His pattern, and in human measure, Holy Church has a triple office too; not the Prophetical alone and in isolation, as these Lectures virtually teach, but three offices, which are indivisible, though diverse, viz. teaching, rule, and sacred ministry.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Ibid., xxxviii; the biblical quotation is from Ezekiel 1:9. Also see: "... as to the Church, gifted as she is with grace up to the measure of her responsibilities, if she has on her an arduous work, it is sufficient to refer to our Lord's words, "What is impossible with men, is possible with God," in order to be certain (in spite of appearances) of her historical uprightness and consistency" (ibid., xxxix).

¹¹⁴ Ibid., xxxix.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., xl.

Thus, for Newman, the very title of the lectures was to be criticized. If the Church were the mystical body of Christ, the Pope, the Vicar of Christ was no longer an Antichrist:

. . . the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, inherits these offices and acts for the Church in them. This is another matter; I am speaking here of the Body of Christ, and the sovereign Pontiff would not be the visible head of that Body, did he not first belong to it. He is not himself the Body of Christ, but the chief part of the Body . . .¹¹⁶

5. The Three Offices of the Church

Christianity, for Newman, was simultaneously:

a philosophy, a political power, and a religious rite: as a religion, it is Holy; as a philosophy, it is Apostolic; as a political power, it is imperial, that is, One and Catholic. As a religion, its special centre of action is pastor and flock; as a philosophy, the Schools; as a rule, the Papacy and its Curia.¹¹⁷

Though the Church had exercised these three functions in substance from the first, they were developed in their full proportions one after another, in a succession of centuries:

[F]irst, in the primitive time it was recognized as a worship, springing up and spreading in the lower ranks of society, and among the ignorant and dependent, and making its power felt by the heroism of its Martyrs and confessors. Then it seized upon the intellectual and cultivated class, and created a theology and schools of learning. Lastly it seated itself, as an ecclesiastical polity, among princes, and chose Rome for its centre.¹¹⁸

If Christianity were at once a theology, worship and government, all these functions had their proper guiding principles. All, however, could be degraded:

Truth is the guiding principle of theology and theological inquiries; devotion and edification, of worship; and of government, expedience. The instrument of theology is reasoning; of worship, our emotional nature; of rule, command and

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., xli.

coercion. Further, in man as he is, reasoning tends to rationalism; devotion to superstition and enthusiasm; and power to ambition and tyranny.¹¹⁹

Newman also discussed how arduous “are the duties involved in these three offices, to discharge one by one” and how “much more arduous are they to administer, when taken in combination”:

Each of the three has its separate scope and direction; each has its own interests to promote and further; each has to find room for the claims of the other two; and each will find its own line of action influenced and modified by the others, nay, sometimes in a particular case the necessity of the others converted into a rule of duty for itself.¹²⁰

Accordingly, there is always tension among these three offices so independent of each other, so divergent, and so conflicting.¹²¹ “All this was foreseen certainly by the Divine Mind, when He committed to his Church so complex a mission; and, by promising her infallibility in her formal teaching, He indirectly protected her from serious error in worship and political action also.”¹²² But Newman wrote:

This aid, however, great as it is, does not secure her from all dangers as regards the problem which she has to solve; nothing but the gift of impeccability granted to her authorities would secure them from all liability to mistake in their conduct, policy, words and decisions, in her legislative and her executive, in ecclesiastical and disciplinarian details; and such a gift they have not received.¹²³

As a result, Newman thought that however well the Church might perform these duties on the whole, it would always be easy for her enemies to make a case against her:

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid., xlii.

¹²² Ibid., xlii-xliii. “Lord Emly questioned the statement in V.M. I, pp. xlii-xliii, that God ‘by promising her (the Church) infallibility in her formal teaching, He indirectly protected her from serious error in worship and political action also.’ See Footnote 2, *LD* 28: 282.

¹²³ Ibid., xliii.

It is this difficulty lying in the nature of the case, which supplies the staple of those energetic charges and vivid pictures of the inconsistency, double-dealing, and deceit of the Church of Rome, as found in Protestant writings, and in particular in the Lectures and other publications here immediately under consideration.¹²⁴

Newman pointed out that the regal function of the Church, as represented by the Pope, seemed to be trampling on the theological, as represented by Scripture and Antiquity. The Church, as a political and a popular power, is answerable in her past and present for innumerable acts which go far beyond the theological definitions in the Council of Trent. Newman believed that the current history and ordinary ways of Catholicity, as sanctioned by its rulers and instanced individually in its people, scandalous as they may have been, were the logical result of the innocent-looking Tridentine decrees.

The decrees of Trent, “though not necessarily in themselves tending to the corruptions which we see, will ever tend to foster and produce them; that is, while these decrees remain unexplained in any truer and more Catholic way.”¹²⁵ Though there might have been “holiness in the religious aspect of the Church, and soundness in her theological, still there is in her the ambition, craft, and cruelty of a political power.”¹²⁶

In his lectures, Newman ascribed the corruptions and scandals of the Church to the theological schools, but he knew that ambition, craft, cruelty, and superstition were not commonly the characteristics of theologians. On the contrary, they bore the marks of

¹²⁴ Ibid., xliii. Newman emphasized this difficulty by citing examples from his lectures and tracts (ibid., xliii-xlvi).

¹²⁵ Ibid., xlvi.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

having a popular or a political origin.¹²⁷ Theology, however, “is the fundamental and regulating principle of the whole Church system”:¹²⁸

It is commensurate with Revelation, and Revelation is the initial and essential idea of Christianity. It is the subject-matter, the formal cause, the expression, of the Prophetical Office, and, as being such, has created both the Regal Office and the Sacerdotal. And it has in a certain sense a power of jurisdiction over those offices, as being its own creations, theologians being ever in request and in employment in keeping within bounds both the political and popular elements in the Church’s constitution,—elements which are far more congenial than itself to the human mind, are far more liable to excess and corruption, and are ever struggling to liberate themselves from those restraints which are in truth necessary for their well-being.¹²⁹

Yet theology could not always have its own way:

[I]t is too hard, too intellectual, too exact, to be always equitable, or to be always compassionate; and it sometimes has a conflict or overthrow, or has to consent to a truce or a compromise, in consequence of the rival force of religious sentiment or ecclesiastical interests; and that, sometimes in great matters, sometimes in unimportant.¹³⁰

Newman argued that over its history, the Church has faced a situation in which “her Prophetical function is impeded for a while in its action, perhaps seriously, by the remonstrances of charity and of the spirit of peace.”¹³¹ There have been instances when theology has been “kind and sympathetic and religion severe,”¹³² and examples of the “theological and religious element of the Church being in antagonism with the political.”¹³³

¹²⁷ Ibid., xlvii-xlviii.

¹²⁸ Ibid., xlviii.

¹²⁹ Ibid., xlviii-xlviii.

¹³⁰ Ibid., xlviii-xlix.

¹³¹ Ibid., l.

¹³² Ibid., li.

¹³³ Ibid.

Though truth is the principle on which all intellectual and theological inquiries proceed, and truth is the motive power which gives them effect, “the principle of popular edification, quickened by a keen sensitiveness of the chance of scandals, is as powerful as Truth, when the province is Religion.”¹³⁴ Therefore, “popular ideas on religion are practically a match for the clearest *dicta*, deductions, and provisos of the Schools, and will have their way in cases when the particular truth, which is the subject of them, is not of vital or primary importance.”¹³⁵ Thus, Newman contended “in a religion, which embraces large and separate classes of adherents, there always is of necessity to a certain extent an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine.”¹³⁶ “Devotional use prevailed over scholastic accuracy in a matter of secondary concern.”¹³⁷

Newman insisted that the “love and pursuit of truth in the subject-matter of religion, if it be genuine, must always be accompanied by the fear of error, of error which may be sin.”¹³⁸ “An inquirer in the province of religion is under a responsibility for his reasons and for their issue.”¹³⁹ If he was challenged either to admit or to refute what was asserted, it would have been far better had he waited awhile, as events had shown,

¹³⁴ “To the devotional mind what is new and strange is as repulsive, often as dangerous, as falsehood is to the scientific” (ibid).

¹³⁵ Ibid., li-*lii*.

¹³⁶ To Newman, “the history of the Latin versions of the Scriptures furnishes a familiar illustration of this conflict between popular and educated faith” (ibid., *lii*).

¹³⁷ Ibid., *liii*. JHN to Robert E. Forsaith (The Oratory, 25 December 1876, *LD* 28: 149-150, at 150): “While the Catholic Church allows no private judgment as regards the faith, she allows her children great latitude in respect to devotions”

¹³⁸ *Prophetical Office*, *liv*.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

indeed, far better, even though the assertion had proved true:¹⁴⁰ “That jealousy of originality in the matter of religion, which is the instinct of piety, is, in the case of questions which excite the popular mind, the dictate of charity also.”¹⁴¹

Thus, it was necessary in charity to delay the formal reception of a new interpretation of Scripture until the imaginations of people gradually were accustomed to it.¹⁴² There were times and places, “when it is the duty of a teacher, when asked, to answer frankly as well as truly, though not even then to say more than he need, because learners will but misunderstand him if he attempts more, and therefore it is wiser and kinder to let well alone, than to attempt what is better.”¹⁴³

6. The Principle of Economy

For Newman, there was “the duty of concealment or what may be called evasion, not in religious matters only, but universally.”¹⁴⁴ Why? “Veracity, like other virtues, lies in a mean. Truth indeed, but not necessarily the whole truth, is the rule of Society.”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ Recalling the case of Galileo, Newman argued: “It was safe, not dishonest, to be slow in accepting what nevertheless turned out to be true. Here was an instance in which the Church obliges Scripture expositors, at a given time or place, to be tender of the popular religious sense” (ibid., liv-lv).

¹⁴¹ “Galileo’s truth is said to have shocked and scared the Italy of his day Heaven was no longer above, and earth below; the heavens no longer literally opened and shut; purgatory and hell were not for certain under the earth” (ibid., lv-lvi).

¹⁴² Newman insisted on this principle of conduct: “All I say is, that not all knowledge is suited to all minds; a proposition may be ever so true, yet at a particular time and place may be ‘temerarious, offensive to pious ears, and scandalous,’ though neither ‘heretical’ nor ‘erroneous’” (ibid., lvi-lvii).

¹⁴³ There is not only “a time to keep silence,” but “a time to speak” (ibid., lvii-lviii).

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., lviii.

¹⁴⁵ “Every class and profession has its secrets; the family lawyer, the medical adviser, the politician, as well as the priest” (ibid., lix).

Newman explained: “From the time that the Creator clothed Adam, concealment is in some sense the necessity of our fall.”¹⁴⁶ Accordingly, as a result of the threefold aspect of the Catholic Church: “Many popular beliefs and practices have, in spite of theology, been suffered by Catholic prelates, lest, ‘in gathering up the weeds,’ they should ‘root up the wheat with them.’”¹⁴⁷

This necessary economy was in operation “in the instance of the Old Covenant, in the gradual disclosures made, age after age, to the chosen people.”¹⁴⁸ This was also the case in the primitive Church: “This indeed is the great principle of Economy, as advocated in the Alexandrian school, which is in various ways sanctioned in Scripture.”¹⁴⁹ In fact, the principle of Economy dated from Apostolic times: “From the time that the Apostles preached, such toleration in primary matters of faith and morals is at an end as regards Christendom.”¹⁵⁰

Accordingly, he concluded: “We have still, as Catholics, to be forbearing and to be silent in many cases, amid the mistakes, excesses, and superstitions of individuals and of classes of our brethren, which we come across.”¹⁵¹ Yet, he conceded, this principle of

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., lix.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., lix-lx.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., lx.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., lxi.

¹⁵⁰ For instance: “Idolatry is a sin against light; and, while it would involve heinous guilt, or rather is impossible, in a Catholic, it is equally inconceivable in even the most ignorant sectary who claims the Christian name; nevertheless, the principle and the use of the Economy has a place, and is a duty still among Catholics, though not as regards the first elements of Revelation” (ibid., lxii).

¹⁵¹ “Also in the case of those who are not Catholic, we feel it a duty sometimes to observe the rule of silence, even when so serious a truth as the ‘Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus’ comes into consideration” (ibid., lxiii).

Economy might easily have been “represented as countenancing a double aspect of Catholic doctrine and as evasive and shuffling, theory saying one thing, and practice sanctioning another.”¹⁵²

Though the principle of Economy was occasionally applied to different subject-matter by the Church in relation to her own children and to strangers, “the rule is the same in its principle as that of Moses or St. Paul, or the Alexandrians, or St. Augustine.”¹⁵³ Since human nature is for all ages one and the same, Newman observed that in some countries, truth and error in religion may be so intimately connected as not to admit of separation as in the case of the parable of the wheat and the cockle:

Such may be the feeling under which the Church takes part in popular religious manifestations without subjecting them to theological and historical criticism; she is in a choice of difficulties; did she act otherwise, she would be rooting up the wheat with the intruding weeds; she would be “quenching the smoking flax,” and endangering the faith and loyalty of a city or a district, for the sake of an intellectual precision which was quite out of place and was not asked of her.¹⁵⁴

Newman also pointed out how difficult it is to determine the point at which such religious manifestations became immoderate and wrong:

Their tolerance may sometimes lead to pious frauds, which are simply wicked. An ecclesiastical superior certainly cannot sanction alleged miracles or prophecies which he knows to be false, or by his silence connive at a tradition of them being started among his people. Nor can he be dispensed of the duty, when he comes into an inheritance of error or superstition, which is immemorial, of doing what he can to alleviate and dissipate it, though to do this without injury to what is true and good, can after all be only a gradual work. Errors of fact may do no harm, and their removal may do much.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵² Ibid. See also JHN to James Edward McCarten (24 October 1878), *LD* 28: 412-413 and the Footnote 1 (ibid.).

¹⁵³ *Prophetical Office*, lxiii-lxiv.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., lxv.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., lxvi.

Since neither the local rulers nor the pastors of the Church were impeccable in act or infallible in judgment, Newman would not claim that all ecclesiastical measures and permissions were praiseworthy and safe precedents. However, he acknowledged that even Jesus passed over the superstitious act of a woman who was in great trouble, because her faith was meritorious.

Granted that the New Testament allowed such superstitions, he asked: “Need men wait for the Medieval Church in order to make their complaint that the theology of Christianity does not accord with its religious manifestations?”¹⁵⁶ Indeed, “a poor Neapolitan crone, who chatters to the crucifix” does no more than the woman in the Gospel, who preferred to rely for a cure on a bit of cloth, which was our Lord’s, to directly and honestly addressing Him.”¹⁵⁷

Newman concluded: “Taking human nature as it is, we may surely concede a little superstition, as not the worst of evils, if it be the price of making sure of faith”.¹⁵⁸

Of course it need not be the price; and the Church, in her teaching function, will ever be vigilant against the inroad of what is a degradation both of faith and of reason: but considering, as Anglicans will allow, how intimately the sacramental system is connected with Christianity, and how feeble and confused is at present the ethical intelligence of the world at large, it is a distant day, at which the Church will find it easy, in her oversight of her populations, to make her Sacerdotal office keep step with her Prophetical.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., lxvii.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., lxviii.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., lxviii-lxix.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., lxix.

Newman knew that worship “being the act of our devotional nature, strives hard to emancipate itself from theological restraints.”¹⁶⁰ Worship has many shapes and objects and these are not altogether unlawful. Undoubtedly, “the first and most necessary of all religious truths is the Being, Unity, and Omnipotence of God” and “it was the primary purpose and work of Revelation to enforce this.”¹⁶¹ Accordingly, he asked:

But did not that first truth involve in itself and suggest to the mind with a sympathetic response a second truth, namely, the existence of other beings besides the Supreme? and that for the very reason that He was Unity and Perfection,—I mean, a whole world, though to us unknown,—in order to people the vast gulf which separates Him from man?¹⁶²

Because “Revelation in this matter does but complete what Nature has begun,”¹⁶³ yet “the *cultus* of Angels and Saints, though ever to be watched with jealousy by theologians, because of human infirmity and perverseness, is a privilege, nay a duty, and has a normal place in revealed Religion.”¹⁶⁴

Recognizing the order of beings between the Supreme Creator and man to be a natural and true sentiment, Newman disagreed with the contemporary opinion that “monotheism and polytheism are the characteristics of distinct races, the former of the

¹⁶⁰ “Theology did not create it, but found it in our hearts, and used it” (ibid).

¹⁶¹ Ibid., lxix.

¹⁶² Ibid., lxix-lxx.

¹⁶³ “It is difficult to deny that polytheism is a natural sentiment corrupted. Its radical evil is, not the belief in many divine intelligences, but its forgetfulness of their Creator, the One Living Personal God who is above them all,—that is, its virtual Atheism” (Ibid., lxxi).

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., lxxi.

Semitic, the latter of the Aryan.”¹⁶⁵ Rather, “All things are His and He is in all things.”¹⁶⁶

For Newman:

The primary object of Revelation was to recall men from idolizing the creature. The Israelites had the mission of effecting this by the stern and pitiless ministry of the sword. The Christian Church, after the pattern of our Lord’s gentleness, has been guided to an opposite course.¹⁶⁷

The mission of the Christian Church is not “to oppose herself to impulses which were both natural and legitimate, though they had been heretofore the instruments of sin, but to do her best, by a right use, to moderate and purify them.”¹⁶⁸ Thus, the Church invoked saints, sanctioned the use of their images, and, in the spirit of the Gospels and the Acts, had expected miracles from their persons, garments, relics, and tombs.¹⁶⁹ Thus, the Church’s mission is “not to forbid the memory and veneration of Saints and Angels, but to subordinate it to the worship of the Supreme Creator.”¹⁷⁰ Consequently “there will ever be a marked contrariety between the professions of her theology and the ways and doings of a Catholic country.”¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., lxxi-lxxii. Newman added: “[The semitic] insistence on the Divine Unity is rather directed against the Holy Trinity, than against polytheism” (ibid., lxxii).

¹⁶⁶ “Still more readily will that true theology, which teaches that He ever was a Father in His incomprehensible essence, accept and proclaim the doctrine of the fertility, bountifulness and beneficence of His creative power, and claim for Him the right of a Father over the work of His hands” (ibid., lxxiii).

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Newman referred to Moses who raised “the brazen serpent” and Christians who “have from the first cherished and honoured with a special cultus the memories of the Martyrs” (ibid., lxxiv).

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., lxxv.

Newman stressed that “while the Catholic Church is ever most precise in her enunciation of doctrine, and allows no liberty of dissent from her decisions, (for on such objective matters she speaks with the authority of infallibility), her tone is different, in the sanction she gives to devotions, as they are of a subjective and personal nature.”¹⁷² “This contrast will be the greater, when, as sometimes happens, ecclesiastical authority takes part with the popular sentiment against a theological decision.”¹⁷³ Newman gave a number of cases from the past and present to prove this practice.¹⁷⁴

In most circumstances, however, the Church moderated or suspended the requirements of her theology, and the two offices, political and pastoral, had a common interest against the theological. Yet, this was not always so and Newman wanted to show instances in which the imperial and political expedience of religion stands out prominent, and both its theological and devotional duties are in the background:

Apostolicity of doctrine and Sanctity of worship, as attributes of the Church, are differently circumstanced from her regal autocracy. Tradition in good measure is sufficient for doctrine, and popular custom and conscience for worship, but

¹⁷² “This is an additional reason why the formal decrees of Councils and statements of theologians differ in their first aspect from the religion of the uneducated classes; the latter represents the wayward popular taste, and the former the critical judgments of clear heads and holy hearts” (ibid., lxxv).

¹⁷³ Ibid., lxxv.

¹⁷⁴ St. Peter committed an error in countenancing the Mosaic rite as a result of the pressure exerted on him by the Judaic Christians (ibid., lxxvi). St. Paul on various occasions acted in the same spirit of economy (ibid.) as did the missionary Church of Alexandria (ibid., lxxvii). St. Gregory’s use of Economy prompted Newman to comment on the “general subject, viz. the embarrassments and difficult questions arising out of the regal office of the Church and her duties to it” (ibid., lxxvii-lxxviii). Since “St. Gregory was a Bishop as well as a preacher and spiritual guide, the economy which is related of him is an act of the regal function of the Church, as well as of her sacerdotal and pastoral” (ibid., lxxviii).

tradition and custom cannot of themselves secure independence and self-government.¹⁷⁵

Accordingly:

If the Church is to be regal, a witness for Heaven, unchangeable amid secular changes, if in every age she is to hold her own, and proclaim as well as profess the truth, if she is to thrive without or against the civil power, if she is to be resourceful and self-recuperative under all fortunes, she must be more than Holy and Apostolic; she must be Catholic.¹⁷⁶

Therefore, the Church “has ever from her beginning onwards had a hierarchy and a head, with a strict unity of polity, the claim of an exclusive divine authority and blessing, the trusteeship of the gospel gifts, and the exercise over her members of an absolute and almost despotic rule.”¹⁷⁷ In addition, “as to her work, it is her special duty, as a sovereign State, to consolidate her several portions, to enlarge her territory, to keep up and to increase her various populations in this ever-dying, ever-nascent world, in which to be stationary is to lose ground, and to repose is to fail.”¹⁷⁸ The Church did all this with a view to the life, health, and strength of Christianity and the salvation of souls.

Although there have been a number of collisions and compromises between the regal and prophetic offices of the Church as a result of their respective duties and interests, Newman pointed out that “the early tradition of the Church was dissuasive of

¹⁷⁵ “The Greek Church shows this, which has lost its political life, while its doctrine, and its ritual and devotional system, have little that can be excepted against” (ibid., lxxx).

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., lxxx.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Newman then discussed the function of the Church in civil and temporal matters (ibid., lxxx-lxxxi).

using force in the maintenance of religion.”¹⁷⁹ However, at times, the interests of the Church, as a regal power, acted as an influence upon theology.¹⁸⁰ He also held that certain quasi-doctrinal conclusions might have been fatal to the constitution and therefore to the being of the Church.¹⁸¹

In this case, then, He [God] willed that a point of theology should be determined on its expediency relatively to the Church’s Catholicity and the edification of her people,—by the logic of facts, which at times overrides all positive laws and prerogatives, and reaches in its effective force to the very frontiers of immutable truths in religion, ethics, and theology.¹⁸²

Newman then pointed to other instances when theological schools gave way to ecclesiastical expedience and of the interests of peace and unity being a surer way of arriving at a doctrinal conclusion than methods more directly theological.¹⁸³ “Expedience is an argument which grows in cogency with the course of years; a hundred and fifty years after St. Stephen, the ecclesiastical conclusion which he had upheld was accepted generally by the School of Theologians, in an adhesion to it on the part of St. Augustine.”¹⁸⁴

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., lxxxii.

¹⁸⁰ Newman also recounted a number of examples from the history of the Church (ibid., lxxxiii).

¹⁸¹ Newman gave as examples, the infallibility of the Church in the solemn and public act of the Canonization of Saints, the Apostolic Succession of the Bishops in the Catholic Church, the validity of the Sacraments, etc. (ibid., lxxxiv-lxxxvi).

¹⁸² Ibid., lxxxvi.

¹⁸³ Newman referred to several examples: Pope Innocent, in the fourth century, writing to the Bishops of Macedonia, conceding the validity of heretical orders; the African Bishops condemning (with the concurrence of Augustine) Donatus alone, the author of the schism, but accepting the rest, orders and all, lest remaining outside the Church, they should be a perpetual thorn in her side (ibid., lxxxvi-lxxxvii).

¹⁸⁴ “As Christianity spread through the various classes of the Pagan Empire, and penetrated into private families, social circles, and secular callings, and was received with

Newman also recalled Jesus' prophetic announcement:

the kingdom of heaven should be a net, gathering fish of every kind; and how indeed should it be otherwise, if it was to be Catholic, human nature being what it is? Yet, on the other hand, the Sermon on the Mount, and other discourses of our Lord, assigned a very definite standard of morals, and a very high rule of conduct to His people.¹⁸⁵

He then pointed out:

Under these circumstances, the Holy See and various Bishops took what would be called the *laxer aude*, as being that which charity, as well as expediency suggested, whereas the graver and more strict, as well as the ignorant portion of the Christian community did not understand such a policy, and in consequence there was, in various parts of the world, both among the educated and the uneducated, an indignant rising against this innovation, as it was conceived, of their rulers.¹⁸⁶

Consequently, Newman added:

The resolution of the difficulties of the problem was found in a clearer recognition of the distinction between precepts and counsels, between mortal sins and venial, and between the two forums of the Church, the external and internal;—also in the development of the doctrine of Purgatory, and in the contemporary rise of the monastic institution, as exhibited in the history of St. Antony and his disciples.¹⁸⁷

To conclude his reflections about the collision and the adjustment of the regal or political office of the Church with the prophetic, Newman cited another instance of the political in contrast with the sacerdotal—the Labarum of Constantine: “The sacred symbol of unresisting suffering, of self-sacrificing love, of life-giving grace, of celestial

temporary or local toleration, the standard of duty amongst its adherents fell; habits and practices of the world found their way into the fold; and scandals became too common to allow of the offenders being cast off by wholesale” (ibid., xci-xcii).

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., xcii.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., xciii.

peace, became in the hands of the first Christian Emperor, with the sanction of the Church, his banner in fierce battle and the pledge of victory for his sword.”¹⁸⁸

Based on the general principle that “whatever is great refuses to be reduced to human rule, and to be made consistent in its many aspects with itself,”¹⁸⁹ Newman concluded: “We need not feel surprise then, if Holy Church too, the supernatural creation of God, is an instance of the same law, presenting to us an admirable consistency and unity in word and deed, as her general characteristic, but crossed and discredited now and then by apparent anomalies which need, and which claim, at our hands an exercise of faith.”¹⁹⁰

7. 1877 Preface: A Summary

Newman’s delivery of the lectures on the prophetic office did not bring an end to his *via media* theory. Wiseman’s lectures on the Roman Catholic theology of the rule of faith and the infallibility of the Church were both a challenge and a complement to his ongoing discussion of the *via media* theory, especially its understanding of the Church and her authority. Wiseman’s lectures gave Newman an opportunity to clarify his ecclesiological position that attributed authority to Antiquity and the Church, while avoiding what he considered the extremes of the Roman Catholic Church’s claim to infallibility and Protestant theories of Private Judgment. However, Newman’s theory of *via media* crumbled as he became aware of the role of infallibility in the Ancient Church.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., xciii-xciv.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., xciv.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

Newman fused his 1877 Preface to the third edition of his *Prophetical Office* by recalling the original purpose of discussing the Holy Catholic Church. He identified three major elements in his lectures: the hypothetical (theory of *via media*); the rhetorical (the name-calling and sweeping imputations on Romanism); and the argumentative (the theology of the Anglican divines and the survey of the Church of Rome in her patristic, moral and political aspects). The arguments that he raised against Rome were mainly two: first, the disparities between the Ancient Church and the present Roman Church in teaching, conduct, worship, and polity; second, the disparities between Rome's formal teaching and her "popular and political manifestations." While Newman had answered the former in his *Essay on the Development* in 1845, the 1877 Preface was an answer to the latter.

As his *Prophetical Office* had simply ascribed Roman ecclesiastical errors to Roman theology, the Preface was intended to show the distinction between the Roman Church's official theological teaching and the superstitious practices among ordinary Roman Catholics. In addition, he distinguished between the Church as an intellectual and a popular system, and its political and institutional form. Accepting the Church as a complex but divine institution, he considered the Church as the very self of Christ, His Mystical Body and Bride, His representative on earth. Thus, the Church continues to carry out the ontological functions or offices of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King.¹⁹¹

¹⁹¹ According to Weidner (*Via Media*, I): "Newman's acceptance of the divine truths about our Lord and His person and Offices was among many other fundamental doctrines traceable to his evangelical formation. John Calvin developed this schema over several editions of *The Institutes*, synthesizing into three major aspects. . . . Thomas Scott

These functions of the Church parallel three functions of Christianity: a philosophy, a religious rite and a political power. As a philosophy, the Church is Apostolic; as a religion, She is Holy; and as a political power, She is imperial (One and Catholic). The prophetic office embraces all of the philosophical, intellectual and theological aspects of faith; the priestly, worship, prayer, spirituality and every aspect of the devotional life; the regal, its administration and government.

However, Newman stated that there was difficulty in holding these elements together insofar as they used different instruments and served different ends. Accordingly, Newman advocated the ancient practice of the principle of Economy. His ultimate view of the Church was, then, one in which none of these three offices unduly dominated the other. Rather, they ideally stood in a judicious constitutional relationship to one another, respecting their separate provinces and maintaining an orderly balance and tension in which one completes and supplies what the other lacks. Thus, in Newman's understanding, the Church is a living organism ever growing in tension and mutual give-and-take.

The Preface also presented another important aspect of Newman's ecclesiology, his view of the Church as the proper completion of revealed religion. Revelation demanded a God-given and infallible organism, the Church as its prophet, priest and shepherd. Newman saw three great dangers to any religion—superstition, rationalism and institutionalism—and the concomitant abuses of devotion, reason and order, which

says that the offices cannot be separated in either Christ's performance of them or in the Christian's dependence on Christ."

are essential goods in themselves yet needed to be regulated by the principle of Economy. Thus, the 1877 Preface presented an ecclesiology that is founded on a complete theory of religion: any religion, if really revealed, contains these three indispensable elements: an intellectual system, a body of devotion and worship, and an institutional form and authority.¹⁹²

¹⁹² Dulles argued: “Like many of Newman’s earlier works, his final contribution to ecclesiology is not a finished product But it gives new and valuable input into the question and is a truly seminal work that can always be reread with profit.” See Avery Dulles, S. J., “The Threefold Office in Newman’s Ecclesiology,” in *Newman after a Hundred Years*, ed. Ker, Ian Turnbull and Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 375-399, at 399; hereafter cited Dulles, “The Threefold Office in Newman’s Ecclesiology.”

CHAPTER TEN: THE *PROPHETICAL OFFICE* AND THE 1877 PREFACE: A COMPREHENSIVE ECCLESIOLOGY

In 1877, Newman republished the third edition of his *Prophetical Office* as *Via Media*, Volume I, with a new Preface.¹ After recapping the sources of these lectures and summarizing the ecclesiology of the *Via Media*, this chapter will evaluate the ecclesiology of the *Prophetical Office* by highlighting its principal themes and their significance in terms of Newman's thought and their relevance for today.

1. The Sources of Newman's Ecclesiology

The ecclesiology of Newman's *Via Media I* was not the product of any particular period of his life; rather it was the fruit of a life-long search. Thus, it incorporates Newman's evangelical, Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic investigations and insights. Accordingly, his ecclesiology must be culled from his earlier works, sermons, letters, tracts, lectures and finally from his 1877 Preface.

First of all, during his evangelical years, which extended over the first two decades of his life, Newman became familiar with Scripture and convinced of the need for a definitive creed or dogma in religion. He was influenced by evangelical writings, particularly the Calvinism of Thomas Scott, who viewed the three offices of Christ—Priest, Prophet, and King—as grounded in the Person of Jesus; Scott believed that to gain access to one was to submit to all of them. It was also the evangelicals who taught

¹ The development of Newman's ecclesiology encompassed four decades (1837-1877); as Ker (*Biography*, 139) has observed, "the theology of the Church which Newman was painfully to develop during the next forty years begins and ends with the *Prophetical Office*, for the lengthy preface he wrote for the third edition of 1877 constitutes his last and greatest contribution to ecclesiology."

Newman to look for types and parallels in the Old Testament that would shed light on New Testament developments. Consequently, he undertook the task of coordinating the offices of the Church and viewing them in light of the problems that beset Israel, as well as the challenges that faced Jesus and the early Church. He was, however, imbued with anti-Roman Catholic sentiments.

Subsequently, Newman's ecclesiology was influenced by Anglican theology, especially the doctrine of ministerial and apostolic succession, which was a foundational element of Tractarian ecclesiology.² For Newman, the Church was founded on apostolic authority and succession rather than on any political or popular authority. To defend the Church of England as a true representation of the Church in contrast to Protestant and Roman "extremes," it became necessary for Newman to establish a solid Anglican ecclesiology. To accomplish this goal, he proposed a theory of the *via media*, which viewed the Church of England as a "middle way" between the exaggeration of popular Protestantism and the corruptions of Roman Catholicism—a unique Anglican doctrine consistent with Antiquity.³

In "Home Thoughts Abroad," Newman suggested that those who wanted "to do anything effectually" in reforming the Anglican Church must start "upon *recognized* principles and customs."⁴ He re-emphasized existing Anglican principles, such as apostolic succession, the ministerial commission, the system of Church discipline, and

² See "Thoughts," 360-361 and *LD* 4: 406.

³ JHN to Jemima Newman (Tunbridge Wells, 2 October 1834), *LD* 4: 337.

⁴ For Newman, unprecedented changes were rightly called innovations; those which spring from existing institutions, opinions, or feelings, were called developments, and may be recommended without invidiousness as being improvements (*ibid.*, 361-362).

the liturgy.⁵ For him, a second Reformation was inevitable and its manifesto appeared in the form of his *Tracts 38* and *41* which were titled *Via Media*.⁶ In fact, many of his tracts were published both to uphold the *via media* and to foster a new reform that would continue the reform that had been initiated by the Anglican Divines of the sixteenth century.

The *Prophetical Office* continued Newman's plan of building on this *via media* by "means of the stores of Divine truth bequeathed to us in the works of our Standard English authors."⁷ It was a deliberate painstaking effort on the part of Newman to build a theology on the writings of Anglican divines.⁸ Whether it was called "Anglo-Catholicism" or "a mere modification or transition-state either of Romanism or of popular Protestantism," the *via media* needed to be tried out.⁹ For Newman, Anglo-Catholicism needed to be built on the doctrines found in the Book of Common Prayer, the

⁵ Newman, however, was also blamed for re-attempting a "failed experiment." See "Thoughts," 246-247.

⁶ *Tracts 38*, 40-48. See also O'Connell, *Oxford Conspirators*, 164 and Lease, *Witness to the Faith*, 32.

⁷ *Prophetical Office*, xii.

⁸ "I have tried, as far as may be, to follow the line of doctrine marked out by our great divines, of whom perhaps I have chiefly followed Bramhall, then Laud, Hammond, Fields, Stillingfleet, Beveridge and others of the same school" (JHN to Martin Joseph Routh [Oriell, 6 January 1837], *LD* 6: 7). ". . . my time and thoughts have almost been absorbed with books, questions and compositions on the subject of Romanism—I am publishing a sort of *Via Media* as far as it goes, and of course it makes me very anxious to be accurate. I do not think I deviated from our great writers in any point, certainly any point in which they agree—Doubtless, I shall make some mistakes after all—but not for want of pains—most of it has been re-written, not retranscribed, several times—good part from four to six times" (JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriell, 3 January 1837), *LD* 6: 4-5).

⁹ *Ibid.*, 17.

Thirty-nine Articles, the Creed and Episcopal authority.¹⁰ For Newman, what Anglicans really needed was not an invention, nor originality, nor sagacity, nor even learning, but a recognized theology.¹¹

Newman also advocated the principle of doctrinal development and suggested building upon the existing principles of the Church of England rather than going over to Rome. His plan consisted in developing the Caroline principles¹² in England in order to elicit apostolicity and turning Oxford into the sacred city of apostolicity just as Rome was the city of catholicity.¹³ His theological reading of the Anglican divines also provided him with a methodological link between the evangelical approach to interpreting Scripture and that of the Church Fathers.

Scripture was Newman's third source for ecclesiology. He wanted to formulate the truth of the true Catholic Church, the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the Saints, the Pillar of Truth with a firm adherence to the infallible rule of faith, that is, the Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Church Catholic, rather than an adherence to private

¹⁰ Ibid., 23.

¹¹ Ibid., 24. Newman wrote to Mrs. John Mozley ([5 January 1837], *LD* 6: 6): "My book [Prophetical Office] is all but finished . . . It is no *advance* on any thing I have said – but a systematizing, consolidation, supplying premises etc. I say nothing."

¹² The "Caroline Divines" were bishops and theologians who came to prominence during the reigns of Charles I (1600-1625-1649) and Charles II (1630-1660-1685).

¹³ Newman ("Thoughts," 361-364) relied on testimonies to the intrinsic excellence of the English Church and rejected the idea of union because of Roman corruptions; he held that except in matters of conscience, it is a person's duty to remain where one is born. Since he did not distinguish between Popery and Catholicism, developing the existing fundamental principle of the Anglican Church was then his only option.

judgment.¹⁴ Many of the tracts and sermons that he wrote between 1833 and 1837 were an effort to formulate an ecclesiology based on the Scriptural witness of the existence of a visible Church as a condition of the invisible. He held that Jesus Christ founded a visible Church on earth as a witness to truth, a witness to the unseen world and as a keeper of the sacraments. For Newman, Scripture was a witness to the power and permanence of the Church and to her organization, governors, rules and disciplines, order and obedience, diversity of ranks and gifts, purity of doctrines and unity.

Fourthly, the Fathers of the Church became Newman's source for both his methodology and theology. Towards the beginning of his studies at Trinity College (1816) and later at Oriel College (1822), as he became familiar with Church History, especially the Fathers of the Church, he began to embrace various views about the existence of the visible and substantive body of the Church, the dogma of apostolic succession, the doctrine of Tradition, the necessity of the independence of the Church and the popular aspect of the Church. The Fathers not only provided an abundance of ideas for Newman's tracts and lectures but also convinced him of the "mystical or sacramental principle, and spoke of the various Economies or Dispensations of the Eternal."¹⁵

The themes of many of his tracts and lectures, such as the sacramentality of the universe, the concepts of revelation, scripture, tradition, the *disciplina arcani* and the role of theology, were influenced by his study of Arianism. In his historical investigation of the Arians of the fourth century, he began to see himself as if in an ecclesiological mirror.

¹⁴ *Prophetical Office*, xiii-xiv.

¹⁵ *Apologia*, 26-27.

He saw how the Church adopted various means to preserve and teach the true deposit of Faith, such as the use of *Disciplina Arcani* (Doctrinal Reserve), *kat' oikonomous* (Economical Method) of accommodation, *theologia* (Theology), and the Allegorical Method. These findings broadened his ecclesiology and enabled him to see the Church as the custodian and dispenser of the doctrines of faith, and the use of both apostolic tradition and Scripture in teaching.

With the discovery of the great Church of Alexandria, Newman found the foundational principles for his ecclesiology: “The visible world still remains without its divine interpretation; Holy Church in her sacraments and her hierarchical appointments, will remain, even to the end of the world, after all but a symbol of those heavenly facts which fill eternity.”¹⁶ He wished the return of Athanasius and Basil for the reform of his Church. The confirmation of Antiquity was always valuable for his ecclesiology: “Ancient Consent is, practically, the only or main kind of Tradition which now remains to us.”¹⁷ His parish work and the reading of the Church Fathers and the *Analogy of Religion* also re-enforced these ecclesiological ideas in his mind and drove him away from evangelicalism.

Newman’s Mediterranean voyage (1832-1833) was a patristic pilgrimage that provided the opportunity of experiencing the concrete realities of the Greek and Roman churches. While he was impressed with the morale and liturgy of the Greek Church, he definitely became hopeful about the growing openness of the Greek Church towards the

¹⁶ Ibid., 27.

¹⁷ *Prophetical Office*, 50.

Church of England. The encounter with the Roman Church overpowered him with a mixture of thoughts and feelings, ranging from a genuine appreciation for the Church of Rome to frequent yet haunting thoughts about the apocalyptic future of Rome. The real situation of the churches of Greece and Rome made him realize that in fact the Church in this world is the actualization of the Lord's parable of wheat and tares.

A fifth source for Newman's ecclesiology was Bishop Joseph Butler's *Analogy of Religion* (1736). For Butler, it was part of the Revelation that Christ, the Mediator between God and Man, held the offices of king, priest and prophet.¹⁸ Newman found the three offices of Christ intrinsically related to Butler's method of analogy as it applied to the central problem of Christianity, the redemption of humanity through Christ's fidelity on the Cross. "Just as Butler took the method and applied its opportunities and restraints to a central issue of Christology, so Newman would take the same offices and methods and apply them to ecclesiology."¹⁹ Moreover, Butler regarded Popery "as the great corruption of Christianity, and a manifest, open usurpation of all human and divine authority."²⁰ Butler's view of Roman corruption might have prompted Newman to discuss the authority of the Church in his lectures.

Last but not least, Hurrell Froude's letters and writings influenced Newman's religious and intellectual beliefs, especially his ideas about the Church. While Newman

¹⁸ Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (available at: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/butler/analogy.txt>), 193-197; hereafter cited: Butler, *Analogy*. See also Weidner, *Via Media*, liv.

¹⁹ Ibid., lvii.

²⁰ Butler, *Analogy*, 13.

turned to a study of the Fathers, Froude took an interest in the ecclesiastical history of the Middle Ages which became a complement to Newman's interest. He consulted regularly with Froude who never hesitated to criticize Newman's *Arians*; ²¹ Froude may have been responsible for Newman's emphasis on the doctrines of *disciplina arcani* and economy. During their Mediterranean voyage, they both took interest in the concerns of the Church ²² and discussed topics such as the Church as a popular institution, ²³ the ecclesiastical system, ²⁴ the laity, ²⁵ the sacramentality of the Church, ²⁶ apostolic succession, ²⁷ and the theocratic Church. ²⁸ Froude also influenced Newman in regard to the development of doctrines, ²⁹ apathy to Protestantism, ³⁰ and a love of apostolic and catholic principles. ³¹

Newman's controversy with Jager broadened Newman's ecclesiological horizon with a number of controversial issues, such as infallibility, private judgment, Scripture, and Tradition, and their relationship to the Church. During this controversy, Newman consulted with Froude, especially regarding doctrinal fundamentals and non-

²¹ Froude to JHN (January 1835), *LD* 5: 19.

²² *Remains* 1: 296; see *ibid.*, 306-308. They found "definite contradiction between the principles of the secular organization and the principles of Catholic Christianity" (*ibid.*, 121).

²³ JHN to Froude (Oriël, 18 September 1833), *LD* 4: 51-53, at 53.

²⁴ Brendon, *Froude*, 89.

²⁵ Froude to JHN (Dartington, 2 July 1835), *LD* 5: 97-98, at 98; see Froude to JHN (Paignton, 30 July 1835), *LD* 5: 116-118, at 117.

²⁶ *Remains* 3: 126; see: 127-132.

²⁷ JHN to Froude (Oriël, On the Purification 1836), *LD* 5: 225-226.

²⁸ See *Apologia*, 24-26.

²⁹ *Remains* 1: 336.

³⁰ Brendon, *Froude*, 142. See also Froude to JHN (Barbados, 25 January 1834), *LD* 4: 214-216, at 215-216.

³¹ *Remains* 2: 410; see also 392-428.

fundamentals,³² prophetical and apostolic traditions,³³ and the *via media*.³⁴ Many of Newman's views regarding the prophetical office of the Church were first raised in his controversy with Jager.³⁵ Newman later recalled that the debate he had described in "Home Thoughts Abroad" (1836) was also an attempt to advance the theory of *via media* that started his controversy with Jager.³⁶ Nonetheless, Froude undoubtedly was more influential than anyone else in navigating Newman toward an ecclesiology characteristically Roman Catholic.³⁷

In summary, these different influences collectively prompted Newman to reflect upon many topics that are connected with an understanding of the Church. As he was being formed theologically, he also decided to articulate his own theology of the Church through the series of lectures which became his *Prophetical Office*.

³² Brendon, *Froude*, 98.

³³ JHN to Froude (Oriental College, 20 July 1835), *LD* 5: 102-104, at 102-103.

³⁴ Froude to JHN (15 November 1835), *LD* 5: 162; Brendon, *Froude*, 172-173.

³⁵ "In particular the amplification of the very notion of prophetical office is given in the dialogue Newman wrote to develop his ideas for Froude, and the idea of prophetical office is clearly most relevant to the growth of the idea of doctrinal development" (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 9). Almost ten years later, on 27 January 1846, Newman wrote to Henry Wilberforce about how the Jager Controversy molded his theory of *via media* (Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 10).

³⁶ *Apologia*, 113; the two imaginary friends of Newman in "Thoughts" may represent Jager and Froude.

³⁷ The correspondence between Newman and Froude and Froude's *Remains* indicates that Froude's constant exhortations to Newman pushed him and the *Tracts* in a decisively Catholic direction. Newman (*Apologia*, 53) acknowledged Froude's influence: ". . . from Froude I learned to admire the great medieval Pontiffs"

2. The Ecclesiology of the *Prophetical Office* and 1877 Preface

The main object of Newman's lectures was to establish a theology of an article in the Apostles' Creed, "the Holy Catholic Church."³⁸ For him, if Anglicans denied the Roman Catholic view of the Church, then they were obliged to give a more "definite and intelligible doctrine" of the Church.³⁹ In his lectures, Newman did not enter into the question of the existence of the Church, which was a given for him.⁴⁰ The existence of the visible Church as the keeper of the sacraments and witness to the Truth was self-evident in Scripture;⁴¹ thus, what was needed was a theology of the Church.

A. The Prophetical Office of the Church

Newman's lectures were intended "to furnish an approximation in one or two points towards a correct theory of the duties and office of the Church Catholic."⁴² Thus, leaving aside the sacerdotal and ecclesiastical offices, he discussed topics connected with the prophetical office of the Church.⁴³ Since "Christ is the great Prophet of the Church,

³⁸ *Prophetical Office*, 6.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ In his 1833 Tracts, Newman emphasized that "Scripture makes the existence of a Visible Church a condition of the existence of the Invisible" and "the Sacraments are evidently in the hands of the Church Visible" (*Tract 11*, 2-3). The visible Church on earth is warranted by the plain sense of Scripture and professed as an article of the Creed (*ibid.*, 4).

⁴¹ For Newman, two things were self-evident in Scripture: first, the existence of a Visible Church in the Apostles' day; and second, that the Church was intended to continue (*Tract 11*, 7-8). Chadwick, *Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, 2-3, argued that "one characteristic doctrine of the Oxford men was that high doctrine of the Episcopal and priestly ministry which is usually described in the phrase apostolic succession." See also *Tract 20*, 1-2. The Church as a visible society was the keeper of the sacraments and the sign of the invisible sacramental life of heaven (*Tract 11*, 2-3).

⁴² *Prophetical Office*, 7.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 12.

and His teaching is as truly her law,”⁴⁴ he considered it appropriate to begin with the prophetic function. Thus, Newman lectured on a *via media* theory of authority of the prophet by advocating indefectibility of the Church in the first eight lectures and a double Rule of Faith based on Antiquity in the next five lectures. In both cases, he decided to use the theory of *via media* as a viable alternative to what he considered the extreme positions of Roman Catholics and Protestants. Nonetheless, in his last lecture, Newman acknowledged that his theory of *via media* was not realized even in his Church.

The Tractarian *via media* was untenable for Jager who believed that the only way to achieve certainty of faith is to follow the constant and universal teaching of the Church. Jager argued that the Roman Catholic is certain about faith “because by adhering to the teaching of the Church, which is infallible, he is committed to a doctrine which is of all times and all places.”⁴⁵ He also disagreed with the claim that the Church has the right to make articles according to time and circumstances since the Roman Church had never claimed it.

Newman, however, accepted that the Church Catholic is “so far to be infallible, infallible in fundamentals.”⁴⁶ She has authority in controversies of faith “to oblige her Ministers to take her view and exposition of the fundamentals” and “to hinder individuals

⁴⁴ Ibid., 307-308.

⁴⁵ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 62. Jager also demonstrated in detail the evidence of the Church’s infallibility (ibid., 64-65). He instanced the doctrines of the primitive Church as further justification of the notion of infallibility, a doctrine unanimously demonstrated by both Scripture and the Fathers (ibid., 66).

⁴⁶ Ibid., 39.

from openly professing or teaching any other exposition.”⁴⁷ Thus, Newman accepted the authority of the Church and its infallibility on the main points of belief. However, he thought that Jager drew the line of infallibility much higher.⁴⁸ To defend his doctrine of infallibility, Newman made the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines and claimed infallibility in fundamentals.

In substance, the real issue between Catholics and Anglicans was the authority of the Church: does the Church have the right to enlarge its own foundation? Newman began his lectures in the *Prophetical Office* by reaffirming the *via media* theory: though Anglicans agreed with Protestants in accepting Scripture as the document of ultimate appeal in matters of faith, they “do not consider it our sole informant in divine truths.”⁴⁹ Anglicans also relied on “Antiquity.”⁵⁰ Roman Catholics, on the other hand, admitted Scripture but regulated their faith by the existing Traditions of the Church.⁵¹ The Roman system, as far as it was Catholic and Scriptural, appealed to the Fathers but as far as corruption, found it necessary to supersede them by the claim of infallibility.⁵² Therefore, Newman examined the Roman Catholic doctrine of infallibility both morally and politically.

For Newman, the Roman Catholic doctrine of infallibility was based, first of all, upon the notion that any degree of doubt about religious truth was incompatible with faith

⁴⁷ Ibid., 40.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 41.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 28.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 29.

⁵¹ Ibid., 37-38.

⁵² *Prophetical Office*, 83-84.

and that an external infallible assurance was necessary to exclude doubt.⁵³ Accordingly, Rome professed to know not only what the Apostles knew but also a complete knowledge of the whole Dispensation. To know some things in any subject infallibly implied that we know all things and there were no degrees in infallibility. Therefore, Rome claimed to know not only infallibly but also completely and “in consequence, she is led on from the profession of uniform precision to that of universal knowledge.”⁵⁴

Since the Roman system professed to be a complete and systematic theology, Newman thought that it exhausted every part of the Divine Economy and destroyed the Mystery, thereby depriving poetical fervor, imagination, delicacy and reverence of the Christian mind. He argued that the “practice of systematizing” led to a decision concerning the relative importance of doctrines.⁵⁵ Thus, Roman teaching, by its profession of infallibility, morally lowered the standard and quality of Gospel obedience and impaired its mysterious and sacred character in various ways.⁵⁶ Accordingly, Newman concluded that although the Anglican and Roman systems were identical in the abstract and in principles, in practice, the doctrine of infallibility created a serious divide between them.⁵⁷

However, what was morally a disadvantage to Rome was politically a gain. Newman considered the Roman practice of abstract reasoning and the neglect of the

⁵³ Ibid., 85-86.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 90-91.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 98-99.

⁵⁶ Newman (“Thoughts,” 128) stated that the “grand sin” of the papal system was the degradation of the human mind.

⁵⁷ *Prophetical Office*, 105.

Fathers, measures of political expediency⁵⁸—this was not only the necessary result of infallibility but also the main evidence of it. Secondly, Roman theologians were jealous of the Fathers because they “dreaded the range and complication of materials.”⁵⁹ On the other hand, Anglicans took a different but balanced approach because they were also guided by probabilities and doubt. They gave testimony whether men would hear, or whether they would forbear and then left the matter to God.

Since Rome had the gift of infallibility, her various judgments, however unpremeditated, were consistent with each other; she hoped that the artificial show of consistency would be taken as evidence of truth.⁶⁰ Newman argued that not only was the Roman doctrine of infallibility defective with respect to proof, but also in its theory: first, Roman theologians could not in theory answer the question how individuals could know for certain that the Church was infallible; and second, they could neither say where this gift resides nor “determine who or what is infallible, or why.”⁶¹

Therefore, the *via media* seemed a sound option to Newman: a middle way on the one hand, by accepting Scripture as the ultimate rule of faith and relying on Antiquity and on the other hand, by superseding private judgment on certain definitive subjects of historical testimony delivered uninterrupted from the Apostles.⁶² In theory, everyone agreed that “without private judgment there is no responsibility” and that “a man’s own

⁵⁸ Rome’s “political temper is the cause of their treating the Ancient Fathers with rudeness and recklessness” (ibid., 107).

⁵⁹ Ibid., 108.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 122.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid., 128-129.

mind, and nothing else, is the cause of his believing or not believing, and of his acting or not acting upon his belief.”⁶³ Even if infallible guidance was granted, a man must have the choice of resisting it or not. Man has been given both internal and external means by which to form judgments.⁶⁴

Private judgment, however, could easily be misused due to illiteracy, prejudice and inaccuracy of mind.⁶⁵ The Church Catholic interprets Scripture infallibly because she is “the true Prophet of God.”⁶⁶ Popular Protestantism, however, devalued the Church because the Church “is not and never was, more than a collection of individuals.”⁶⁷ It, however, had taken an arbitrary position denying all these external means except the text of Holy Scripture, upon the antecedent notion that, when God spoke by inspiration, all other external means were superseded. For Protestants, Scripture under the guidance of divine illumination spoke but one doctrine and so was the instrument of the Holy Ghost in converting the soul. This belief, for Newman, was “perfect as a theory” and “consistent with itself,” like the Roman Catholic theory of baptismal grace conveyed to

⁶³ Ibid., 130.

⁶⁴ The internal means are common sense, natural perception of right and wrong, the sympathy of the affections, exercises of the imagination, reason, and the like. The external means are scripture, the existing church, tradition, catholicity, learning, antiquity, and the national faith (ibid., 131).

⁶⁵ Newman stated that it is one thing to apprehend Catholic doctrines but quite another to ascertain how and where they were implied in Scripture. Most Christians brought their prejudices and impressions to the written word and “they think inaccurately; they judge and feel by prejudice” (ibid., 157).

⁶⁶ Ibid., 159.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 160.

individuals was the evidence of infallibility.⁶⁸ However, he observed: “they may witness for truth and yet act against it.”⁶⁹

For Newman, “the concordant assent of Christendom to doctrines so severe and high as the Christian Mysteries is no slight argument in favour of their Apostolic origin.”⁷⁰ Thus, the doctrine that Scripture alone was sufficient also failed the Fathers.⁷¹ Further, there was neither natural probability nor supernatural promise that individuals reading Scripture would necessarily be led to knowledge of the true and complete faith of a Christian. In fact, it was presumptuous. Accordingly, Newman proposed Antiquity and the works of Fathers as guides.⁷²

Newman thought that Roman Catholics simplified matters by removing reason, Scripture and Antiquity, and depending mainly upon Church authority.⁷³ Roman Catholics also held that if the right of private judgment was allowed, it would lead to discordant opinions and people would claim to know more than the Church itself. Newman disagreed with the Romanists and argued that Scripture imparted knowledge, though unsystematic, in one direction: “towards the system of the Church and of Antiquity.”⁷⁴

⁶⁸ Ibid., 161.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 162.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid., 163.

⁷² Ibid., 167.

⁷³ Ibid., 133.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 139. The main reason for heresies and sects, in Newman’s opinion, was that “the Church’s voice is not heard clearly and forcibly; she does not exercise her own right of interpreting Scripture; she does not arbitrate, decide, condemn; she does not answer the call which human nature makes upon her” (ibid., 141).

For Newman, a true Catholic was one “who takes what God has given him, be it greater or less, does not despise the lesser because he has received the greater, yet puts it not before the greater, but uses all duly and to God’s glory.”⁷⁵ Accordingly, he wanted a Church that was nurtured and trained, claiming the obedience of its members, though laying itself open afterwards to their judgment, according to their respective capabilities for judging, a Church able to appeal confidently to the writings of Antiquity for its doctrines.⁷⁶ He, therefore, reiterated the *via media* theory: “Without claiming infallibility, the Church may claim the confidence and obedience of her members.”⁷⁷

Newman argued that there is no intricacy or discordance in the respective claims of the Church and the private judgment in the abstract. While the Church enforced a fact by apostolic tradition, private judgment expatiated beyond the limits of that Tradition. Each acted in its own province and was responsible within it.⁷⁸ In practice, Newman wanted to obey first and then know the Truth. The Church Catholic was not only bound

⁷⁵ Ibid. In practice, everyone began religion by faith and not by controversy even if the teaching he received contained a mixture of error. Obedience was first and then education “to exercise itself upon all of these, by way of finding out God’s perfect truth” (ibid., 136). Generally, “under whatever system a man finds himself, he is bound to accept it as if infallible, and to act upon it in a confiding spirit, till he finds a better” (ibid., 138).

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 143.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 189-190. Newman realized that Romanists and Protestants alike opposed the *via media*. The Protestants of the day considered it meaningless and the Romanists saw it as the doctrine of the Church’s abiding and continuous infallibility (ibid., 194-195).

to teach the Truth but was also divinely guided to teach it: “She is indefectible in it, and therefore not only has authority to enforce, but also is of authority in declaring it.”⁷⁹

Between the extremes of infallibility and private judgment, Newman argued for a strong indefectible Church that might claim the confidence and obedience of her members. The Church not only transmits the faith by human means, but also has a supernatural gift for it.⁸⁰ Thus, the Church Catholic was destined ever to be the guardian of the pure and undefiled faith or to be indefectible in that faith. There was no inconsistency in saying, first, “that Scripture contains the Saving Faith; and, next, that the Church Catholic has, by a Divine gift, ever preached it.”⁸¹ However, “it would be inconsistent to say, first, that the Church Catholic has ever preached the Saving Faith; next, that each individual is allowed to draw his Faith for himself from Scripture.”⁸² Thus, Newman did not set up the Church against Scripture, but he made the Church the keeper and interpreter of Scripture, which contained what may be called her charter to be “the *pillar and ground of the Truth*.”⁸³

⁷⁹ Ibid., 190.

⁸⁰ Ibid. For Newman, both the Twentieth Article and the Athanasius Creed witnessed the Church’s authority and left no room for private judgment for examining Scripture to discover necessary doctrine to be believed in order for salvation. Article XX, Of the Authority of the Church, stated: “The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything contrary to God’s word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ: yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation” (available at: <http://gavvie.tripod.com/39articles/art3.html>).

⁸¹ Ibid., 192.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid., 193.

For Newman, the Church would ever retain what Scripture called “the Faith,” the substance of the Gospel as taught by the Apostles and, as a consequence of the Scripture promise, the Word of God would never depart out of her mouth.⁸⁴ However, all through inspired history, there were traces of divine intentions mysteriously frustrated. Therefore, Newman argued that the promise was satisfied only “in what we see fulfilled at this day, viz. in the whole Church in all its branches.”⁸⁵ The promises were made to the Church as One.⁸⁶ Since, the “one has become in one sense many, the full prophetic idea is not now fulfilled; and, with the idea also is lost the full endowment and the attribute of infallibility in particular, supposing that were ever included in it.”⁸⁷ As a result, the Ancient Church was to be our model in all matters of doctrine.

Newman believed that the Anglican theory of religion was meaningful but distinct from the Roman theory: “They maintain that faith depends on the Church, we that the Church is built on the faith.”⁸⁸ And the “power of the keys is the antagonist of Private Judgment.”⁸⁹ Thus, the Church has authority but individuals have the liberty to judge for themselves outside the range of that authority.⁹⁰ However, for Newman, “the Church is

⁸⁴ Ibid., 196.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 197.

⁸⁶ “This condition is Unity, which is made by Christ and His Apostles, as it were, the sacramental channel through which all the gifts of the Spirit, and among them purity of doctrine, are secured to the Church” (ibid., 199).

⁸⁷ Ibid., 201. For Newman, the unity of ministerial succession was a cause of its continuance (ibid., 202).

⁸⁸ Ibid., 212.

⁸⁹ “The Church is not built upon individuals, nor knows individuals” (ibid., 236).

⁹⁰ Ibid., 268.

not a judge of the sense of Scripture in the common sense of the word, but a witness.”⁹¹

The “Church bears witness to a fact, that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received and came from the Apostles.”⁹² The proof resided “first in her own unanimity throughout her various branches, next in the writings of the Ancient Fathers.”⁹³ Thus, both Antiquity and Catholicity are the real guides, and the Church their organ.

If the Church “does not claim for herself any gift of interpretation, in the high points in question, much less does she allow individuals to pretend to it.”⁹⁴ Neither individual nor Bishop, Convocation or Council might have ventured to decline the Catholic interpretation of the Sacred Mysteries.⁹⁵ Scripture was an infringement on our private judgment. This was true only of “*necessary* doctrine, or the Faith once delivered” and “in matters of inferior moment, both the Church and the individual have room to exercise their own powers.”⁹⁶ Since the Church transmitted faith through human means which were imperfect, she was endowed with supernatural gifts. In the *via media* theory, the Church is strong and authoritative but not infallible. In fact, the Church is

⁹¹ Both Protestants and Romanists “consider their supposed judge to be a judge” having “a direct power over Scripture” through the “gift of divine illumination” (ibid). Anglicans, on the other hand, did not consider the Church as a judge, rather as a keeper and witness of Catholic Tradition and in this sense invested with authority (ibid., 269).

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 270-272.

⁹⁵ Acknowledging the reviews of *Via Media* I, Newman wrote (to B. M. Pickering [The Oratory 23 October 1877], *LD* 28: 258): “The one you said is very civil – the writer could not speak otherwise in his opinions – *only he* should know ours better than to fancy we hold the Pope infallible in all that he says or writes.”

⁹⁶ *Prophetical Office*, 272-273.

indefectible and accepted private judgment in minor details since conscience is the subject of Truth.

Since the Church depended upon faith and was indefectible in fundamentals, the next question is: what is this saving faith?⁹⁷ In his letter to Jager, Newman claimed that for Anglicans, Scripture contained all things necessary to salvation and that what was not in Scripture could not be imposed as an article of faith.⁹⁸ Scripture was the ultimate basis of proof, the place of final appeal, in respect to all fundamental doctrines; he emphasized that the three words, “*ultimate appeal, doctrines, and fundamentals* must be clearly understood.”⁹⁹ The reception of pure Tradition was pious but the doctrines conveyed by Tradition needed Scriptural proof. The Church is, first “the *keeper* of Christian doctrine, next *declares* it, thirdly has authority in regard to it, i.e. speaks definitively about it.”¹⁰⁰ Since Scripture did not contain everything and there were certain doctrines not found in it, Newman proposed the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ In his study of the Arians, Newman observed that Revelation was a universal gift rather than a sole gift to Israel or Christians. While all people had the guidance of tradition and conscience, the Word and Sacraments were characteristics of the elect people of God. However, in a letter written to Pusey, Newman, for the first time, expressed his reservations about relying on the principle of *sola Scriptura* (Falmouth, 5 December 1832), *LD* 3: 126-128.

⁹⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 24.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 36; italics in the original.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 98; see 75-76 and 83-84. This distinction was criticized as purely Newman’s invention and lacking foundation either in Scripture or in Tradition and was even diametrically opposed to them (*ibid.*, 68-69; and 70-71). Newman, however, claimed that he found the principle in the Fathers (*ibid.*, 73).

Newman explained to Jager that in contrast to Tradition, “Scripture has the prerogative of being the document of final appeal in controversies; that it is ever to be honoured with a singular honour, as the formal and authoritative basis of teaching a tradition.”¹⁰² Then he showed how the Gospel fit into this system.¹⁰³ Being full, profound, determinate and authoritative, Scripture superseded Tradition. The real nature of Scripture was evident in the words—Testament or Will—by which Scripture was designated. Accordingly, Newman believed that “we are rid of all à priori questions about the *sufficiency* of Scripture as a document of faith.”¹⁰⁴ For him, any one book of Scripture was sufficient for a rule of faith and there was no abstract measure of what was sufficient.¹⁰⁵ Scripture had one and only one sense that was unanimously held in great measure by the whole Church, even now.¹⁰⁶

Newman pointed out that this Catholic Truth, of which Scripture was the depository—especially the portion more or less immediately connected with the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation—had from the first, contemporarily with the existence of the New Testament, been taken as the condition of communion with the Church and was called the Creed. There were variations in the Creed in early times and in various places but “Scripture only is the rule and canon of Faith”¹⁰⁷ with “nothing to be believed as terms of communion but the Creed” and “nothing to be believed in order to Salvation,

¹⁰² Ibid., 117-118.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 118 and 128-129.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 119.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 119-120.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 121.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

but what is founded on Scripture.”¹⁰⁸ Newman repeated these topics in five lectures (9-13) of his *Prophetical Office*.

First, Newman explained the saving faith, the essentials of the Gospel, the Creed or the Rule of Faith.¹⁰⁹ To guard and to transmit it, not to remodel it, was the Church’s sole duty.¹¹⁰ Newman, however, advocated the principle of development: to collect, systematize, and set forth the traditions of the Church. This was an important work even though the direct apostolic origin of every phrase of doctrine was not certain.¹¹¹

Newman argued that Roman Catholics habitually excluded what the primitive Fathers held or enforced from their table of essential truths, Protestants considered it an infringement on the sacred right of private judgment to have anything clearly and distinctly elucidated about Scriptural doctrine.¹¹² Anglicans, on the contrary, accepted the Creed as a glorious privilege and were ready to battle and even to suffer for it. However, there are objections against the Anglican view of “saving faith.”¹¹³ As a response to the objection that the Creed did not contain the whole of truth, Newman

¹⁰⁸ In fact, Newman based his view of Scripture first on the Anglican Articles and Canons and then on Scripture and the Fathers; he referred to the Sixth Article and the Canons of 1571 (ibid., 122-125).

¹⁰⁹ *Prophetical Office*, 214-219.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 222-224.

¹¹¹ Newman added: “Now the Articles of our Church must be taken as doing this for us in their place and degree” (ibid., 236).

¹¹² Ibid., 224.

¹¹³ Ibid., 247-249.

introduced the distinction between episcopal and prophetic traditions and held that it is the duty of the Church to draw a line between them.¹¹⁴

In his discussion of the Rule of Faith, Newman described “the Church as a keeper and witness of Catholic Tradition, and in this sense invested with authority”¹¹⁵ but she “is not a judge.”¹¹⁶ Secondly, he argued that the Church adhered to a double Rule, Scripture and Catholic Tradition:¹¹⁷ “Tradition is inadmissible, viz., not in the abstract, and before inquiry, but in the particular case.”¹¹⁸ The office of the Church as “the ‘keeper of Holy Writ,’ seems to make it probable that she was intended to interpret, perhaps to supply what Scripture left irregular and incomplete.”¹¹⁹ Accordingly, Anglicans agreed with Catholics in holding, contrary to Protestants, that Tradition as well as Scripture was an authoritative and independent informant.¹²⁰ However, Scripture was in principle, and not only by accident, the sole Canon of our faith.¹²¹

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 249. The Church is called a superstructure, as being built upon the great rudiments of the Gospel Doctrine; a pillar and ground, as being the expounder of it (ibid., 256-257 and 263).

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 269.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 274.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 279.

¹¹⁹ Newman based his position on the Anglican Divines and on the principle of probability (ibid., 282): “Stronger evidence for its truth is scarcely conceivable; for if any but the Scriptures had pretensions to be an oracle of faith, would not the first Successors of the Apostles be that oracle?”

¹²⁰ Ibid., 286. For Newman, the controversy between England and Rome regarding Scripture and Tradition was of a verbal character but with the Protestants, it was not verbal (ibid., 287-289). He also justified the Articles regarding Catholic Tradition as a protest against certain specific errors (ibid.).

¹²¹ Ibid., 290-293 and 310-311; see 327. Newman narrated the common testimonies of Fathers regarding Scripture as the “Rule of Faith” (ibid., 304).

B. The Reception of the *Prophetical Office*

Although Newman painstakingly attempted to establish the theory of the Anglican Church as a *via media*, he admitted in the fourteenth lecture that what he had tried to prove was still a dream: the Anglican Church in reality was not a visible fulfillment of the theory. Yet he took comfort in the thought that not only the English Church but “the Church Catholic anywhere, or at any time, Primitive, Roman, or Reformed, is but a name” and “the Church is ever invisible in its day, and faith only apprehends it.”¹²² This did not mean that the Church has become “a mere creation of man.”¹²³ Recalling the struggles of the Church in Jewish history, the patristic period and the Middle Ages, he concluded that the Church was ever ailing and lingered on in weakness: “always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in her body” (2 Corinthians 4:10).¹²⁴

For three years (1834 to 1836), Newman continued to work on the *Prophetical Office*, in order to establish the *via media* theory which was also an effort to build a coherent systematic ecclesiology based on Anglican principles. In his last lecture, he summarized his ecclesiology: since the Church, by office and definition, is the pillar and ground of truth, the faith committed to her is to be clearly proclaimed and indefectibly maintained. Even though the Anglican Church had denied her own powers, she still had not lost the gifts given to her. Struggling like the churches of Early Ages and the Middle Ages, she still continued to be a branch of the One Catholic Church.

¹²² Ibid., 331-332.

¹²³ Ibid., 338-339.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 354.

Even after the delivery of these lectures, Newman continued to discuss the topics in other essays and tracts. Wiseman's lectures on the Roman Catholic theology of the rule of faith and the infallible Church were both a challenge and a complement to the ongoing discussion of the Church and her authority. However, in 1839, Newman found that the theory of *via media* crumbled as he realized the power of the infallible Church even in Antiquity.¹²⁵ In fact, his *via media* had a short life-span; it died in the latter part of 1839, after the publication of the two editions of his *Prophetical Office* in 1837 and 1838. Despite its short life, the *Prophetical Office* was reviewed both affirmatively and negatively by different writers.¹²⁶ In any case, many of the themes of the *Prophetical*

¹²⁵ *Apologia*, 149-150.

¹²⁶ According to Weidner (*Via Media*, xiii): "Despite Newman's high appreciation of the effort represented by the *Prophetical Office*, the work occasioned a brief flurry of excitement and then was quickly overwhelmed by a series of events, including Newman's own development away from its central thesis." Weidner also mentioned the opinions of a number of writers, including Dean Church, who asserted that Newman's view of the Church of England had become "the accepted Anglican view" and claimed that the work was pivotal: "It was unsystematic and incomplete. But so far as its arguments extended, it almost formed an epoch in this kind of controversial writings" (*ibid.*, xiv). F. L. Cross maintained essentially the same view: "the book is perhaps the most enduring work that Newman produced" (F. L. Cross, *John Henry Newman* [London: P. Allan, 1933], 70). However, other Anglican did not consider the work central to the definition of the Church of England. Edward Hawkins, the provost of Oriel, found the *Prophetical Office* not very congenial (Weidner, *Via Media*, xiv). Henry R. McAdoo (*The Spirit of Anglicanism* [New York: Scribner, 1965], 398) considered Tractarianism as only a side development. Likewise, Paul E. More observed: "Newman was fundamentally troubled by a deep seated craving for the support of an absolute external authority which I consider anathema to the Church of England" (P. E. More, "The Spirit of Anglicanism" in Frank Leslie Cross and Paul Elmer More, eds. *Anglicanism* [Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing Co. 1935], 17). There was disagreement about another fundamental feature of the *Prophetical Office*: Newman's view of history. In addition, some felt that the *Prophetical Office* promoted faith, while others felt it fostered doubt (Weidner, *Via Media*, xv).

Office continued to be discussed by Newman until he wrote his Preface for its third edition in 1877.

C. The Priestly and Regal Offices of the Church

In his fourteen lectures in the de Brome Chapel, Newman focused solely on the topics that were relevant to the prophetic office of the Church. However, he knew that “the distinct portions of the general subject so affect each other, that such points as Church authority, Tradition, the Rule of Faith, and the like, cannot be treated without seeming to trench upon political principles.”¹²⁷ In 1877, when Newman prepared the Preface, he added the other two offices of the Church and so formulated a more comprehensive ecclesiology.

In his 1877 Preface, Newman considered the divine origin of the Church as the “representative of Jesus Christ,” the “very self of Christ here on earth in human measure.”¹²⁸ Consequently, the Church carried out the three functions or offices of Christ, namely, Prophet, Priest, and King.¹²⁹ If the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, the Pope the Vicar of Christ is no more an Antichrist and “the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, inherits these offices and acts for the Church in them.”¹³⁰

¹²⁷ *Prophetic Office*, 12.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, xxxix.

¹²⁹ Newman later criticized the title of the lectures because of three office being “indivisible, though diverse” (*ibid.*, xl).

¹³⁰ Newman wrote: “This is another matter; I am speaking here of the Body of Christ, and the sovereign Pontiff would not be the visible head of that Body, did he not first belong to it. He is not himself the Body of Christ, but the chief part of the Body . . .” (*ibid.*).

Christianity, for Newman, was not only a philosophy or a political power but first of all a religious rite.¹³¹ In primitive times, it was recognized as worship, springing up and spreading in the lower ranks of society and among the ignorant and dependent, and making its power known by the heroism of its martyrs and confessors.¹³² The Church was a visible sacrament of the invisible. She was entrusted with sacraments and ministers of the sacraments. He, however, dreaded all forms of popular superstitions. Thus, worship and edification were important functions of the Church: “In truth, the Church was framed for the express purpose of interfering or (as irreligious men will say) meddling with the world.”¹³³

On the one hand, as Newman observed in “Home Thoughts Abroad,” “the spirit of old Rome” continued in Christian Rome “with its corrupt papal system, its cruelty, . . . its craft in its falsehoods, its deceitful deeds, and its grasping ambition in the very structure of its polity”;¹³⁴ on the other hand, in the 1877 Preface, he accepted that it is expedient or natural to have all these systematic elements in order for the Church to be regal.

The three offices, which especially belong to Christ, demand that the Church have regal functions both after His pattern and in human measure. The pope, as the Vicar of

¹³¹ According to Dulles, Newman’s treatment of the priestly office “may be judged original and impressive. It forthrightly addresses some of the most serious objections raised by the Prophetic Office and still pressed against Catholicism in our own day” (Dulles, “The Threefold Office in Newman’s Ecclesiology,” 386).

¹³² *Ibid.*, xli.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 258-259. See also *Arians*, 257 and JHN to Frederic Rogers (Rome, 5 March 1833), *LD* 3: 234-235.

¹³⁴ “Thoughts,” 123.

Christ, is the visible head of that Body; he has received these offices and acts for the Church in them. The pope, however, is not the Body of Christ, but the chief part of the Body.

For Newman, Christianity was necessarily a political power and as such, it was imperial, that is, One and Catholic. Thus, Christianity as a rule of life had the papacy and its curia. Though in substance the Church had exercised these three functions from the first, Christianity inherited the regal offices as the last step of its structural growth. Thus, it seated itself as an ecclesiastical polity among princes and chose Rome for its center.¹³⁵ Newman, however, was hesitant about supporting the centralization and triumphalism of the papacy and the Roman curia.¹³⁶

D. Newman's Comprehensive Ecclesiology

Newman's lectures on the prophetic office were delivered in defense of the Anglican Church; the 1877 Preface was written in the defense of the Roman Catholic Church. In effect, Newman provided a more comprehensive ecclesiology in his third edition of the *Prophetic Office* in *Via Media I*. Newman had spoken of such a project as something he had "long wished to do" for both theological and personal reasons.¹³⁷ He described the personal issue in some letters to Emily Bowles as feeling like a Persian

¹³⁵ *Prophetic Office*, xl-xli. Dulles, however, remarked that Newman treated "the regal office almost though it were the responsibility of the pope alone" (Dulles, "The Threefold Office in Newman's Ecclesiology," 391).

¹³⁶ During his first visit to Rome, Newman expressed disgust over the practices of Rome's court such as the kissing of the pope's feet and carrying him on the *sede gestatoria* (JHN to Mrs. Newman [25 March 1833], LD 3: 268). Earlier he had justified the English rejection of the pope because he felt that the pope had encroached upon the other patriarchates by claiming power over them against their rights (*Tract 33*, 1).

¹³⁷ *Prophetic Office*, xxxvi.

“driven to fight under the lash”¹³⁸—an indication of his dissatisfaction with Roman centralization and the control of Propaganda over English affairs.

In his *Prophetical Office*, Newman had sacrificed the visible unity of the Church in order to claim legitimacy for the Anglican Church; in 1877, he had come to the point of conceding the invisibility of holiness in the Roman Church in order to claim legitimacy for it. He, however, acknowledged abuses in the Roman Catholic Church. Accordingly, he had to develop a theological framework that would accommodate both: the wheat and the tares. Secondly, from an ecclesiological point of view, he completed a theology of the Church by including a discussion of the priestly and regal offices.

Newman provided a dramatic picture of the entire history of the Church in his last lecture of the *Prophetical Office*: the challenge to the Church would be enormous, but the holiness of the Church would not be overwhelmed, either by sinful members or by enemies. He came to the conclusion that Catholicity involved a threat to the Church’s holiness because a popular religion was easily deformed by the errors and the bad taste of the multitude. Thus Catholicity had two effects: first, static and pure Antiquity had to be sacrificed to the more comprehensive idea of development if the Church was really to embody a universal religion, suited to all times and places. Secondly, in the real world, it became difficult to assert universality and holiness; we should surrender to the Mystery

¹³⁸ JHN to Emily Bowles (1863), *LD* 20: 447; also JHN to Henry Wilberforce (12 August 1868), *LD* 24: 120-121.

of the Lord's parables of "wheat and tares growing together" or "a net gathering fish of every kind."¹³⁹ Thus, the Catholicity of the Church obliged her to wait in patience.

At the end of 1876, when Newman began to edit this collection of his Anglican lectures, he was faced with defining the *via media* and writing the accompanying notes. The Preface, the final reworking of years of thought, was begun in February 1877 and finished in the summer of that year. In his Preface, Newman recalled his original purpose of discussing the meaning of an article of the Creed—the Holy Catholic Church—and identified the three major elements of his lectures: first, hypothetical (the theory of *via media*); second, rhetorical (his sweeping accusation against Romanism); and third, argumentative (Anglican theology and the Roman Church in her patristic, moral and political aspects).

To address the disparities between the primitive Church and the present-day Roman Church in teaching, conduct, worship, and polity, Newman had developed his 1845 *Essay on Development*. In the 1877 Preface, he answered the disparities between the formal Roman Catholic teachings and her popular and political manifestations, i.e., between what was preached and what was lived in the real world.

Newman's Preface was at the time unique in Roman Catholic ecclesiology by admitting the abuses of the Church in such a way that truth and apologetics were both served. In the *Prophetical Office*, he had simply ascribed errors to Roman theology; in the Preface, he distinguished between Rome's official theological teachings and the

¹³⁹ *Prophetical Office*, xcii. The parable of the "wheat and tares" is from Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43; the parable of the dragnet is from Mathew 13:37-50.

superstitious abuses prevalent among ordinary Roman Catholics. It was a distinction between the Church as an intellectual and a popular system and between its political and institutional form. His admission of abuses in the Preface puzzled many of its critics.¹⁴⁰ Newman acknowledged abuses close to the heart of the Roman Catholic Church by alluding rather allegorically to the complex nature of the Church with the image of the prophet's vision of the Cherubim in whom, "the wings of one were joined to the wings of another, yet they turned not, when they went, but everyone went straight forward."¹⁴¹

The Preface, however, was not mainly an answer to the problem of abuses or disparities alone; rather it was an attempt to synthesize and complete an ecclesiology without sacrificing the actual dimensions of the Church. Accepting the Church as a complex but divine institution, Newman formulated an understanding of the Church as the very self of Christ, his Mystical Body and Bride, his representative on earth. The Church thus continued to carry out the functions or offices of Christ as Prophet, Priest

¹⁴⁰ Weidner (*Via Media*, xxxvii and lviii-lix) has pointed out that the *Dublin Review* (29 (1877), 514 n.) struggled: "there is one passage of which we confess ourselves unable to conjecture the sense. The passage is so remarkable, that we feel bound to place it before our readers, in the hope that more competent judges may pronounce on both its meaning and on its truth.' (*Dublin Review*, 29 [1877], 516): "It is so ordered on high that in our day Holy Church should present just that aspect to my countrymen which is most consonant with their ingrained prejudices against her, most unpromising for their conversion; and what can one writer to counteract this misfortune? But enough of this; whatever comes of it, I must be content to have done what I feel it is an obligation to." (*Prophetical Office*, xxxvii). "To concede abuses so close to the heart of the Roman Catholic Church, and to admit that the Church was unattractive as a result of the abuses, was beyond understanding in both a certain school of theology as well as a kind of Catholic journalism" (Weidner, *Via Media*, lix).

¹⁴¹ *Prophetical Office*, xxxviii.

and King.¹⁴² These functions of the Church paralleled the three functions of Christianity: a philosophy, a religious rite and political power. The prophetic office embraced all the philosophical, intellectual and theological aspects of faith; the priestly, worship, prayer, spirituality and every aspect of the devotional life; the regal, its administration and government.

Newman thus extended christology into ecclesiology: “after His pattern, and in human measure, Holy Church has a triple office too; not the prophetic alone and in isolation, as these lectures virtually teach, but three offices, which are indivisible, though diverse, viz. teaching, rule, and sacred ministry.”¹⁴³ Just as Christ’s and the Apostles’ ministries were subjected to trials, so is the Church’s ministry. The work of the Church is slow, developing, and imperfectly realized. The share of the Church in the offices of Christ remains within the boundaries of “human measure.”

Consequently, arduous “are the duties involved in these three offices, to discharge one by one, much more arduous are they to administer, when taken in combination.”¹⁴⁴ If in the *Prophetic Office*, Newman charged that most of the Roman errors issued from infallibility, rationalism and the schools of theology, in the Preface, he saw the matter differently: “the natural and proper function of the Schools lies and has lain in forming those abstract decrees which the Author considers to be the least blamable portion of Roman teaching.”¹⁴⁵ The abuses in the Church reflected the activities of popular

¹⁴² See *ibid.*, xlii and Weidner, *Via Media*, li.

¹⁴³ *Prophetic Office*, xl. See also *PPS* 2: 304-306.

¹⁴⁴ *Prophetic Office*, xli.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, xlvii-xlviii.

devotion and political behavior rather than excessive rationality. Theology restrained and corrected such extravagances of human infirmity in the exercise of regal and sacerdotal powers.

A kind of “hierarchical priority” of the *Prophetical Office* was retained vividly in the Preface by Newman: “Theology is the fundamental and regulating principle of the whole Church system. It is commensurate with Revelation, and Revelation is the initial and essential idea of Christianity.”¹⁴⁶ However, to be a regulating principle, theology need not be a dominating principle. It regulates by “keeping within bounds both political and popular elements in the Church constitution,” without unbalancing the three offices.¹⁴⁷

Theology had another basis for claiming the regulating principle. For Newman, it was not only commensurate with Revelation, but also “in a certain sense a power of jurisdiction over those offices” and “being its creation.”¹⁴⁸ Therefore, attributing any kind of “centrality” to theology or refusing any “special position” to theology or prophetic office was the result of a wrong understanding of Newman’s ecclesiology.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., xlvii.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., xlviii.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Weidner (*Via Media*, lx) has mentioned disputes about the centrality of theology in Newman’s Preface: Richard Bergeron and John Coulson maintained that the centrality of theology as a “regulating principle” is not only Newman’s own position, and does not upset the balance of the offices, but that it maintains that balance. On the other hand, Nicholas Lash has questioned the interpretation of Coulson and Bergeron and asserted that the “greatness of the Preface consists in Newman’s refusal to allocate to any one of the offices a position of privilege or centrality in respect of the others.” Dulles also observed that Newman gave a “definite priority to the prophetic office” (Dulles, “The Threefold Office in Newman’s Ecclesiology,” 380).

For Newman, the offices of the Church came into being with the Revelation of Christianity. Therefore, the prophetic office defined the nature and extent of the other two offices. Yet once the definition was made, the prophetic office limited itself for the sake of the truth it taught and did not extend into the other offices, which had a proper function and scope of their own. By definition, Revelation created the priestly office, but this did not mean that the devotional office was created by theology. In fact, theology had to be at the service of imagination and reason.

Accordingly, Newman advocated the ancient practice of the principle of Economy.¹⁵⁰ The theological office of the Church had duties for both Catholicity and edification. As to Catholicity, the Church aimed at something less than the best to arrive at the greatest good; as to edification, one should not pull up the tares at the expense of the wheat. Thus, expediency was demanded at the “very frontiers of immutable truths in religion, ethic, and theology.”¹⁵¹ For Newman, the principle of reserve should be exercised even when so serious a truth as “*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*” comes into consideration.¹⁵²

Theological truth and devotional truth were bound up with moral truth and each tried to restrain the other from sin and error. If the restraint was to be real, a third office with actual power was necessary. This was the ruling office of the Church. For

¹⁵⁰ The principle of Economy or pastoral restraint was long-standing with Newman; this principle separated theology as a science from other sciences; see Robin C. Selby, *The Principle of Reserve in the Writing of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

¹⁵¹ Weidner, *Via Media*, lxxxvi.

¹⁵² *Prophetic Office*, lxiii.

Newman, such an authority was an integral part of the original constitution of the Church. The regal power, though necessary to preserve the field of truth imposed by theology and given life by devotion, must also be restrained and limited. Accordingly, each office had its center: the devotional office, Christianity as religion, was centered on the pastor and people; the prophetic office, Christianity as philosophy, was centered on the Schools of theology; the regal office, Christianity as a political power, was centered on the papacy and the curia.

Newman did not underestimate the difficulty of holding the three offices together insofar as they use different instruments and served different ends. None of these three offices unduly dominated the others, rather they ideally stood in a judicious constitutional relationship to one another, respected their separate provinces and maintained an orderly balance and tension in which one office completed and supplied what the others lacked. Thus, the Preface presented the Church as a living organism ever growing in tension and mutual give and take.

The theology of the Preface was not only a way to understand the Church theoretically but also a way to grasp the necessary intrinsic conflicts of life within the Church. Accordingly, the existence of deviations in the Roman Catholic Church did not invalidate her; rather the Church as Catholic Church reflected the New Testament parable of wheat and weeds. Acceptance of Catholicity demanded the introduction of the development of doctrine—specifically—a fuller development of the triple offices of the Church—and accounted for a universal communion in which members, even officials, embraced deviations or misuses. The disjunction of the offices never indicated that there

was disjunction between the Church and the world. Consequently, the Church was not alienated from human realities nor was it completely divinized.

Finally in the Preface, Weidner identified a remarkable parallel between the triple offices of the Church and the tripartite functions of conscience.¹⁵³ Conscience provided a real image of God and governed and guided human beings. In his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, Newman wrote: “Conscience is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its information, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas.”¹⁵⁴ Newman described another parallel to the triple offices of the Church in his *Grammar of Assent*, the three main channels which Nature furnishes for our knowledge of God: our minds, the voice of mankind and the course of the world.¹⁵⁵

Thus, an important aspect of the ecclesiology in the Preface was that the Church was presented as a proper completion of revealed religion. Revelation necessitated a God-given and infallible organ, the Church as its prophet, priest and shepherd. The three great dangers to any religion—superstition, rationalism and institutionalism—each the abuse of devotion, reason and order, which were essential goods in themselves, were to be regulated by the principle of Economy. Thus, the Preface provided an ecclesiology that was founded on a view of religion that proposed that any religion, if revealed,

¹⁵³ Ibid., lxxx-lxxxi. See also Weidner, *Via Media*, lxxi-lxxii.

¹⁵⁴ *A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, 248-249.

¹⁵⁵ JHN, *An Essay in aid of a Grammar of Assent*, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/grammar/index.html>, 389; hereafter cited: *Grammar*. Weidner concluded: For Newman, Christian revelation has, in the work of Jesus Christ, met the needs of conscience, completed the lack of information and balance found in the dimly remembered universal revelation, and overcome the alienation and discord found in the world system. The work of Jesus continued in the Church, which shared His offices ‘in human measure’ (Weidner, *Via Media*, lxxiii).

contains these three indispensable elements: a body of devotion and worship, an intellectual system and an institutional form and authority.¹⁵⁶

The ecclesiology of the 1877 Preface was the finale of Newman's personal, spiritual and intellectual search for a theology of the Church. The fruits of his evangelical, Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic experiences and studies were embodied in this short essay on ecclesiology that defended the assent to a living Church. The Preface constituted a new *via media* ecclesiology that was kept within bounds by a teaching office active enough to judge developing doctrine in accordance with the original Revelation, but restrained enough to recognize the needs of a pastoral office and a governing body. This ecclesiological theory kept the Church truly balanced on the golden middle where virtue stands.

3. The Characteristics of the *Via Media's* Ecclesiology

The most evident characteristic of Newman's *Lectures on the Prophetical Office* is its narrative style. In his fourteen lectures and 1877-Preface, Newman demonstrated his powerful skill of using a narrative style. The ecclesiology of *Via Media I* also has many biblical, patristic, sacramental and Christological, and ecumenical characteristics—which date back a half-century.

¹⁵⁶ In his foreword to Edward J. Miller's *John Henry Newman on the Idea of Church*, xi, J. H. Walgrave wrote: "In his last major contribution to ecclesiology, the preface to the third edition of the *Prophetical Office*, Newman not only attempted to describe and analyze this inner and essentially conflictual structure but also tried to make it acceptable and illuminating as necessary and fruitful for the life of such an institution as the church in such an ecological medium as the historical human world. This synthesis is the final conclusion from his experience in the church and is meant to be a hypothesis that most adequately accounts for the facts and justifies the otherwise disquieting phenomena that could be brought up against the church."

Towards the end of September 1828, in an essay on Aristotle's poetics, Newman expressed his belief that revealed religion should be poetical and that a poetical view of reality is a Christian duty. In contrast to those English writers who dismissed the popular devotions of the Catholics of Italy, he thought that "the catholic system addresses itself to the *imagination*; which is about as true as to say that religion itself is addressed to the *feelings*."¹⁵⁷ Feelings could be considered a matter of "*poetical taste*" but he claimed for them "a much higher origin, though one which everyone has within him if he will cultivate it—the devotional sense."¹⁵⁸

From childhood, Newman had a kind of Platonic understanding of the unreality of the material world that was balanced by an incipient sense of the sacramental. From the moment of his first consciously religious commitment and evangelical formation, he knew that faith was to be found in a person rather than in a creed or a church structure. The reason for Newman's disinterest in Aristotelian and scholastic articulations of faith may have been a by-product of his study of the Arian heresy. He found that the Sophist schools were places where the heretical Arian exponents were educated and the Sophist teachers had Aristotle as their primary authority. Consequently, they based their arguments on their dialectical skills rather than the testimony of the early Church.¹⁵⁹

Via Media I is important to understanding Newman's formation as a theologian, his search for a theological methodology and his re-appropriating history as a theological

¹⁵⁷ "Thoughts," 125.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ According to Avery Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 419-442, at 440, a number of 20th century ecclesiologists have been influenced by the Platonism of the Fathers.

category. In his *Via Media*, there is a desire for a reformed Catholicism, which he never abandoned, and which allowed most of the issues central to his theology to be transformed even after his entrance into the Roman Catholic Church. *Via Media I* is also a key to understanding Newman's characteristic ecclesiology, especially, his use of patristic history to reintroduce a methodological pluralism into theological thinking.¹⁶⁰ His positing a christological foundation for the *Prophetical Office* is an instance of his historical approach. His reading of the Fathers made him confident of the patristic practice of reading Scripture as examples of typology.¹⁶¹

The particular value of narrative is not in its ability to state theological ideas abstractly and succinctly but in its capacity to make its subject matter vibrant and real. The contextual history of the *Prophetical Office* illustrates how Newman was able to narrate a theology of the Church from his ecclesial experiences rather than importing an abstract theological framework and speculative terms. His use of the *via media* as a common thread that runs through his fourteen lectures is remarkable and is a clear instance of his expertise in narrative theology. Engaging first Anglicans and then Roman Catholics, he became more persuasive in articulating an ecclesiology that was intelligible for both. Simultaneously, Newman was capable of explaining important theological concepts such as infallibility, private judgment, indefectibility, revelation and creed with

¹⁶⁰ Weidner (*Via Media*, li) has observed: "If the doctrine of the offices of Christ taught Newman something materially about Christianity, it also contributed to his understanding of formal method, especially the application of Old Testament texts to illustrate New Testament meaning."

¹⁶¹ "In fact, without this kind of interpretation, the doctrine of the offices of Christ would not have taken hold in such Bible-centered faith as the Evangelical one Newman grew into" (ibid., lii).

depth and precision. The *Prophetical Office* also shows us that theology can be written in a literally pleasing fashion, engaging the aesthetic dimension of the human spirit. His *Via Media* ecclesiology is narrative theology *par excellence*.

Secondly, following the methodology of Anglican divines, Newman made use of the treasury of patristic literature and based his ecclesiology on it. Although he used both the method and the bountiful resources of the Fathers of the Church in all his lectures, his critics have sometimes accused him of misusing or misunderstanding some of the writings of the Fathers. However, the method of formulating a theology by interweaving references from both Scripture and Fathers made Newman's *Prophetical Office* ecumenically significant.

Thirdly, everything that Newman wrote is replete with numerous biblical references. No one who has read him will ever doubt his ability to engage Scripture with passion and spontaneity. His notions of the Church are forged not only from the New Testament but also from the Old Testament; his lectures articulated an ecclesiology based on the foundation of Scripture and used numerous biblical references to substantiate his claims.¹⁶² The very word "Church" as used in Scripture, with a few exceptions, means a visible body.¹⁶³ It was on the basis of Scripture, he distinguished two other characteristics of the Church: "the grant of *power* to the Church and the promise of

¹⁶² *Tract* 11, 3.

¹⁶³ "The possible exception to this rule, out of about 100 places in the New Testament, where the word occurs, are four passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians; two in the Colossians; and one in the Hebrews. (Eph. i. 22; iii. 10, 21; v. 23-32. Col. i. 18, 24. Heb. xii. 23.) – And in some of these exceptions the sense is at most but doubtful." For Newman, "The Greek word [*ekklēsia*] means simply an assembly, a visible body . . ." (ibid., 3-4).

permanence.”¹⁶⁴ He felt these two things are self-evident in Scripture: first, that a Visible Church existed in the Apostles’ day; second, that the Visible Church, instituted by Christ through the Apostles was intended to continue.¹⁶⁵ From Scripture, he concluded that the Visible Church was set up, first of all, as a witness to the Truth as a light on a hill, and secondly, as the keeper of the sacraments.¹⁶⁶ The prophetic office of the Church is nothing but the continuation of the mission of Christ, the Great Prophet. The Preface identified the Church as the continuation of Christ the prophet, king and priest in accordance with both the Old and New Laws. Thus, Newman’s ecclesiology is based on the strong foundation of Scripture and is in effect a biblical ecclesiology.

Fourthly, Newman grounded his ecclesiology in christology. Though he never explicitly indicated that he was following an evangelical view of the Church in the pattern of Christ the king, priest and prophet, Newman had this schema in mind even when he was planning to construct a theology primarily on the prophetic office of the Church in contrast to the ecclesial and sacerdotal offices of the Church.¹⁶⁷

In his autobiographical memoir, Newman acknowledged that his reception of the “divine truths about our Lord and His person and Offices” were among the many

¹⁶⁴ *Tract 11*, 4.

¹⁶⁵ Newman listed a number of scriptural references as proof for the existence of a Visible Church in the Apostles’ day, for the organization of the Church, diversity of ranks, governors, gifts, order, ecclesiastical obedience, rules and discipline, unity, etc (*Tract 11*, 7-8).

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁶⁷ The contextual study of the *Prophetic Office* provides evidence for such a conclusion, though with a number of intimations; for instance, in his Assize sermon (“National Apostasy”), Keble insisted on the supernatural origin of the Church which was derived by apostolic descent from Christ. Keble’s “Assize Sermon” is available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/keble/keble1.html>.

fundamental doctrines traceable to his evangelical formation.¹⁶⁸ However, most evangelicals hesitated to grant the Church a share in the offices of Christ for fear of divinizing the Church. Newman applied these offices to the nature of the Church more boldly than evangelicals were prepared to do. He completed his christological ecclesiology by discussing the other two offices of Christ in the Preface. In fact, he held a high christological ecclesiology, but by emphasizing “in human measure,” he was able to say that the Church shared in Christ’s ministry without implying triumphalism. Thus, providing christological foundation for ecclesiology, Newman was able to avoid over-divinizing the Church and also able to formulate an ecclesiology without promoting centralization or triumphalism.

Fifthly, Newman’s understanding of Church as highly sacramental is a modification of his early sense of the unreality of material phenomena. Instead of unreal, he began to see the material world as “connected with the more momentous system.” Thus, his understanding of the Church as a sacrament of “real things unseen” on earth began to evolve in his mind. In many of his tracts and sermons, he discussed the Church as the objective form on earth of an object, person and authority. The *Prophetical Office* was the beginning of this sacramental ecclesiology that reached maturity in the Preface.

¹⁶⁸ AW, 79. According to Weidner (*Via Media*, li.), “Newman’s reception of the divine truths about our Lord and His person and Offices was among many other fundamental doctrines traceable to his evangelical formation. John Calvin developed this schema over several editions of the *Institutes*, synthesizing into three major aspects Thomas Scott says that the offices cannot be separated in either Christ’s performance of them or in the Christian’s dependence on Christ” (*Prophetical Office*, xlii).

Sixthly, in the Preface to his *Prophetical Office*, he completed an ecumenical ecclesiology that integrated the principles of a number of Christian churches—Evangelical, Anglican, Protestant and Roman Catholic. In the Preface, he brought with him a treasure: the ability to understand certain Protestant emphases about the life of faith. Hence, *Via Media I* is a meeting place for what often appears to be irreconcilable opposites: an understanding of the unmediated relationship of the soul to God as stressed in Protestantism and the sacramental nature of the Church as exemplified in Catholicism; and an appreciation for the authority of individual conscience as found in Protestantism and the strong concern for institutional authority and doctrinal orthodoxy as evidenced in Catholicism.

His evangelical background helped Newman to articulate his insights about the place of the individual within the Church. By extension, he was able to value differences of opinion, even with respect to doctrine in such a way that some degree of institutional unity could gradually be seen as a possibility for all the churches. Personally, Newman always was a lover of apostolicity and grew into a longing for catholicity, the oneness of the churches. Thus, his ecclesiology is an unparalleled source and model for ecumenical theology.

Lastly, Newman's ecclesiology could be characterized as a communion ecclesiology, since it promotes the view that the Church is a Mystery which is humanly incomprehensible. For instance, by expounding an historical account of the relationship of Scripture and Tradition, he prompted churches to an ecclesiological examination of conscience. In addition, by formulating an ecclesiology reminding his readers that there

are a number of principles both in the inner and exterior structures of the Church conflicting and complementing each other, he had foreseen the advent of a communion ecclesiology.

4. The Principal Themes of the *Prophetical Office*

The topics of his lectures in the *Prophetical Office* were in fact ecclesiological themes that Newman was personally struggling to articulate. Many of these topics, including infallibility, private judgment, the development of doctrine, consulting the faithful and the principle of economy, had a past history as well as future development in Newman's writings. Each of these themes had a part to play in the composition of the *Prophetical Office* as well as subsequent importance in the development of Newman's ecclesiology.

In regard to infallibility, Newman felt that Roman Catholics had drawn the doctrinal line much higher than Anglicans.¹⁶⁹ In his opinion, the doctrine of infallibility led Rome to moral loss and political gain. Infallibility was not only defective in regard to proof but also in theory. On the one hand, Roman Catholic theology did not answer the question how individuals were to know for certain that the Church is infallible and where this gift resided.¹⁷⁰ On the other hand, the Protestant doctrine of private judgment led to the "latitudinarian notion that one creed is as good as another."¹⁷¹ In contrast, the *via media* was a middle course that accepted Scripture as the ultimate rule of faith and relied

¹⁶⁹ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 102.

¹⁷⁰ *Prophetical Office*, 122.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 29.

on Antiquity, even though the Church might claim the confidence and obedience of her members without claiming infallibility.¹⁷²

The Church Catholic was not only bound to teach the Truth but was also divinely guided to teach it. She was indefectible and, therefore, not only had authority to enforce her teaching, but also was authoritative in teaching. She accepted private judgment in minor details since conscience is the subject of Truth. Therefore, in the *via media*, the Church was authoritative but not infallible. The Church was a witness and keeper of Catholic Tradition and in this sense was invested with authority.¹⁷³ The Church Catholic and Apostolic is only indefectible and safeguards the freedom of conscience. Newman accepted Antiquity and Catholicity to be the real guides and the Church their organ.

For Newman, dogma referred to that certain revealed truth which expresses divine reality. Dogma is a foundational principle of the Church because it expresses the actual revelation of God.¹⁷⁴ While all people had the guidance of tradition and conscience, the word and sacraments were the characteristics of the elect people of God. For Anglicans, Scripture contained all things necessary for salvation and what was not in Scripture could not be imposed as an article of faith. Scripture was the ultimate basis of proof, the place of final appeal in respect to all fundamental doctrines. Being full, profound, determinate

¹⁷² Ibid., 143.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 269.

¹⁷⁴ “Christianity is faith, faith implies a doctrine; a doctrine propositions; propositions yes or no, yes or no differences” (JHN, *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects*, 284, available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/arguments/tamworth/section5.html>).

and authoritative, Scripture superseded Tradition.¹⁷⁵ Scripture alone was the basis and bond of union among Christians as far as faith was concerned.

However, in regard to this Catholic Truth—of which Scripture was the depository—a certain portion, more or less immediately connected with the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, had from the first been taken as the condition of communion with the Church, and this was the Creed. Accordingly, the fundamental or essential doctrines were those contained in the Creed, which was commonly called the symbol or rule of faith. Nothing was to be believed in terms of communion but the Creed and nothing was to be believed in order for salvation but what was founded on Scripture. The Church was the keeper of Christian doctrines. She had authority to speak definitively about it. It was the duty of the Church to draw a line between essentials and non-essentials.¹⁷⁶

In both the Jager controversy and the lectures on the *Prophetical Office*, because of the existence of both fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, Newman introduced the distinction of episcopal and prophetical traditions and stated that it was the duty of the Church to draw a line between them. Anglicans gave extensive influence to tradition as “tradition interpretative of Scripture”, “tradition of doctrine not in Scripture”, “tradition of discipline, ceremonies, historical facts, &c. extending to a variety of matters.”¹⁷⁷ In

¹⁷⁵ *Prophetical Office*, 272-273.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 327. Accordingly, to collect, systematize, and set forth the traditions of the Church, was surely a most edifying and important work.

¹⁷⁷ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 36-37.

fact, the Church adhered to a double rule of faith; Scripture and Catholic Tradition.¹⁷⁸

Newman agreed with Catholics in holding, contrary to Protestants, that Tradition as well as Scripture was an authoritative and independent informant.¹⁷⁹

In regard to the development of doctrine, Newman was led by his study of Arianism to conclude that one of the reasons for the Arian heresy was the absence of an adequate creed and the unwillingness of the Church to be open to the novel. In his “Home Thoughts Abroad,” Newman suggested the possibility of doctrinal development on the premise that Christianity was intended to meet all forms of society rather than being so rigid.¹⁸⁰ However, he did not support anything contrary to apostolic usage.¹⁸¹ But his anonymous friend insisted on “liberty of acquiescing in innovations” and was convinced of “providential phenomenon, the growth of a secondary system” compatible with some “portion of true faith” which could not be considered schismatic.¹⁸² Newman accepted it as an element of prudence and the principle of economy.¹⁸³

It was during the Jager controversy that Newman introduced the idea of development of doctrine and defended the authority of the Church to explain, develop, and defend the Creed.¹⁸⁴ When he allowed the Church power to draw articles of religion

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 273.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 289.

¹⁸⁰ “Thoughts,” 243-244.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Ibid., 245.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 245-246.

¹⁸⁴ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 87-89.

from its fundamental Creed according to time and circumstances, Jager objected.¹⁸⁵

Newman, however, accepted the Church's duty to elucidate and develop points of doctrines but not change because "to develop is not to create."¹⁸⁶ Accordingly, he concluded that to "collect, systematize, and set forth the Traditions of the Church, is surely a most edifying and important work, and great is our debt to Councils, modern or ancient, in proportion as they have attempted this; even though the direct Apostolical origin of every phrase or view of doctrine they adopt, be not certain."¹⁸⁷ He also advocated the Anglican theory of gradual but progressive teaching methods of the Church.¹⁸⁸ Thus the theory of development of Christian doctrines emerged from his ecclesiological reflections in the *Prophetical Office*.¹⁸⁹

In regard to the laity, Newman discovered that it was the people who defended the Catholic orthodoxy during the Arian struggle and he likened the Tractarian Movement to the struggle of the early Church which threw itself on the people rather than on the

¹⁸⁵ In his Sixth Letter, Jager argued that the Roman Catholic Church never claimed such power which Protestants or Parliament claimed (ibid., 71). The issue was raised by Jager again in his Seventh Letter, challenging Newman to clarify what he meant by development. According to Allen, these challenges from Jager had their effect on Newman's *Prophetical Office* and *Essay on the Development* (ibid., 16-20 and 107).

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 97 and 71-72. Newman also emphasized the sacramentality of divine revelation and the responsibility of the Church to serve the divine revelation (ibid., 89).

¹⁸⁷ *Prophetical Office*, 236.

¹⁸⁸ Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 89-90. Newman stated: "As the Christian develops the Creed, he must receive with trust, and unhesitatingly, the interpretation which the Church gives of it; and if in the end, he differs from her on some points of little importance, he must not raise himself up against her" (ibid., 90-91).

¹⁸⁹ According to Ker, "Newman's idea in his lectures on the Prophetical Office (1837) of a "Prophetical Tradition" existing within the Church had allowed in principle for developments taking place as a normal occurrence; . . ." See JHN, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. Sixth edition, Foreword by Ian Ker (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), xviii-xix.

political or ecclesiastical leaders.¹⁹⁰ For him, the people are the real “Fulcrum of the Church Power.”¹⁹¹ Therefore, he was open to laymen belonging to the movement and hailed their co-operation as the greatest benefit to it.¹⁹² With Froude, he shared his ecclesiological conclusion that the Church was a popular institution and consulted with him about the laity’s role in the Church. Thus, Newman found great strength in the active role of the laity in the reform of the Church.

If Christianity is a poetic experience and adherence to it a matter of conscience, there is always room for imagination and creativity. Newman believed in the existence of the prophetic tradition, a vast system in the Church and the *Sensus Fidelium*. He gradually formulated an ecclesiological principle that the Church was essentially a popular institution and that the people are the real guardians of the Church.¹⁹³ Within this ecclesiological view, his argument for “Consulting the Faithful” was not a matter of debate but a collateral principle that should be accepted. Therefore, the role of the laity and consultation with them even in hierarchical decisions and pronouncements was an integral part of his ecclesiology rather than a mere accommodation of a democratic Church.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁰ JHN to Charles Portales Golightly (Oriel, 30 July 1833), *LD* 4: 14.

¹⁹¹ JHN to R. F. Wilson (Oriel College, 8 September 1833), *LD* 4: 44.

¹⁹² JHN to John William Bowden (Oriel, 23 September 1833), *LD* 4: 54. Newman considered Bowden “a fellow-labourer with great satisfaction, especially as being a layman” (Oriel, 18 October 1833), *LD* 4: 60-61.

¹⁹³ JHN to Richard Hurrell Froude (Oriel, 18 September 1833), *LD* 4: 53.

¹⁹⁴ Femiano observed: “In pursuing this line of thought on the Church and especially in his lectures on *The Prophetic Office of the Church*, he was eventually led to distinguish more clearly the laity’s role in the Christian community (Samuel D.

The absence of proper theological knowledge among Anglicans was one reason that Newman decided to deliver the lectures on the prophetic office of the Church.¹⁹⁵ In his third lecture, he criticized the Roman doctrine of infallibility for leading to erroneous theology.¹⁹⁶ He concluded that Roman theologians destroyed the Mystery by their “practice of systematizing” and their arrogance of claiming all knowledge.¹⁹⁷ Moreover, Roman theologians had been jealous of the Fathers because they dreaded the range and complication of materials.¹⁹⁸

Anglicans, according to Newman, took a different yet balanced approach because they had been taught to consider that in its degree, faith, as well as conduct, must be guided by probabilities and that doubt was ever a human portion in this life.¹⁹⁹ Anglicans, who were willing to acknowledge that other systems had unanswerable arguments in matters of detail, were striking a balance between extreme views and were following the voice of God.²⁰⁰ In his lectures, Newman ascribed the corruptions and

Femiano, *Infallibility of the Laity: The Legacy of Newman* [New York: Herder and Herder, 1967], 17).

¹⁹⁵ *Prophetic Office*, 12.

¹⁹⁶ “Because to know some things in any subject infallibly implied that we know all things and there were no degrees in infallibility. Doubt was incompatible with practical abidance in the truth. Aiming at a complete and consistent theology, Roman Catholics neglected authority and founded their theology upon abstract arguments and antecedent grounds. Thus, they destroyed many of the most noble and most salutary exercises of mind in the individual Christian” (ibid., 99).

¹⁹⁷ See ibid., 91, 101 and 105.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 108.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 86-89.

²⁰⁰ For Newman, “Religion was too serious a subject to be made to rest on human inferences and examinations when it could be settled authoritatively; in fact, so little has been revealed to us in a systematic way that the genuine science of theology carried to its furthest limits had no tendency to foster a spirit of rationalism” (ibid., 108-109).

scandals of the Church to the Schools; in his 1877 Preface, he stated that ambition, craft, cruelty, and superstition were not commonly the characteristics of theologians; rather they had a popular or a political origin.²⁰¹

Newman accepted theology as the fundamental and regulating principle of the whole Church system²⁰² but insisted that theology could not always have its own way.²⁰³ He reiterated that the “love and pursuit of truth in the subject-matter of religion, if it be genuine, must always be accompanied by the fear of error, of error which may be sin.”²⁰⁴ He also offered another view of this matter: “That jealousy of originality in the matter of religion, which is the instinct of piety, is, in the case of questions which excite the popular mind, the dictate of charity also.”²⁰⁵ Thus, it is necessary in charity to delay the formal reception of a new interpretation of Scripture until the imaginations of people gradually got accustomed to it. Thus, theologians should be “wiser and kinder” having extreme patience and prudence.²⁰⁶

In regard to the principle of Reserve and Economy, Newman believed that there was “the duty of concealment or what may be called evasion, not in religious matters only, but universally.”²⁰⁷ He viewed this concealment as a result of the threefold aspect of the Catholic Church: “Many popular beliefs and practices have, in spite of theology,

²⁰¹ Ibid., xlv-lvii.

²⁰² Ibid., xlvii-xlviii.

²⁰³ Ibid., xlviii-xlix.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., liv.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., lv-lvi.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., lvii-lviii.

²⁰⁷ “Veracity, like other virtues, lies in a mean. Truth indeed, but not necessarily the whole truth, is the rule of Society” (ibid., lviii-lix).

been suffered by Catholic prelates, lest, ‘in gathering up the weeds,’ they should not ‘root up the wheat with them.’”²⁰⁸ He advocated the principle of economy in his Preface.²⁰⁹

However, while discussing the Roman neglect of Antiquity in his second lecture, he also mentioned how Roman Catholics misused the doctrine of *Disciplina Arcani*.²¹⁰

This necessary Economy was in operation in the Old Covenant, in the gradual disclosures made, age after age, to the chosen people and in the primitive Church.²¹¹

Though it was occasionally applied to different subject matter by the Church towards her own children as well as strangers, “the rule is the same in its principle as that of Moses or St. Paul, or the Alexandrians, or St. Augustine.”²¹² Newman then wanted Catholics to be forbearing and to be silent in many cases, amid the mistakes, excesses, and superstitions of their fellow-Christians.²¹³ The Church, in her teaching function, would have been ever vigilant against the inroad of what was a degradation of both faith and reason. However,

²⁰⁸ Ibid., lix-lx.

²⁰⁹ According to Newman, the *Disciplina Arcani* or Rule of Secrecy was the self-restraint practiced by the primitive Church in its communication of the most sacred doctrines of Christianity; it was the practice of the early Church to forbid the publication of the more sacred articles of faith to the world at large. Newman was intrigued by this principle of reserve and the way the pre-Nicene Church used it.

²¹⁰ Following this practice, some Roman Catholic writers claimed that there was much to censure in the writings of the Fathers and much which was positively hostile to the Roman system (ibid., 77-78).

²¹¹ The principle of Economy was Apostolic: “From the time that the Apostles preached, such toleration in primary matters of faith and morals is at an end as regards Christendom This indeed is the great principle of Economy, as advocated in the Alexandrian school, which is in various ways sanctioned in Scripture” (ibid. lxi-lxii).

²¹² Ibid., lxiii-lxiv.

²¹³ Ibid., lxiii.

considering how intimately the sacramental system was connected with Christianity, it was far from easy to make her sacerdotal office keep step with the prophetical.²¹⁴

Both before and during the Tractarian movement, Newman was deeply interested in the affairs of the Church, particularly ecclesial life and reform.²¹⁵ The reform he envisioned for the Church was the recognition of the Church's existing spiritual powers and principles.²¹⁶ Newman's concerns about the Church were evident in many of his tracts and in his letters to the editor of the *Record*.²¹⁷ These letters manifested his love for the Church.²¹⁸ The purpose of discipline was not to secure a pure Church but to avoid scandals, to remove the instruments of evil and to limit the Church to those who were on

²¹⁴ Ibid., lxix.

²¹⁵ The study of the Arian heresy taught Newman how the corrupt state of the Church, as in Antioch, could easily have been the source of heretical teaching. In spite of his mixed feelings and apocalyptic thoughts about Rome, he felt more attached than ever to the Catholic system; see JHN to Mrs. Newman (Rome, Good Friday, 5 April 1833), *LD* 3: 273-274. In order to defend the Apostolic Church, he began organizing "friends of the Church." Newman was never neutral about his beloved Church and felt that unless their conscience dictated otherwise, people should remain in the Church in which they were born; they found "the Church and State united and decided therefore to maintain that Union" ("Thoughts," 363).

²¹⁶ It included bringing back "those doctrines, which, to the eye of faith, give a reality and substance to religion," such as the system of Religious Institutions of the Middle Ages (ibid., 366-367). In spite of his anti-Roman sentiments, Newman candidly remarked to Jenkyns: "How one may speculate about the future! This is but a dream, yet I suppose in some way the Roman system will be broken up, yet without destroying the essentials of the Church system" (Rome, 7 April 1833, *LD* 3: 280). For Newman, to follow the Prayer-Book and its words were the accents of the Church Catholic and Apostolic as she manifested herself in England (*Prophetical Office*, 260-263).

²¹⁷ In his tracts, Newman envisioned his ecclesiology, especially of the reality of the Visible Church, and wrote on the topics treating the revival of Church discipline, its Scripture proof, its application, its objections and benefits in his letter to the *Record* (*Apologia*, 42-43).

²¹⁸ Ibid.

the path of salvation.²¹⁹ His suggestions for an association of friends of the Church centered on preserving orthodox doctrine and the unity of the Church by holding apostolic succession and the liturgy in its primitive and scriptural claims.²²⁰ He often reassured his friends: “our efforts have not been against Ministers, but *for* the Church.”²²¹

Regarding Church reform, Newman’s tracts observed that all parts of Christendom had much to repent and reform—including his own Church whose greatest sin was perhaps the disuse of a “godly discipline.”²²² He felt that those who clamored for alterations in the Liturgy were people who felt “that love and love only is in the Gospel the character of the Almighty God and the duty of regenerate man.”²²³ Knowing the likelihood of doctrinal corruptions, he suggested a second reform to complete in its details the reform already started by Anglican divines.

In his tracts on the *via media*, he added that a second reform should include not only matters of discipline and liturgy but also of the Articles.²²⁴ Newman’s fourteenth and final lecture was an outpouring of his feelings for the Church.²²⁵ For him, the True Church was built upon the One Faith and the Faith committed to the Church should be clearly proclaimed, indefectibly maintained, and universally acknowledged. Even if Anglicans doubted or neglected their gifts, they remained with the Church, though as a

²¹⁹ Ibid., 95.

²²⁰ See Newman’s “Remarks on Suggestions for an Association of Friends of the Church,” (*LD* 4: 129).

²²¹ JHN to John William Bowden (Oriental, 29 December 1833), *LD* 4: 151.

²²² *Tract* 8, 4.

²²³ *Tract* 3, 4.

²²⁴ See *Tract*, 38.

²²⁵ *Prophetical Office*, 331-332.

burden and as a witness to the last day.²²⁶ Thus, Newman's lectures were also a testimony of his ecclesial love and quest.²²⁷

Newman's ecclesiology developed over the course of decades as different facets of the Church slowly became evident—through various people, circumstances and studies. It was Dr. Richard Whately who first taught him the existence of the Church as a substantive body or institution. It was about 1823, when Newman was first introduced to the doctrine of apostolic succession, which taught that the Church enjoys a continuity of life, teaching, authority and ministry from the Apostles.

While in Rome for the first time, he defended the historical fact of St. Peter's presence in Rome and his primacy among the Apostles. Because of this apostolic foundation and primacy, "Rome itself, the head of all, and the mother of many of the churches of the West" has been considered "undeniably the most exalted church in the whole world."²²⁸ Visiting Rome made Newman enthusiastic to safeguard apostolic succession. Yet, he was confronted with an ecclesiological dilemma: how to avoid popery without giving up the Church. He was seeking a middle ground, a *via media*, to save catholicism from papistical corruptions. The conditions of the Greek and Roman churches, however, convinced him that it "was beyond the power of the servants in the

²²⁶ "The Church does not become a mere creation of man, though she sells herself to be his slave" (ibid., 338-339).

²²⁷ See also ibid., 354-355.

²²⁸ "Thoughts," 122-123.

parable to pull up the tares from the wheat – but that it is incomprehensible is no objection to the notion of God’s doing it.”²²⁹

In the imaginary dialogue on the Church in the second part of his “Home Thoughts Abroad,” he was told that in spite of the corruption in the Church of Rome, there was a religious fact, the existence of a great Catholic body, union with which was a Christian privilege and duty and the English were separated from it. He, however, preferred purity to the unity of the Church.²³⁰ In spite of knowing the principle of catholicity from the teachings of the Fathers,²³¹ he claimed catholicity for the Anglican Church;²³² however, when this claim proved impossible to sustain, Newman turned to apostolicity:²³³ this was a “plain tangible *fact* . . . as the universal or catholic character of the Roman communion.”²³⁴

Another reason for Newman’s giving priority to apostolicity over catholicity was that the Fathers “did not in their writings curiously separate the Church’s intrinsic and permanent authority as divine, from her temporary office of bearing witness to the

²²⁹ JHN to Samuel Rickards (Naples, 14 April 1833), *LD* 3: 289.

²³⁰ Newman argued that what was important for him was that the “Church is founded on a doctrine—the gospel of Truth Perish the Church Catholic itself . . . rather than the Truth should fail. Purity of faith is more precious to the Christian than unity itself.” (“Thoughts,” 241-242).

²³¹ “There cannot be two distinct bodies, each claiming descent from the original stem. Indeed, the very word catholic witnesses to this. Two Apostolic bodies there may be without actual contradiction of terms; but there is necessarily but one body Catholic” (*ibid.*, 242).

²³² “Thoughts,” 242-243.

²³³ Newman claimed: “Foundation we have as apostolical as theirs . . . and doctrine much more apostolical” (*ibid.*, 242).

²³⁴ *Ibid.*

apostolic doctrine as to an historical fact.”²³⁵ Thus he decided to elicit apostolicity in Oxford, making it “the sacred city of this principle.”²³⁶ He thought that “the Apostolical form of doctrine was essential and imperative, and its ground of evidence impregnable.”²³⁷ Accordingly, apostolic succession became a foundational principle of Tractarian ecclesiology.

In his very first tract, Newman emphasized that the Church was not a creature of the state or of the people; rather the Church was founded on the authority of apostolic descent.²³⁸ Accordingly, Christian ministry was a succession and the very form of ordination acknowledged the doctrine of apostolic succession.²³⁹ He upheld apostolicity not because the episcopacy was the best form of ecclesiastical polity, but because ministerial succession was an undeniable fact.²⁴⁰ Because of the principle of apostolicity, his tracts portrayed the bishops as the only successors and spiritual descendants of the Apostles.²⁴¹

In the Jager controversy, Newman was reminded that when “we believe in a Church, One, Holy, and Catholic this involves all she teaches.”²⁴² However, he often

²³⁵ “Thoughts,” 243.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, 358.

²³⁷ *Apologia*, 44.

²³⁸ *Tract I*, 2.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, 2-3.

²⁴⁰ For Newman, the obligation to uphold the tradition of apostolic succession was consistent with the general spirit of the Jewish church of the Old Testament and the practices of Jesus and his disciples (*ibid.*, 1-2). To those who labeled him “Papist and Pelagian,” he replied that he was neither Puritan nor Protestant but an “apostolical” (JHN to Simeon Llyod Pope [Bisley, 21 August 1834], *LD* 4: 324-325, at 325).

²⁴¹ *Tract* 10, 6.

²⁴² Allen, *Newman and Jager*, 108.

took refuge in the notion of apostolicity. In his fourteenth and final lecture, he explained “the True Church is built upon the One Faith, transmitted through successive generations.”²⁴³ He knew that Anglicans disagreed among themselves “whether there be any Church at all, that is, One True Church, commissioned and blessed by Christ.”²⁴⁴ However, he observed that the whole course of Christianity was but one series of troubles and disorders; accordingly, at the time that Newman originally delivered his lectures, he did not give sufficient attention to the oneness and holiness of the Church.

5. The Significance of the *Prophetical Office* in Newman’s Theology

Newman’s life, both as an Anglican and as a Roman Catholic, was hectic with intellectual and theological discussions, debates and controversies. What is the place and significance of the *Prophetical Office* in the context of Newman’s life? First, his *Prophetical Office* could be considered a nursery where many of Newman’s unique ecclesiological views originated. In the *Prophetical Office*, one finds the seedlings of Newman’s views on the doctrines of development, infallibility, and consulting the faithful—three ecclesiological topics that he considered in his later writings.

In *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845; revised 1878), Newman discussed the idea of doctrinal development. First, the principle of dogma was axiomatic to Newman’s ecclesiology because dogma is foundational to religion. If his study of the writings of the Fathers of the Church familiarized him with the struggles that

²⁴³ *Prophetical Office*, 332.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 334.

the Fathers endured in their care and concern for doctrinal orthodoxy, he later joined them in defending and developing the doctrines of the Church.

One of the principles of his ecclesiology was that the Church must rest upon the dogmas contained in Scripture which were gradually developed in the course of time by theologians and leaders of the Church. The development of doctrines was a sacred function of the members of the Church, not a mere fabrication of the human mind, although human minds have always been engaged in the process. A second reason for his *Essay on the Development* was that Newman wanted to reconsider the charges he raised in the *Prophetical Office* about Roman infidelity to the ancient Church.

The original version of Newman's *Prophetical Office* was written a third of a century before the First Vatican Council's pronouncement about the infallible Magisterium of the Roman Pontiff. According to Newman, there was in the Church a continuous dialectic movement of authority and private judgment alternately advancing and retreating as the ebb and flow of the tide, moving the development of doctrine forward. In this regard, he vouched for both the pure and serene atmosphere on the summit of the Rock of St. Peter, while recognizing a great deal of Roman malaria at its foot. In fact, the Church had no province over the activity of the individual mind and conscience. The *Prophetical Office* advocated a *via media* of indefectibility between infallibility and private judgment, and endorsed a healthy tension between the Church and the individual for stabilizing religious belief.

The freedom of the individual, the final authority of conscience, and the extremely personal nature of religious faith and intellectual striving could not be

rescinded by the doctrine of infallibility.²⁴⁵ Even in the 1877-edition of the *Prophetical Office*, Newman did not alter what he had said about infallibility in 1836.²⁴⁶ For him, infallibility was never an arbitrary absolute but had to be guided by Scripture and Tradition. Accordingly, he defended the divine and prophetic character of the Church and defended the infallibility of the Church,²⁴⁷ not that of the Pope.²⁴⁸

Another ecclesiological struggle for Newman was to describe the proper role of the laity in the Church. As an Anglican, he sought Froude's view on the matter and came to see how the *sensus fidelium* was an ecclesiological imperative because of the vast and ever-developing prophetic tradition within the Church.²⁴⁹ Newman addressed the issue

²⁴⁵ John T. Ford, "Infallibility: A Review of Recent Studies," *Theological Studies* 40 (1979), 273-305, at 292: "Nowhere is Newman's prophetic leadership more evident than in the question of infallibility"

²⁴⁶ According to Dulles, Newman in his 1877 Preface to the *Via Media* came to an affirmative view of infallibility. "He lays down the principle, 'No act would be theologically an error, which was absolutely and undeniably necessary for the unity, sanctity, and peace of the Church'"; see Avery Dulles, "Newman on Infallibility," *Theological Studies* 51 (1990), 434-449, at 446; hereafter cited: Dulles, "Newman on Infallibility." See also Weidner, *Via Media*, lxxxiv.

²⁴⁷ The note that Newman made to serve as an outline for his explanation of the gift of infallibility shows how broadly he conceived the notion of infallibility (Femiano, *Infallibility of the Laity*, 53-54). Dulles ("Newman on Infallibility," 447 & 441) concluded that for Newman, the bearer of infallibility is neither the hierarchical magisterium (*ecclesia docens*) alone nor the body of the faithful (*ecclesia discens*) alone, but the Church as a whole.

²⁴⁸ Dulles observed: "Newman's positive argument for infallibility, like that of Karl Rahner in our own century, proceeded a priori, on the basis of antecedent probabilities" (ibid., 439).

²⁴⁹ According to Femiano, "The analysis of the infallibility of the laity which Newman made in his article 'On Consulting the Faithful' was intended to prove the theological foundation for a wider cooperation between the laity and the hierarchy in the Church The meaning of this conspiratio must be broadened, however, if it is to find its fullest realization in the Church, for the laity and the hierarchy also cooperate in the development of doctrine." See Femiano, *Infallibility of the Laity*, 136-137. See also

again in his essay *On Consulting the Faithful* (1859), which began yet another controversy.²⁵⁰ This work was another instance when he did not deny the presence of abuses in the Church. In this essay, he dared to discuss an important ecclesiological topic, the role of the laity, who constitutes the overwhelming majority in the Church.

Many of Newman's latter theological works were the result of the ongoing discussion on the topics such as the doctrines of development, infallibility, role of the laity, etc., that he raised originally in the *Prophetical Office*. Accordingly, while often overlooked even by Newman scholars, the *Prophetical Office* deserves a singular place of distinction in the theological and ecclesiological contributions of Newman.

6. The Relevance of Via Media Ecclesiology Today

As was the case in most of his writings, both his *Prophetical Office* and the 1877 Preface, Newman's personal life and theological thought were interconnected. To appreciate the *Prophetical Office* fully, a study of both the contextual history and the ecclesiology of these lectures is necessary. If the contextual history leads to Newman's personal search for a comprehensive theory of *via media*, the ecclesiological analysis concludes in the finale of a comprehensive ecclesiology.²⁵¹

William P. Frost, "On Celebrating Newman's Faith in the Laity," *Horizons* 6 (2006): 258-261.

²⁵⁰ John Coulson wrote: "Talbot then asks his celebrated question: 'What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain Dr Newman is the most dangerous man in England . . .'" (John Coulson, editor, *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine* [New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961], 41-42).

²⁵¹ Regarding a contemporary theology of the laity, Congar argued: "At bottom there can be only one sound and sufficient theology of the laity, and that is a 'total ecclesiology'" (Yves M. J. Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, translated by Donald Attwater [Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957], xxxii).

From the viewpoint of contextual history, the threshold of Newman's *Via Media* ecclesiology is founded in his pursuit of both truth and certitude about possessing truth. Newman situated the idea of the Church within the context of pursuing the truth. Christianity is a revealed religion. Revelation, in its very idea, is revelation of the Truth. Revelation, consequently, is expressed in dogmas and necessitates an authoritative keeper and teacher. Who is the authority on Christian Revelation? In other words, who claims to be a prophet of Revelation? If God has spoken, there must be an organ, a prophet to interpret this revelation. The very idea of a prophet is one who claims to speak for God. Now who is to claim this prophetic role, the individual on the basis of private judgment or the Church with infallibility?²⁵²

During the third decade of his life, Newman came to believe strongly that religion has to be enforced by authority of some kind, since moral trust is not acceptable to the human heart. He believed it was the divinely instituted Church which was responsible for the legitimate enforcement of Christian truth.²⁵³ Thus, the Church is the only visible authority on Revelation. However, Newman found himself between Roman Catholics and Protestants claiming extreme opposites: infallibility and private judgment.

²⁵² This preoccupation of Newman's was present in his 1830-rift with the Bible Society: "If we recognize that the Church was the divinely-sanctioned system and the reading of the Bible is not sufficient for salvation, then, would there be something for Churchmen to cling to?" (JHN to Pope [Oriell, 15 August 1830], *LD* 2: 264-265, at 265). See also Ker, *Biography*, 37. When Newman was asked to write for the Theological Library, the editors were looking to answer the question: what is the proper province and true value of human authority in the matter of revelation? See William Rowe Lyall to Hugh James Rose (Fairsted, 19 October 1832), *LD* 3: 104-105.

²⁵³ Ker, *Biography*, 37.

Therefore, as virtue stands in the middle, the *via media* offers a balance in ecclesiology.²⁵⁴

In his ecclesiological analysis in the *Prophetical Office*, Newman's effort at construing a theology of the Church was bountiful with serious discussions about a number of themes related to the Church but was never a complete ecclesiology. It was when he wrote the 1877 Preface that he added what was lacking.²⁵⁵ Thus, with the combination of the *Prophetical Office* and the Preface of 1877, *Via Media I* is the beginning and the end of Newman's ecclesiological thinking.

As a *via media* and a comprehensive ecclesiology, *Via Media I* was a pioneer in ecclesiology extending the dimensions and vitality of the Anglican Church of his birth rather than abandoning it for Rome.²⁵⁶ At the same time, his *Via Media* was the work of an honest and courageous seeker of truth who was willing to accept the truth where it was to be found. Thus, Newman's *Via Media* ecclesiology represents a dialogue among the Evangelical, Anglican, Anglo-Catholic, and Roman Catholic Newman. As such, the *Via Media* is a critical work for understanding his development as well as his impact on the larger Christian Church in his century and in those that followed.

Via Media I with its comprehensive ecclesiology, is an answer to many of the problems that the Church is often faced with both inside and outside her own boundaries.

²⁵⁴ According to Ford ("Infallibility," 291), "In effect, Newman redistributed powers in a check-and-balance system."

²⁵⁵ Dulles discerned "Certain resemblances between the Preface and *Lumen gentium*." See Dulles, "The Threefold Office in Newman's Ecclesiology." 398-399.

²⁵⁶ Dulles ("Newman on Infallibility," 449) commented: "In a certain sense it may be said that Newman always remained the apostle of *via media* . . . This very fact gives special actuality to his work in the polarized Church of our day."

It provides answers for both ecclesiological methods and issues. Methodologically, Newman was a precursor for beginning theology from one's own existential experience.²⁵⁷ His ecclesiology by its characteristics; narrative, patristic, biblical, christological, sacramental, and ecumenical features, is a model for theologians of all times. For traditional Catholic theology, *Via Media I* is a reminder that theology could be done in the style of the Fathers without using rigid abstract Aristotelian and scholastic terms and concepts.

Theologians of all times and places have much to learn from Newman's *Via Media* ecclesiology when they address ecclesiological and ecumenical issues, such as teaching authority, infallibility, private judgment, creative fidelity, the role of theologians, the role of laity, collegiality and conflicts between local and universal churches, etc. It has both answers as well as questions which are legitimate to ecumenism and ecumenical theology, such as the issues of apostolic succession, catholicity, oneness, pluralism, churches and salvation. Thus, a number of themes present in Newman's *Via Media* ecclesiology are still on the frontiers of contemporary ecclesiology and ecumenical theology, uncharted and unresolved.

²⁵⁷ According to Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," 432, theologians beginning with Karl Rahner have followed Newman's ecclesiology of finding the Church in human existential experiences.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Newman once commented that among his “five constructive works”—*The Prophetical Office of the Church*, *The Lectures on Justification*, *The Essay on Development*, *The Idea of a University* and *The Grammar of Assent*—the *Prophetical Office* had “come to pieces.”¹ Perhaps Newman made this comment realizing that the *via media* that he had proposed in the fourteen lectures of the *Prophetical Office* had fallen apart, in any case, the topics that Newman discussed in these lectures became “pieces”—amplified and modified—of his other writings. Both of these hypotheses are true to some extent. In spite of its “pulverization,” the *Prophetical Office* was Newman’s first “constructive” work.² Accordingly, it is surprising that the *Prophetical Office* has not yet received due consideration in the vast field of Newman studies. This present study concludes that the *Prophetical Office* provides a statement of Newman’s comprehensive ecclesiology.³

Like Newman’s other writings, his *Prophetical Office* was “contextual”—embedded in the totality of his efforts in support of the Oxford Movement. He was always a pilgrim searching for truth and his search for the true Church began at an early phase of his life. The contextual history of the *Prophetical Office* that was traced—not always in exact chronological order—in the first six chapters of this study presented both

¹ JHN to Giberne (18 February 1870), *LD* 25: 34; see Weidner, *Via Media*, xiii.

² JHN wrote to Mrs. Thomas Mozley (2 January 1837). *LD* 6: 3): “My book [Prophetical Office] is gone to Press – and makes me very anxious. I have taken immense pains with it, writing great portions of it from four to six times over.” See also JHN to Hugh James Rose (Oriel College, 3 January 1837), *LD* 6: 4-5.

³ Newman’s *Prophetical Office*, including the Preface of 1877, is available at: <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/viamedia/volume1/index.html>.

the ecclesiological formation and the events that led Newman to deliver these lectures in the Adam de Brome chapel of Saint Mary's Church in Oxford.

This part of the research also clarified various aspects of Newman's ecclesiology. First of all, there were a number of people who influenced his developing ecclesiology. During his Ealing school days, Walter Mayers taught him various Calvinistic ideas. Later at Oxford, William James, an Oriel Fellow, introduced Newman to the dogma of apostolic succession. Edward Hawkins, his predecessor as Vicar of St. Mary's and the Provost of Oriel College, taught him the doctrine of Tradition. Another major theological influence was Richard Whately, who taught Newman the existence of the Church as a substantive body and proposed an anti-Erastian view of Church polity. Hurrell Froude and John Keble were Newman's key sources of High Church doctrines. His theology was also influenced directly or indirectly by many others, including two Roman Catholics, Nicholas Wiseman and Abbé Jager, who were in correspondence with him.

There are a number of resources that clearly provided both methodology and substance for Newman's ecclesiology. The Evangelicalism that influenced him during the first two decades of his life familiarized him thoroughly with Scripture and a belief in a definitive creed in religion. Evangelicalism also taught him to look for types and parallels in the Old Testament that would shed light on New Testament developments. The ecclesiological synthesis that Newman made in his 1877 Preface was based in part on the Calvinistic understanding of the three offices of Christ.

From Scripture, Newman concluded that a visible Church is a condition of the invisible in contrast to the idea of an *ecclesia abscondita* or "hidden" Church. As visible,

the Church is characterized by power and permanence through its organization, governors, rules and disciplines, order and ecclesiastical obedience, diversity of ranks and gifts, purity of doctrines and unity. Joseph Butler's *Analogy of Religion* also contributed to Newman's methodology, re-enforced his view about the offices of Christ and introduced him to the doctrine of infallibility as the worst of Roman corruptions. Biblical images used by Newman—such as “wheat and tares” and “the Cherubim in whom the wings of one were joined to the wings of another, yet they turned not when they went but everyone went straight forward”—are instances of his characteristically biblical ecclesiology.

Anglican divines—especially those of the seventeenth century—furnished Newman with a number of key ecclesiological principles that were consistent with antiquity, including the doctrine of apostolic succession, the ministerial commission, the duty and desirability of Church discipline, and the sacredness of Church rites and ordinances. Newman was indebted to these Anglican theologians for the *via media* and for the principles of apostolicity, catholicity, ongoing ecclesial reform and doctrinal development. These Anglican divines also provided Newman with a methodological link between Evangelicalism and the Church Fathers.

The characteristically Anglican interest in patristics led Newman to study the Fathers systematically, beginning with his reading of Joseph Milner's *Church History*. The Fathers convinced Newman of various ecclesiological principles, such as the existence of the visible Church, the mystical or sacramental characteristics of the Church, the necessity of the independence of the Church, the popular dimension of the Church,

apostolic succession and the double rule of faith. The Fathers led him to accept a theology of the Church as the custodian and dispenser of the word and the sacraments. These principles became the core of the *Prophetical Office*. From his study of the Arians, Newman learned the ancient tools of teaching the faith, including theology, the allegorical method, the principles of reserve and economy. He followed the platonic and narrative theological methodology of the Fathers and accepted both Scripture and Tradition as essential parts of the Church's teaching.

A number of events during Newman's lifetime—such as his Mediterranean voyage (1832-1833), the Irish Church Reform Bill, the rapidly growing liberalism within the Church of England, the Oxford Movement, his correspondence with Jager and Wiseman and accusations that the *Tracts* were Popish—backgrounded his lectures on the *Prophetical Office*.⁴ In a sense, everything that Newman wrote as a young Oxford don—especially *Arians*, “Home Thoughts Abroad,” his *Tracts* and sermons, his editing of Froude's *Remains*—embellished the contextual history of these lectures. For example, Newman's letters evidence the chronological development of his ecclesiology; his *Arians* is a testimony to his ecclesiological indebtedness to the Fathers of the Church; and his verses written during his Mediterranean voyage are creative expressions of his beliefs about the Church and her apostles and saints.

The imaginary ecclesiological debate in “Thoughts” that compared and contrasted the churches of Rome and England was reechoed in Newman's *Prophetical Office*. The

⁴ Similarly, Newman's republication of his *Prophetical Office* in *Via Media I* had an ample background of events and controversies in Newman's life that are not treated in this study.

tracts and sermons that he wrote between 1833 and 1837 as an effort to construct an ecclesiological foundation for Tractarianism foreshadowed his lectures on the *Prophetical Office* in discussing such topics as the visible Church, apostolic succession, ministerial commission, ecclesial life, reform, discipline and the *via media*. His manifesto for Church reform in *Tract 38* and *Tract 41* was a preview of the *Prophetical Office*. In these tracts, he envisioned a comprehensive, yet not fully developed Anglican *via media* strong enough to combat both Protestant and Roman systems.

Many of the topics treated in Newman's *Prophetical Office* were originally raised in his correspondence with Jager and Froude. This correspondence was especially important in providing both an historical link and structural framework for the ecclesiology of his later lectures. Though uniquely different ways, both Jager and Froude compelled Newman to clarify his theological views regarding infallibility, private judgment, the rule of faith, the doctrine of development, the distinction of fundamentals and non-fundamentals, apostolic and prophetic traditions, Scripture and Tradition. Froude's exhortations in particular directed Newman in a more decisively Catholic ecclesiological direction. Even after the delivery of his lectures on the *Prophetical Office*, Newman continued to discuss these topics in other writings, particularly in his *Essay on the Development* (1845), *Apologia* (1864), *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* (1875) and in his essay on "Consulting the Faithful" (1859).

The *Prophetical Office* is to a great extent embedded in Newman's ecclesial experience and theological development. Thus, to understand the *Prophetical Office*, it is necessary to examine the context of the formation and development of his ecclesiological

thought. In his introduction to the fourteen lectures, Newman clearly stated that his intention was to formulate a sound and consistent ecclesiology on the basis of an Anglican *via media* because it was a strong, comprehensive and plausible system. Although he intended to provide a theology of the Church, the fourteen lectures of the *Prophetical Office* only discussed one function of the Church—the prophetic office. While delivering these lectures, he realized that such distinct points as Church, authority, tradition, the rule of faith, and the like, cannot be treated without considering the priestly and regal offices of the Church. However, it was only in 1877, when he wrote the Preface, that he added a discussion of the two offices of the Church he had previously omitted: the priestly and kingly offices.

The fourteen lectures of the *Prophetical Office* could be divided into two main sections. The first eight lectures were devoted to expounding Newman's *via media* theory between the Roman Catholic doctrine of infallibility and the Protestant notion of private judgment. The next five lectures explained Newman's *via media* theory of the rule of faith. In the fourteenth and final lecture, Newman, however, expressed his incipient doubt about the *via media* theory and commented on the fortunes of a Church that must continually struggle.

In the first eight chapters, Newman argued that the Protestant view of *sola scriptura* and its reliance on the authority of private judgment led to the devaluation of the Church, the neglect of apostolic tradition and the Fathers, and consequently to latitudinarianism. In contrast, Rome by her claim of infallibility and her reliance on existing traditions effectively superseded the Fathers and neglected Antiquity and so

failed morally but gained politically. Newman argued that the claim of infallibility led Rome to the abusive “practice of systematizing” as in the case of the doctrines of Trent and consequently, to the destruction of conscious devotion and sense of Mystery. He blamed Rome for her inability to provide proof for its claim of infallibility as well as a specification of its location and limits.⁵

According to Newman, Anglicans followed a middle way by accepting Scripture as the ultimate rule of faith and relying on Antiquity. Avoiding the extremes of both Protestant private judgment and Roman infallibility, he argued for the indefectibility of the Church. While the Church transmits faith through human means, he asserted that she is also endowed with supernatural gifts. Therefore, according to the *via media*, the Church is strong and authoritative but not infallible; the Church is indefectible in fundamentals and, since conscience is the subject of Truth, leaves the non-fundamentals to private judgment.⁶

Newman discussed the rule of faith in his last five lectures. He contended that the saving faith or the fundamentals are what Scripture expressively teaches and what the Creed states or what Antiquity taught as essentials or unalterable doctrines. The Church teaches the Creed, enforces it as a condition for communion, and indefectibly rescues it

⁵ In this regard, Newman anticipated the intramural debates at the First Vatican Council (1869-1870) about the nature and scope of infallibility; see Margaret O’Gara, *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1988).

⁶ Speaking of Newman’s judgment about the Vatican dogma of infallibility, Sullivan concluded: “It is my impression that the attitude of most Catholic theologians today would resemble that taken by Newman.” See Francis A. Sullivan, *Magisterium: Teaching Office in the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist, 1983), 95.

from the arbitrariness of private judgment. However, he believed in the development of doctrine and thought that to collect, systematize, and set forth the traditions of the Church is a most edifying and important work. He argued that the Creed could be proved from Scripture and since there are lesser and greater truths, it is the duty of the Church to draw a line between them. He, however, did not think of the Church as a judge but as a witness and keeper of the Divine Word. The Church is the organ of the Word; Antiquity and Catholicity are the real guides.

For Newman, the Church adheres to a double rule of faith: Scripture and Catholic Tradition. Scripture, however, being the testament and law of Christ, is the sole Canon of Faith. Accordingly, he argued that Anglicans do not devalue Tradition but maintain that Tradition by itself, without Scriptural warrant, could not convey any article necessary for Salvation. The Catholic Tradition, in fact, serves Scripture. The words of Scripture are not to be added to but are to be developed. Since the Church, by office and definition, is the pillar and ground of truth, the faith committed to her care is to be clearly proclaimed and indefectibly maintained.

According to Newman's 1877 Preface, the Church is the very self of Christ here on earth in human measure and carries out the functions of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King. These three offices, teaching, ruling and ministry, though diverse, are indivisible. If the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, inherits these three offices and acts for the Church through them. These functions of the Church are parallel to the three functions of Christianity: a philosophy, a religious rite and a political power.

The real difficulty, however, is holding these offices together since they use different instruments and serve different purposes. Accordingly, Newman proposed the continuation of the ancient principles of reserve and economy. He argued that the Church must not allow one office to dominate the others, but must hold the three offices in a judicious constitutional relationship to one another, respecting their separate provinces and maintaining an orderly balance and tension in which each one completes and supplements the other; thus, the Church is an ever living organism balancing ebbs and flows. Nonetheless, even in the 1877 Preface, Newman accorded not a “centrality” but a “hierarchical priority” to the prophetic office. He argued that theology is the fundamental and regulating principle of the whole Church system and is commensurate with revelation. Revelation, as the initial and essential idea of Christianity, is the subject-matter, the formal cause, and the expression of the prophetic office, and as such, has created both the regal and the sacerdotal offices.

Thus, Newman’s 1877 Preface was not an entirely new ecclesiology. Rather, the Preface gave him an opportunity to formulate an ecclesiology that embraced the whole Church and answered the charge of disparities between official teaching and popular practices, between the Church as an intellectual and a popular system, and between its political and institutional forms. Accordingly, the *Prophetic Office* and the Preface together constitute a comprehensive ecclesiology embracing all aspects of the Church and providing the theological foundation for his unique views on specific subjects such as infallibility, private judgment, indefectibility, Scripture and Tradition, apostolic and prophetic traditions, creed, the doctrine of development, the freedom of theologians and

conscience, consulting the faithful, the role of the laity, and the principle of reserve and economy.⁷

Newman's Preface is a compact but complete ecclesiology, useful for both Catholics and non-Catholics. His Preface synthesizes his Evangelical, Protestant, Anglican and Roman Catholic experiences and even his basic philosophy of religion. Along with writing the Preface, he revised the ecclesiology in his *Prophetical Office* by adding retractions and notes. The resulting publication—*Via Media I* (the 1877 Preface and the revised *Prophetical Office*)—is characterized by its methodology and narrative style, as well as by its biblical, patristic, sacramental, Christological and ecumenical features. These characteristics of Newman's ecclesiology strengthen its appeal to theologians of different denominational backgrounds and make it perennially valuable.

Newman began the formal writing of his ecclesiology in 1836, relying on his early Evangelical schooling, Protestant challenges, and Anglican experiences; four decades later, he completed his ecclesiology as a Roman Catholic with the 1877 Preface that had ecumenical aspects derived from all these traditions. His *Via Media I* is then an ecumenical meeting place of what otherwise would be irreconcilable ecclesiological opposites. He embarked on his ecclesiological voyage as a lover of apostolicity with a longing for catholicity, the oneness of the churches; accordingly, his *Via Media I* ecclesiology is both a valuable resource and model for ecumenical theology.

⁷ Dulles had observed that Newman's "Greatest merit" is directing attention to these topics. See Dulles, "The Threefold Office in Newman's Ecclesiology," 375.

Another unique aspect of Newman's ecclesiology is that he understood the Church as the proper completion of revealed religion. He pointed out three great dangers in any religion: superstition, rationalism and institutionalism; each of these abuses of devotion, reason and order—which are essential goods in themselves—need to be regulated by the principle of economy. Accordingly, the very concept of Revelation demands a God-given and infallible organism—the Church as its prophet, priest and shepherd. Thus, his ecclesiology is based on the premise that any religion, if revealed, contains these three indispensable elements: a body of devotion and worship, an intellectual system, and an institutional form and authority.⁸

Newman's ecclesiology can also be characterized as a communion ecclesiology because it promotes the view that the Church is a mystery and sacrament and so there are many aspects that are incomprehensible. Through an ecclesiology that accepted a number of conflicting and complementing principles, he formulated what today would be called a Communion ecclesiology. Newman was always an apostle of *via media* demanding the “golden middle” in ecclesiology because “Veracity, like other virtues, lies in a mean.”⁹

Finally, from the point of view of its contextual history, the ecclesiology of *Via Media I* enshrines the view of the Church within the human pursuit of truth because Newman believed that it was the divinely instituted Church which possesses the

⁸ Dulles compared Newman and Friedrich von Hügel (who was influenced by Newman's Preface) on their understanding of “religion as a composite of three elements corresponding to the offices of Christ.” See *ibid.*, 392-393.

⁹ *Prophetical Office*, lix.

legitimate enforcement of the revealed truth. From an analytical perspective, his *Prophetical Office* is an ecclesiology of a single function of the Church, the prophetical office. In style and method, his *Prophetical Office* is a precursor for theologians doing theology in a narrative style, utilizing the rich resources of Scripture and the Fathers, as well as experience.

The content of his *Prophetical Office*—topics such as infallibility, private judgment, creative fidelity, the role of theologians and the laity—were principal themes in Newman’s theology and are still at the frontiers of contemporary ecclesiological and ecumenical debates. The *via media* that he tried to apply to understanding these topics is still valid because none of these topics can be fully understood or explained without such a mediating approach. Thus, the enduring lesson of Newman’s *Lectures on the Prophetical Office* as presented in *Via Media I* is his *via media* ecclesiology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Internet Editions of the Works of John Henry Newman:

The following works of John Henry Newman (chronological listing) are available at:
<http://www.newmanreader.org/works/index.html>.

- _____. *Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833/1871).
- _____. *Tracts for the Times* (1833-1841).
- _____. *British Critic* (1836/1842).
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 8 vols. (1834-1869).
- _____. *British Critic* (1836/1842).
- _____. *On the Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837/with *Preface to the Third Edition* [Via Media] 1877).
- _____. *Preface to Froude's Remains* (1838).
- _____. *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius* (1842/1844).
- _____. *Oxford University Sermons* (1843/1873).
- _____. *Sermons on Subject of the Day* (1843/1869).
- _____. *Essays on Miracles* (1843/1870).
- _____. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845).
- _____. *Retractation of Anti-Catholic Statements* (1845/1833).
- _____. *Loss and Gain* (1848/1874).
- _____. *Discourses to Mixed Congregations* (1849).
- _____. *Difficulties of Anglicans* (1850).
- _____. *Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851).

- _____. *Idea of a University* (1852 and 1852/1873).
- _____. *Callista* (1855 and 1888).
- _____. *The Rambler* (1859-1860) with *On Consulting the Faithful* (1859).
- _____. *Apologia* (1865).
- _____. *Apologia* (1864 and 1865).
- _____. *The Dream of Gerontius* (1865).
- _____. *Verses on Various Occasions* (various/1867)
- _____. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (1870).
- _____. *Essays Critical and Historical*, 2 vols (various/1871).
- _____. *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (various/1871).
- _____. *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions* (various/1872).
- _____. *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (1872).
- _____. *Letter Addressed to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk* (1875).
- _____. *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius* (1881/1887).
- _____. *Letter Addressed to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk* (1875).

2. Published Works of John Henry Newman (Listed alphabetically)

- Newman, John Henry. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious Opinions*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1946.
- _____. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua and Six Sermons*. Edited by Frank M. Turner. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- _____. *The Arians of the Fourth Century, Their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct, chiefly as Exhibited in the Council of the Church, between A. D. 325, & A. D. 381*. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1833.

- _____. *John Henry Newman: Autobiographical Writings*. Edited by Henry Tristram. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1957.
- _____. (translator). *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril*. London: F. and J. Rivington, 1845.
- _____. *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, 1891.
- _____. *Anglicans Difficulties*. With introduction and notes by Stanley L. Jaki. Pinckney, MI: Real-View-Books, 1995.
- _____. *Characteristics from the Writings of John Henry Newman*. Edited by William Samuel Lilly. London: Henry S. King, 1874.
- _____. *The Church of the Fathers*. London: Longmans, Green, 1840.
- _____. *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*. Edited with an introduction by John Coulson. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.
- _____. *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others*. Edited at the Birmingham Oratory. London: Longmans, Green, 1917.
- _____. *Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations*. London: Longmans, Green, 1906.
- _____. *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects*. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*. Edited by Charles Frederick Harrold. New York: Longmans, Green, 1947.
- _____. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. Foreword by Ian Ker. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- _____. *Essays Critical and Historical*. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *Essays Critical and Historical*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, 1919.
- _____. *Fifteen Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*. London: Longmans, Green, 1909.
- _____. *The Idea of a University*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982.

- _____. *Lectures on Catholicism in England*. London: (no publisher listed), 1851.
- _____. *Lectures on Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Submitting to the Catholic Church*. London: Burns & Lambert, 1850.
- _____. *Lectures on the Doctrines of Justification*. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838.
- _____. *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1837/1838/1877.
- _____. *A Letter Addressed to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk on Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation*. London: S. and J. Brawn, Printers, 1875.
- _____. *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on His Recent Eirenicon or Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*. In *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*. Volume II. London: Longmans, Green, 1900.
- _____. *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during His Life in the English Church*. Edited at Cardinal Newman's request by Anne Mozley, with a brief autobiography. New impression. 2 Volumes. London: Longmans, Green, 1911.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume I. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume II. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume III. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume IV. Edited by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume V. Edited by Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume VI. Edited by Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume VII. Edited by Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume VIII. Edited by Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume IX. Edited by Francis J. McGrath and Gerard Tracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume X. Edited by Francis J. McGrath. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XI. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XIV. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Vincent Ferrer Blehl. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XX. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1970.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXIII. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXIV. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXV. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXVIII. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXX. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXXI. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Volume XXXII: Supplement. Edited by Francis J. McGrath. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- _____. *The Lives of the English Saints*. Volume 5. London: Freemantle, 1901.

- _____. *Loss and Gain*. Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1854.
- _____. *Meditations and Devotions of the Late Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume I. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume II. London: Longmans, Green, 1908.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume III. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume IV. London: Longmans, Green, 1909.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume V. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume VI. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume VII. London: Longmans, Green, 1908.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Volume VIII. London: Longmans, Green, 1908.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Reprinted in one volume, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Philosophical Notebook of John Henry Newman*. Volume I. Edited by Edward Sillem. Louvain: Nauwelearts, 1969.
- _____. *Sayings of Cardinal Newman*. London: Burns & Oates, 1890.
- _____. *Selected Treatises of S. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1877.
- _____. *Selected Treatises of S. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*. Volumes I & II. London: Longmans, Green, 1903.
- _____. *John Henry Newman – Sermons 1824-1843*. Volume I. Placid Murray, editor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- _____. *John Henry Newman – Sermons 1824-1843*. Volume II. Placid Murray, editor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- _____. *John Henry Newman – Sermons 1824-1843*. Volume III. Francis J. McGrath and Placid Murray, editors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010.

- _____. *John Henry Newman – Sermons 1824-1843*. Volume IV. Francis J. McGrath, editor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011.
- _____. *Sermon Notes of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, 1913.
- _____. *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*. New impression. London: Longmans, Green, 1902.
- _____. *Sermons chiefly on the Theory of Religious Belief preached before the University of Oxford*. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1843.
- _____. *Sermons and Discourses*. New edition, edited with a preface and introduction by Charles F. Harrold. New York: Longmans, Green, 1949.
- _____. *John Henry Newman: Spiritual Writings*. Selected and introduced by John T. Ford. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2012.
- _____. *Tract No. 90. Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles*. Second edition, with corrections of the First Edition. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1841.
- _____. *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*. London: Pickering, 1881
- _____. *The Via Media of the Anglican Church. Illustrated in Lectures, Letters, and Tracts, written between 1830 and 1841*. New impression. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1901.
- _____. *The Via Media of the Anglican Church by John Henry Newman*. Edited with introduction and notes by Halbert D. Weidner. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

3. Articles by John Henry Newman

(Listed chronologically)

- _____. "Home Thoughts Abroad. No. I." *The British Magazine* V (January 1, 1836), 1-11, and V (February 1, 1834), 121-31.
- _____. "Home Thoughts Abroad. No. II." *The British Magazine* IX (March 1, 1836), 237-248.
- _____. "The Brothers' Controversy – Apostolic Tradition." *The British Critic* XIX (no. XXXIX, July, 1836), 209-231.

- _____. "Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Catholic Church." *The British Critic* XIX (no. XL, October, 1836), 373-403.
- _____. "Affairs of Rome." *The British Critic* XXI (no. XLIV, October, 1837), 261-283.
- _____. "Catholicity of the English Church." *The British Critic* XXVII (no. LIII, January, 1840), 40-88.
- _____. "Private Judgment." *The British Critic* XXIV (no. LIX, July, 1841), 100-134.

4. Writings by John Henry Newman's Contemporaries

(Listed alphabetically by last names)

- Arnold, Thomas. *The Principles of Church Reform*. Oxford: Fellowes, 1833.
- Browne, Edward Harold. *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal*. New York: H. B. Durand, 1865.
- Church, R. W. *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*. London: Macmillan, 1891.
- Fessler, Joseph. *The True and False Infallibility of the Popes*. New York: Catholic Publications Society, 1875.
- Froude, Richard Hurrell. *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude, M. A., Fellow Oxford of Oriel College*. 2 parts, each in 2 Vols. Edited by John Henry Newman and John Keble. London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1838-1839.
- 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.
- Leach, Thomas. *A Short Sketch of the Tractarian Upheaval*. London: Bemrose and Sons, 1887.
- Liddon, Henry Parry and Robert James Wilson. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*. 4 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1893.
- Members of the University of Oxford. *Tracts for the Times*. Volume I, 2nd edition. New York: Charles Henry, 1839.

- _____. *Tracts for the Times*. Volume. II, 2nd ed. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1841.
- _____. *Tracts for the Times*. Volume. III. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1839.
- _____. *Tracts for the Times*. Volume. IV. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1840.
- _____. *Tracts for the Times*. Volume. V. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1840.
- Palmer, William. *A Treatise on the Church*. 2nd edition, 2 vols. New York; Appleton, 1841.
- 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, 1843.
- _____. *A Sermon Preached before the University*. New York: James A. Sparks, 1843.
- _____. "Churches in London." *The Church of England Quarterly Review* II (1837): 411-449.
- Rainy, Robert. "Cardinal Newman." *The Expositor* VI (1892): 34-48.
- Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn. *The Athanasian Creed*. London: Macmillan, 1871.
- _____. *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D.* London: B. Fellower, 1852.
- Ward, Wilfrid. *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*. 2 Volumes, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.
- Wardlaw, Ralph. *Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, & Green, 1828.
- 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, 1913.
- _____. *Sermons on Various Subjects*. London: John W. Parker, 1849.
- _____. *The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature*. London: B. Fellower, 1830.
- Wilberforce, Henry. "Newman's Oxford Parochial Sermons." *Dublin Review* 12 (1869): 309-330.

Wiseman, Nicholas Patrick. *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*. Vol. I & II. London: Charles Dolman, 1855.

5. Works by Other Authors:

(Listed alphabetically by last names)

Abbey, Charles J. and Overton, John H. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Longmans, Green, 1906.

Abbot, Edwin A. *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*. Volume II. London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.

Allen, Louis. *John Henry Newman and the Abbe Jager: A controversy on Scripture and Tradition (1834–1836)*. Edited from the original manuscripts and the French version. London/New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Avis, Paul D. *Anglicanism and the Christian Church. Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002.

_____. *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers*. Atlanta: John Know, 1981.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Office of Peter and the Structure of the Church*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986.

Barth, Karl. *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002.

Baum, Gregory. *The Credibility of the Church Today: A Reply to Charles Davis*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.

_____, and Andrew Greely, editors. *The Church as Institution*. Concilium 91. New York: Herder and Herder, 1974.

Bea, Augustin. *The Unity of Christians*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.

Bellarminus, Robertus. *De controversiis christianae fidei*. In *Opera omnia*, edited by Justinus Fèvre. 12 vols. Paris: L. Vivès, 1870-1874.

Biemer, Günter. *Newman on Tradition*. Foreword by H. Francis Davis. Translated by Kevin Smyth. London: Burns & Oates, 1966.

- Blehl, Vincent Ferrer. *John Henry Newman: A Bibliographical Catalogue of His Writings*. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, University Press of Virginia, 1978.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Newman: His Life and Spirituality*. New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1958.
- _____. *Newman's Vision of Faith*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- _____. *The Church of God: Body of Christ and Temple of the Holy Spirit*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1982.
- _____. "The Permanent Relevance of Newman." In *Newman Today*, edited with an introduction by Stanley L. Jaki, 165-174. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989.
- Boyle, John P. *Church Teaching Authority: Historical and Theological Studies*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.
- Bremond, Henri. *The Mystery of Newman*. London: William and Norgate, 1907.
- Brendon, Piers. *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement*. London: Elek, 1974.
- Brent, Allen. "Newman's Conversion, the Via Media, and the Myth of the Romeward Movement." *The Downside Review* 101 (1983): 261-280.
- Brown, David, ed. *Newman: A Man for Our Time*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse, 1990.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind*. New York: Paulist, 1984.
- 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.
- Bulter, Cuthbert. *The Vatican Council* (Reissue). Westminster, MD: Newman, 1962.
- _____. "Newman and the Second Vatican Council. In *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium*. Edited by John Coulson and A.M. Allchin, 235-246. London and Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1967; London: S.P.C.K., 1967.
- _____. Review of *Newman the Theologian: The Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works*, by J.-H. Walgrave. In *The Tablet* 215 (1961): 132-133.

- _____. (Abbot of Downside). "The Significance of Newman Today: The Theory of Development." *The Dublin Review* 233 (1959): 337-346.
- Butler, Joseph. *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*. 20th Edition. New York: Newman and Ivison, 1853.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Volume II. Edited by John T. McNeill. Louisville—London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960.
- Capuchin, Zeno. *John Henry Newman: His Inner Life*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987.
- Chadwick, Owen. *From Bossuet to Newman*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- _____, editor. *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1961.
- Chirico, Peter. *Infallibility: The Crossroads of Doctrine*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1983.
- Congar, Yves M.-J. *Lay People in the Church*. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1957.
- _____. *Laity, Church, and World*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1960.
- _____. *The Mystery of the Church*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1960; 2nd edition, revised 1965.
- _____. *Tradition and Traditions: an Historical and a Theological Essay*. Translated by Michael Naseby and Thomas Rainborough. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- _____. *Ecumenism and the Future of the Church*. Chicago: Priory, 1967.
- Connolly, John R. *John Henry Newman: A View of Catholic Faith for the New Millennium*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
- Connolly, Michael. *Newman's Anglican Concept of the Doctrinal Authority of the Church*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Dissertation, 1955.
- Coulson, John. *Newman and the Common Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

- _____. "Newman on the Church—His Final View, Its Origin and Influence." In *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium*, edited by John Coulson and A. M. Allchin, 123-143. London and Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1967; London: S.P.C.K., 1967.
- _____. and A. M. Allchin, editors. *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium*. London-Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1967; London: S.P.C.K., 1967.
- Cross, Frank Leslie. *John Henry Newman*. London: P. Allan, 1933.
- Crowe, F. E. "Development of Doctrine and the Ecumenical Problem." *Theological Studies* 23 (1962): 27-46.
- Davis, H. Francis. *The Theory of Development of Dogma in Newman*. Fribourg: University of Fribourg, 1930.
- _____. "Is Newman's Theory of Development Catholic?" *Blackfriars* 39 (1958): 310-321.
- _____. "Newman and the Theology of the Living Word." *Newman-Studien* 6 (1964): 167-177.
- Dawson, Christopher. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1934.
- Dessain, C. S. "Cardinal Newman as Prophet," *Concilium* 37 (1968): 79-98.
- Dibble, Ronald. *John Henry Newman – The Concept of Infallible Doctrinal Authority*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Dissertation, 1955.
- Dobbin, Edward J. "Sensus Fidelium Reconsidered." *New Theology Review* 2 (1989): 48-64.
- Donnelly, P. J. "Theological Opinion on the Development of Dogma." *Theological Studies* 8 (1947): 649-699.
- Dulles, Avery. *The Dimensions of the Church*. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1967.
- _____. *The Survival of Dogma*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971.
- _____. "The Church, the Churches, and the Catholic Church." *Theological Studies* 33 (1972): 199-234.

- _____. *Models of the Church*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974. Expanded edition, 1987.
- _____. "Ius divinum as an Ecumenical Problem." *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 681-708.
- _____. *The Catholicity of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- _____. *The Reshaping of Catholicism: Current Challenges in the Theology of the Church*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- _____. "A Half-Century of Ecclesiology." *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 419-42.
- _____. "From Images to Truth. Newman on Revelation and Faith." *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 252-267.
- _____. "Newman on Infallibility." *Theological Studies* 51/4 (1990): 434-449.
- _____. "Newman, Conversion, and Ecumenism." *Theological Studies* 51/4 (1990): 717-731.
- _____. *John Henry Newman*, New York: Continuum, 2002.
- _____. "Newman and the Hierarchy." *Newman Studies Journal* 2/1 (Spring 2005): 20-31.
- Ekeh, Ono. "John Henry Newman on the Mystery of the Trinity." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 74 (2009): 202-223.
- Eno, Robert B. *Teaching Authority in the Early Church*. Wilmington DE: Michael Glazier; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984.
- Evans, Robert F. *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought*. London: SPCK, 1972.
- Faivre, Alexandre. *The Emergence of the Laity in the Early Church*. New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1990.
- Femiano, Samuel. *Infallibility of the Laity*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- Ford, John T. "Infallibility: A Review of Recent Studies." *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 273-305.

- _____. "Different Models of Infallibility?" *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 35 (1980): 217-233.
- _____. "Faithfulness to Type in Newman's Essay on Development." In *Newman Today*. Edited with an introduction by Stanely L. Jaki, 17- 48. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989.
- _____. "Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*: Citizenship, Church, and Conscience." *Josephinum Journal of Theology* 8/2 (Summer/Fall 2001): 38-50.
- _____. "Newman as Theological Tourist." *Newman Studies Journal* 3/2 (Fall 2006): 89-100.
- Fries, Heinrich. *Aspects of the Church*. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1966.
- Frost, William P. "On Celebrating Newman's Faith in the Laity." *Horizons* 6 (2006): 258-261.
- Gaillardetz, Richard R. *Witness to the Faith: Community, Infallibility, and the Ordinary Magisterium*. New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1992.
- Galvin, John P. "Papal Primacy in Contemporary Roman Catholic Theology." *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 653-67.
- _____. "The Church as Communion: Comments on a Letter of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith." *One in Christ* 29 (1993): 310-17.
- Gilley, Sheridan. *Newman and His Age*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990.
- Goulder, M. D. *Infallibility in the Church: An Anglican-Catholic Dialogue*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968.
- Graef, Hilda. *God and Myself*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1968.
- Granfield, Patrick. *Ecclesial Cybernetics: A Study of Democracy in the Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
- _____. *The Limits of the Papacy: Authority and Autonomy in the Church*. New York: Crossroad, 1987.
- _____. "Ecclesiology." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 18: 128-31. Washington, DC: Jack Heraty & Associates with Catholic University of America, 1989.

- Hardon, John. "Robert Bellarmine's Concept of the Church." In *Studies in Medieval Culture*, edited by J. Sommerfeldt, 2: 120-27. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan Press, 1966.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *God's People in Christ: New Testament Perspectives on the Church and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- _____. *Light of All Nations: Studies on the Church in New Testament Research*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982.
- Harrold, Charles Frederick. *John Henry Newman: An Expository and Critical Study of His Mind, Thought and Art*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1966.
- Hayman, Henry. "Cardinal Newman: A Tribute from the Anglican Standpoint." *The Bibliotheca Sacra* XLVIII (1891): 144-170.
- Heft, James. *John XXII and Papal Teaching Authority*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1986.
- Hertling, Ludwig. *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity*. Introduction by Jared Wicks. Chicago: Loyola University, 1972.
- Himes, Michael J. *Ongoing Incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the Beginnings of Modern Ecclesiology*. New York: Crossroad, 1997.
- Jaki, S. L. *The Church of England as viewed by Newman*. Pinckney MI: Real View Books, 2004.
- Jay, Elisabeth, ed. *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Journet, Charles. *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*. 3 vols. Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1941, 1951, 1969. Vol. 1 in English: *The Church of the Incarnate Word*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1955.
- Kasper, Walter. *Theology and Church*. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *An Introduction to Ecclesiology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Ker, Ian Turnbull. *John Henry Newman: A Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

- _____. *Newman the Theologian: A Reader*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.
- _____. *Newman on Being a Christian*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Achievement of John Henry Newman*. London: Collins 1990.
- _____. "Newman, the Councils, and Vatican II." *Communio* 28 (2002) 708-728.
- _____, ed. *The Genius of John Henry Newman*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- _____ and Alan G. Hill, editors. *Newman after a Hundred Years*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- _____ and Terrence Merrigan, editors. *Newman and Faith*. Louvain: Peeters, 2004.
- Kloppenburger, Bonaventure. *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1970.
- Komonchak, Joseph A. *Foundations in Ecclesiology*. A supplementary issue of *Loneragan Workshop Journal*, 11 (1995).
- Küng, Hans. *The Council, Reform, and Reunion*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1962.
- _____. *Infallible? An Unresolved Inquiry*. Revised edition. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- Lapati, Americo D. *John Henry Newman*. New York: Twayne, 1972.
- Latourelle, René. *Christ and the Church: Signs of Salvation*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1972.
- _____. *The Vatican Council and Christian Unity*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Lease, Gary. *Witness to the Faith: Cardinal Newman on the Teaching Authority of the Church*. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1971.
- Lefebvre, Philippe & Colin Mason. *John Henry Newman: Doctor of the Church*. Oxford: Family Publications, 2007.
- Lerch, Joseph R. "Ecclesiology." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 5: 34-35. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

- Lubac, Henri de. *The Splendour of the Church*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956; reprint, San Francisco: Ignatius, 1991.
- MacDonald, Timothy I. *The Ecclesiology of Yves Congar: Foundational Themes*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- Martin, Brian. *John Henry Newman: His Life and Work*. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.
- McAdoo, Henry R. *The Spirit of Anglicanism*. New York: Scribner, 1965.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Do We Need the Church?* New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- _____. *Church: The Continuing Quest*. Paramus, NJ: Newman, 1970.
- McCool, Gerald, A. *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1989.
- McDonnell, Kilian. *John Calvin: The Church and the Eucharist*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1967.
- McPartlan, Paul. *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.
- Mersch, Émile. *The Whole of Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body*. Milwaukee, WI: Bruce, 1938.
- _____. *The Theology of the Mystical Body*. St. Louis, MO: B. Herder, 1958.
- Metz, Johannes B. *The Emergent Church*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- Middleton, Robert D. *Newman at Oxford: His Religious Development*. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Miller, Edward Jeremy. *John Henry Newman on the Idea of Church*, with a Foreword by Jan Walgrave, Shepherdstown, WV: Patmos, 1987.
- _____. "Newman's Dialogical Vision of the Church." *Louvain Studies* 8/1 (Spring 1981) 318-331.
- Miller, J. Michael. *The Divine Right of the Papacy in Recent Ecumenical Theology*. Rome: Gregoriana, 1980.
- Milner, Benjamin C. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Church*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

- Moody, John. *John Henry Newman*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945.
- Moorman, John R. H. *A History of the Church in England*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967.
- More, Paul. Elmer, & Frank Lesile Cross, eds. *Anglicanism, The Thought and Practice of the Church of England: Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventh Century*. Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1935.
- Murphy, Dennis J, ed. *The Church and the Bible: Official Documents of the Catholic Church*. Bangalore: TPI, 2007.
- Nichols A., *From Newman to Congar: The Idea of Doctrinal Development from the Victorians to the Second Vatican Council*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990.
- Norris, Thomas J. *Newman and His Theological Method: A Guide for the Theologian Today*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- . “Conversion, the Church and John Henry Newman.” *Doctrine and Life* 51 (2001): 414-423.
- Nuth, M. Joan. “Ecclesiology in Newman’s Apologia: a Study in Narrative Theology.” *Cross Currents* 40/1-2 (1990): 228-255.
- O’Connell, Marvin R. *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833- 45*. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- O’Gara, Margaret. *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1988.
- Ollard, Sidney Leslie. *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1915.
- Page, John P. *What Will Dr. Newman Do? John Henry Newman and Papal Infallibility, 1865-1875*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *The Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.
- Parker, Kenneth and Michael J. Pahls, editors. *Authority, Dogma and History: The Role of the Oxford Movement Converts in the Papal Infallibility Debates*. Bethesda: Academica, 2009.

- Panikulam, George. *Koinonia in the New Testament: A Dynamic Expression of Christian Life*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979.
- Patterson, Webster T. *Newman: Pioneer for the Layman*. Washington DC: Corpus Books, 1968.
- Pattison, Robert. *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "Newman and the Fathers: The Vindication of Tradition." *Studia Patristica* XVIII/4 (1990): 379-390.
- Phan, Peter C, ed. *Church and Theology: Essays in Memory of Carl J. Peter*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1995.
- Philips, Gérard. *The Role of the Laity in the Church*. Chicago: Fides, 1956.
- Pottmeyer, Hermann Josef. *Towards a Papacy in Communion: Perspectives from Vatican Councils I and II*. New York: Crossroad, 1998.
- Przywara, Erich. *The Heart of Newman*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997.
- Rahner, Karl. *Free Speech in the Church*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960.
- _____. *The Church and the Sacraments*. New York: Crossroad, 1963.
- _____. "Freedom in the Church." In *Theological Investigations* 2: 89-107. Baltimore: Helicon, 1963.
- _____. "Reflections on the Concept of 'Jus Divinum' in Catholic Thought." In *Theological Investigations*, 5: 219-243. New York: Crossroad, 1966.
- _____. *The Church After the Council*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- _____. "Magisterium." In *Sacramentum Mundi*, 3: 351-358. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- _____. "Basic Observations on the Subject of Changeable and Unchangeable Factors in the Church." In *Theological Investigations*, 14: 3-23. New York: Crossroad, 1976.
- _____. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. Translated by William V. Dych. New York: The Seabury Press, 1978.

_____, and Joseph Ratzinger. *Episcopate and Primacy*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1962.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *Church, Ecumenism, and Politics*. New York: Crossroad, 1988.

_____. *Called to Communion*. Translated by Adrian Walker. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990.

_____. *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church as Communion*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2005.

Rickaby, Joseph John. *An Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, 1914; republished by BiblioBazaar, 2008.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *The Church against Itself*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.

_____. "Forms of Ecclesiality: The Analogical Church." *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 695-708.

Schillebeeckx, Edward. *World and Church*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1971.

_____. "The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church." *Theological Studies* 30 (1969): 567-87. Reprinted in his *Mission of the Church*, 205-28. New York: The Seabury Press, 1973.

_____. *Church: The Human Story of God*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Schreiter, Robert J. *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and Local*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997.

Selby, Robin C. *The Principle of Reserve in the Writing of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Shaw, Russell. *To Hunt, To Shoot, To Entertain: Clericalism and the Catholic Laity*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993.

Stern, Jean. *Bible et tradition chez Newman*. Paris: Aubier, 1967.

_____. "La controverse de Newman avec l'Abbé Jager et la théorie du développement," *Newman Studien* VI (1964): 123-141.

- Sullivan, Francis A. *Magisterium: Teaching Office in the Catholic Church*. New York: Paulist, 1983.
- _____. *The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic*. New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1988.
- _____. *Creative Fidelity: Weighing and Interpreting Documents of the Magisterium*. New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1996.
- Tavard, George H. *The Church, Community of Salvation: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Quest for Catholicity: A Study in Anglicanism*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- Thils, Gustave. *L'infailibilité pontificale: Sources, conditions, limites*. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1969.
- Thomas, Stephen. *Newman and Heresy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Tierney, Brian. *Origins of Papal Infallibility 1150-1350*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Tierney, Michael, ed. *A Tribute to Newman: Essays on Aspects of His Life and Thought*. Dublin-Belfast-Cork: Browne and Nolan, 1945.
- Tillard, J.-M.R. *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- _____. "Sensus fidelium." *One in Christ* 11 (1975): 2-29.
- _____. *The Bishop of Rome*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1983.
- Trevor, Meriol. *Newman: Light in Winter*. London: Macmillan, 1962.
- _____. *Newman: The Pillar of the Cloud*. London: Macmillan, 1962.
- _____. *Newman's Journey*. London: Collins & World, 1974.
- Tristram, Henry, et al. *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays*. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1945.
- Waddington, Mossie May. *The Development of British Thought from 1820 to 1890*. Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1919.

Walgrave, J.-H. *Newman the Theologian*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960.

Ward, Wilfrid Philip. *The Life of John Henry Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, 1912.

Willebrands, Johannes. "Vatican II's Ecclesiology of Communion." *Origins* 17 (May 28 1987): 27-33.

Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.

Wiseman, James A. *Theology and Modern Science: Quest for Coherence*. New York: Continuum, 2002.

Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.

6. Patristic and Medieval Authors:

(Listed alphabetically by names)

The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch. Newly translated and annotated by James A Kleist, S. J. Westminster MD: The Newman Bookshop, 1946.

St. Ambrose. *Select Works and Letters*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 10). Peabody Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.

St. Athanasius. *Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*. Edited and translated by Robert W. Thomason, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

_____. *Select Works and Letters*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 4). Peabody Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.

St. Augustine. *Letters*. Vol. 1 (1-82). Translated by Sister Wilfrid Parsons. (The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation, vol. 12). New York: The Fathers of the Church Inc, 1951.

_____. *Teaching Christianity (De Doctrina Christiana)*. Volumes I/11. Introduction, translation and notes by Edmund Hill, O.P. Series edited by John E. Rottelle, O.S.A. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press 1996.

St. Cyprian. *The Lapsed (De Lapsis), The Unity of the Catholic Church (De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate)*. Translated and annotated by Maurice Bévenot, S. J. (Ancient Christian Series, no. 25). Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1957.

St. Irenaeus. *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. Translated and annotated by Joseph P. Smith. (Ancient Christian Series, no. 16). Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1952.

St. John Chrysostom. *Baptismal Instructions*. Translated and annotated by Paul W. Harkins. (The Fathers of the Church in Translation, no. 31). Westminster MD: The Newman Press, 1963.

St. Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*. 10 Volumes. Translated by Dominican Province. Charleston, SC: Forgotten Books, 2007.

———. *Summa Theologica*. 3 Volumes. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.

St. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*. Translated by T. Herbert Bindley. *The Commonitory of St. Vincent of Lerins*. London: SPCK, 1914.

———. “The Commonitories (*Commonitoria*).” Translated by Rudolph E. Morris Herbert Bindley. (The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation, vol. 7). New York: The Fathers of Church Inc, 1949.

7. Official Roman Catholic Documents:

(Listed chronologically)

The Canon and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Translated by M. J. Schroeder. Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Vatican Council I. *Supremi pastoris (Prima schema constitutionis de ecclesia Christi)*. Latin text in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, edited by J. D. Mansi, 51: 539-53. Florence, 1759ff.; Paris and Leipzig, 1901-1927. Partial English translation in *The Church Teaches*, edited by J. E. Clarkson et al., 87-94. St. Louis, MO: B. Herder, 1955.

———. *Tametsi Deus (Schema constitutionis dogmaticae secundae de ecclesia Christi)*. Prepared by Joseph Kleutgen. Latin text and Kleutgen’s *Relatio* in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, edited by J. D. Mansi, 53: 308-32. Florence, 1759ff.; Paris and Leipzig, 1901-1927.

_____. *Pastor aeternus (Prima Constitutio domatica de ecclesia Christi)*. Latin text in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, edited by J. D. Mansi, 52: 1330-1334. Florence, 1759ff.; Paris and Leipzig, 1901-1927. English translation with Latin text in *Dublin Review* 67 (1870): 496-507.

Pius XII. *Mystici corporis. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943): 193-248. English translation: *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958*, edited by Claudia Carlen, 35-63. Wilmington, NC: McGrath, 1981.

Paul VI. *Ecclesiam suam. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 609-59. English translation: *The Papal Encyclicals 1958-1981*, edited by Claudia Carlen, 135-60. Wilmington, NC: McGrath, 1981.

_____. *Evangelii nuntiandi. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 68 (1976): 5-76. English translation: *Evangelization in the Modern World*. Washington, DC: USCC, 1976.

Vatican Council II. *Ad gentes. Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church. Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, edited by Austin Flannery, 443-497. Northport, NY: Costello, 1996.

_____. *Gaudium et spes. Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, edited by Austin Flannery, 163-282. Northport, NY: Costello, 1996.

_____. *Lumen gentium. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, edited by Austin Flannery, 1-97. Northport, NY: Costello, 1996.

_____. *Unitatis redintegratio. Decree on Ecumenism. Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, edited by Austin Flannery, 499-523. Northport, NY: Costello, 1996.

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. "Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion" (*Communio notio*). *Origins* 20 (June 25, 1992): 108-112.

_____. "Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church." (Declaration of CDF). *Origins* 30 (September 14, 2000): 210-220.

John Paul II. *Christifideles Laici. Apostolic Exhortation on the Laity. Origins* 18 (February 9, 1989): 561, 563-95.

_____. Encyclical *Ut Unum Sint. Origins* 25 (June 8, 1995): 49, 51-72.