A REREADING OF TRACT 90

by

Kelvin F Curnow

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology

Melbourne College of Divinity

2010

TO AUSTIN COOPER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
1. The Glorious Legacy of the Caroline Divines 12
2. The Oxford Movement 40
3. Tract 90 58
4. Tract 90 – Section β1 Articles VI & XX 71
5. Tract 90 – Section β2 Article XI 94
6. Tract 90 – Section β3 Articles XII & XIII 109
7. Tract 90 – Section β4 Article XIX 127
8. Tract 90 – Section β5 Article XXI 145
9. Tract 90 – Section β6 Article XXII 157
10. Tract 90 – Section β7 Article XXV 202
11. Tract 90 – Section β8 Article XXVIII 210
12. Tract 90 – Section β9 Article XXXI 236
13. Tract 90 – Section β10 Article XXXII 252
14. Tract 90 – Section β11 Article XXXV 263
15. Tract 90 – Section β12 Article XXXVII 272
16. Tract 90 – Section β13 The Concluding Section of Tract 90 288
17. Observations, Summary and Conclusion 308

Appendix I: List of Tracts and Their Authors 334
Appendix II: Tracts for the Times Arranged According to Their Type 340
Appendix III: The Thirty-Nine Articles Commented on in Tract 90 and Those Not Commented on 342
Appendix IV: The Divines and Other Sources Quoted in Tract 90 in Parallel with Those in the Catenae Patrum 352
Appendix V: The Articles Remarked on in Tract 90 Compared with the Fourteen Objections to the Church of Rome in Tract 38 357
Appendix VI: The Athanasian Creed - 1662 Book of Common Prayer 359
Appendix VII: The Tracts for the Times Written by J. H. Newman 360
Appendix VIII: The Books of Homilies 362
Appendix IX: Newman's Citations from the Books of Homilies 364
Appendix X: The Text of Tract 90 (Section 2) Compared with Extracts from the Books of Homilies 369
Appendix XI: The Extract from the Homily on Repentance in Tract 90 (Section 3) Compared with Original Document 371
Appendix XII: The Protestant, Roman Catholic and Tractarian Doctrines of Justification 375
Appendix XIII: Authorities Cited in Tract 90 Concerning the Visible Church 377
Appendix XIV: The Visible Church – Editions of Tract 90 Compared 382
Appendix XV: Comparison Between Authorities Cited in Tract 90 and The British Critic (January 1840) 387
Appendix XVI: Citations from the Council of Trent used to Support Contentions in Tract 90 388
Appendix XVII: Works by Newman Published During his Anglican Period and Roman Catholic Period 394
Appendix XVIII: The Council of Trent and the Articles Religion 399
Appendix XIX: The Forty-Two Articles of Religion and the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion in Tract 90 406
Appendix XX: Tractarian Doctrine in Tract 90 cited from the Books of Homilies 413

Appendix XXI: The Confessions of Religion.....438
Appendix XXII: The Different Editions of Tract 90, Section 4 (Indicating Alterations to the Text) 484

Bibliography.....489

A REREADING OF TRACT 90

by

KELVIN F. CURNOW

INTRODUCTION

The Oxford Movement (1833-1845) presented the most comprehensive nineteenth-century Anglican programme of systematic theology on the nature of the Church.[1] The impetus for the formation of the Movement lay in the decision by the Whig Government to pass the *Irish Church Act (1833)*.[2] Its intention was to reorganise the Anglican dioceses in Ireland, effectively reducing their number to twelve. This action shattered the unity between the civil and ecclesiastical, the notion of a balanced relationship between the Church and State which had existed from Elizabethan times. That relationship was built around the central principle that to be an Englishman was to also be a member of the Church of England. Underlying this notion was that the secular and divine served each other and the nation as one.[3] It had been assumed that one would not do harm to the other. The apologist Richard Hooker (1554-1600) enunciated this concept in his work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*: "… there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is not also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth, which is not also of the Church of England."[4] To some, the *Irish Church Act* appeared to break the nexus between the Church and the State which caused a crisis in the Church of England. The Church had long enjoyed the protection of Parliament and was considered to be in a privileged position. The events of 1833 effectively caused some in the Church to question the provenance of its authority, one which had for so

---

[1] C. Brad Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 33.
[2] Brian Martin, *John Henry Newman: His Life and Work* (London: Continuum, 2001), 56.
[3] Richard Hooker, *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker, in Eight Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: With Several Other Treatises and a General Index*, Isaac Walton, editor (London: W. Clarke *et al*, 1821), III: 226.
[4] Ibid.

long been assured by Governments, both Whig and Tory. The question was addressed in a sermon preached by John Keble (1792-1866) to the Judges of the Assize at St. Mary's, Oxford, on 14 July, 1833.[5] Keble noted in the *Advertisement* to the first edition of *Sermons Academical and Occasional* that the government was treating the established Church "… as one sect among many…"[6] The comfortable balance between Church and State, a doctrine espoused by Hooker, had effectively been replaced with the doctrine of Erastianism.[7] Keble proclaimed the Church could no longer look to the State for sanction but would find its authority in "Apostolical Authority."[8]

John Henry Newman (1801-90) was the foremost theologian and writer of the Oxford Movement. His contributions in the areas of ecclesiology, Church history, liturgy and doctrine were significant and remain so. Notable among these were his contributions to the series of doctrinal statements, the *Tracts for the Times*.[9] Newman reflected in his work, the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, the reason these documents (indeed all Tractarian publications) were written.

> … we were upholding the primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and the Anglican divines. …that the Apostolical form of doctrine was essential, and its grounds of evidence impregnable… [10]

---

[5] This event was considered by Newman to be the beginning of the Oxford Movement. John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., undated), 56.
[6] John Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, Second Edition (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1848), 127.
[7] Erastianism is the principle which states that the State has ascendency over the Church in matters ecclesiastical. See: F. L. Cross & E. A. Livingstone, editors, *The Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Second edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), 467-8.
[8] John Keble, "National Apostasy", *Sermons Academical and Occasional.* (Oxford & London: John Henry Parker, 1848), Sermon No. 6, 137.
[9] Newman's response to the threat of liberalism was to begin the tracts, of which he was their editor and principal author. Newman, *Apologia.* 61.
[10] Ibid., 63.

Tractarian thought continued the two fundamental tenets held by the High Church Party since the English Reformation. The first tenet was that it looked to the primitive Church for the foundations of its teaching, theology and authority. This notion was expounded by Newman in *Tract 1*. Newman also re-emphasised the ecclesiological concept advocated by Keble in his sermon, *National Apostasy*. The Church was not to look to the secular world for the basis of its authority, but to "… the real ground on which our authority was built – OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT."[11] The second of the tenets stated that the Anglican Church represented in its purest form the primitive Church and that this was reflected in the works of the Anglican Divines in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. (It was Rome, according to the Oxford Movement, which had moved from the teachings of the Church as established by Christ.[12]) The Caroline Divines were Churchmen who advanced High Church principles against the tide of Calvinism and Puritanism. The Divines developed the doctrine of the *Via Media*, a principle which held that the Church of England represented the middle way between the extremes of Rome and the Protestants of Continental Europe.[13]

The Oxford Movement had its foundations in the desire of a group of High Churchmen to defend the Church against the encroachment of the State on its authority.[14] The reason for the establishment of such a group at Oxford was closely aligned with the same desire by Parliament for reform. Oxford University in the nineteenth century was a place of prestige and privilege; to gain acceptance it was necessary to subscribe in writing to the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*. In 1839, the Whig government sought to introduce a

---

[11] John Henry Newman, *Tract 1* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 11.
[12] Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: High Anglican Churchmanship 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 171.
[13] The principal, if not the term, goes back to Archbishop Parker's (1504-75) definition of a 'golden mediocrity' in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England between Rome and Geneva. Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1660-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 17.
[14] Newman, *Apologia*. 57*f*.

statute which removed the imperative to give assent to the Thirty-nine Articles. In effect this would allow dissenters and non-jurors access to the university, an institution which had previously been reserved for Anglicans. The Tractarians wished to prevent this. Hooker's dictum, which created a nexus between being English and being a member of the English Church, would be broken forever if those, other than Anglicans, were to be admitted to the quintessential English institutions.[15]

However, the Tractarian defence of the status quo created a dilemma for the Oxford Movement; for to support subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was essentially to argue for statements which were notoriously Protestant.[16] In *Tract 90: Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles*, published on 25 January, 1841, Newman sought to re-interpret the Articles placing on them a Catholic reading.[17] He repeated the arguments which had been articulated in earlier Tractarian literature. Newman sought authority for his contentions from the writings of the Fathers and the Anglican Divines.[18] These were the twin sources of Tractarian doctrine. To complete the hegemony, the Movement further considered the Church of England was the branch of the universal Church in England.[19] Effectively the Tractarians sought the highest theological ground, claiming as their own the authority of the Primitive Church, the Divines and the Church both universal and Catholic. With the authority of the latter held as an underlying tenet, Newman argued that: "Religious Changes, to be beneficial, should be the act of the whole body; they are worth little if they are the mere act of a majority."[20] The Church of

---

[15] Richard W. Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1909), 146. Also see: John Keble *The Case of Catholic Subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles Considered: With Especial Reference to the Duties and Difficulties of English Catholics in the Present Crisis: In a Letter to the Hon. Mr. Justice Coleridge* (Privately Printed, 1841), Paragraph 26.
[16] John Henry Newman, *Tract 90* (London: Rivingtons, 1841), Introduction, Paragraphs 1 & 3.
[17] Newman, *Apologia*. 91*f*.
[18] Ibid., 102.
[19] George H. Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity, a study in Anglicanism* (London: William Clowes & Sons, Ltd., 1963), 156-7.
[20] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 1.

England was the Church for all who were English; to in any way impinge on its supremacy was to destroy the ideal promoted centuries earlier by Hooker. Newman condemned those who sought to undermine the Church.[21] The seamless tradition of the Church was to stand as a bulwark against those who would seek to tear her down.[22] The Primitive Church was the exalted pattern which was to be emulated always and, in this, Newman perceived the unhappy parallel of a Primitive Church and its nineteenth-century successor both harassed and attacked by the State. The Church was to act to prevent intervention in its affairs in much the same way as the Divines had done in preventing unwarranted intrusions into the Church's authority.[23]

It has been the long-held convention that Newman's attempt to re-interpret the Articles to make them benign to a Catholic reading was his undoing as a member of the Church of England.[24] Moreover, there has been an equally long-held view that Newman sufficiently 'moulded' the sources he cited in *Tract 90* for them to comply with his argument, whereas in their original context the documents were not supportive of Newman's contentions.[25] Contemporary historians have questioned Newman's methodology and his motivation with regards to writing *Tract 90*. Sheridan Gilley wrote that *Tract 90* was open to the charge of sophistry.[26] Peter Nockles noted that Newman's choice of excerpts from the Caroline Divines and the *Books of Homilies* were one-sided

---

[21] Ibid.
[22] This was not a term generally used by the Tractarians. Newman used the phrase 'Rule of Faith' in his contention that Anglican doctrine was not to be measured against Scripture alone. Newman, *Tract 90*. Chapter 1. *Passim*. Also see: Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 191.
[23] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 2. Newman noted that the Tractarians should seek to be what Hammond, Andrewes and Hooker were. The Tractarians were to stand against the proposed changes as much as the Divines stood against the tide of Protestantism.
[24] Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years*. 387.
[25] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 132.
[26] Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and His Age* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2003), 200

and misleading.[27] In another recent book, George Herring wrote that *Tract 90* signified a significant shift in Newman's theological interest, from apostolicity of the Anglican Church to its Catholicity.[28] A Swedish scholar, Rune Imberg undertook a major study of the *Tracts for the Times*. By comparing the changes made to different editions of the Tracts, he has argued that there was a demonstrably growing acceptance of Roman Catholic theology by the Tractarians.[29]

Each of these contemporary historians argued against the traditional view that the Tractarians presented a consistent, unchanging argument that the Anglican Church was the branch of the Church Catholic established in England under apostolic authority. While these, along with other contemporary writers, show evidence of reading the primary sources, none has undertaken a detailed textual analysis of the Tractarian documents. In itself, this does not necessarily mean that reasonable conclusions cannot be drawn from a reading of these sources; however, with respect to *Tract 90* this does not follow.

Disturbing tendencies have arisen in contemporary commentaries on Tractarianism. Some writers have relied on the research of others as an unquestioned source from which to draw their own statements and conclusions. There was no apparent research of the primary documents. George Herring's book, for example, contained new material on Tractarian ordinations, incumbents and parishes, but, for a large part, relied on the work of Peter Nockles, Sheridan Gilley and Rune Imberg.[30] More extreme views on the

---

[27] Peter Nockles, "Survivals or New Arrivals? The Oxford Movement and the Nineteenth Historical Construction of Anglicanism", Eamon Duffy, Peter Lake, Dairmaid MacCulloch, Judith Maltby, Peter Nockles, *et al.*, *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion.* Stephen Platten, editor (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 172-3.
[28] George Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* (London & New York: Continuum, 2002), 62.
[29] Rune Imberg, *In Quest of Authority: The Tracts for the Times and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-1841* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1987), *Passim.*
[30] Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* 1-74.

Movement have begun to appear, no more so than those of Frank M. Turner, whose book questions the veracity of Newman's work and his character.[31] What many writers had in common was their attempts to 'get into the mind' of the (Tractarian) writers. This was a questionable practice. What became apparent was that modern historians often made assumptions for which there was no evidence.[32] Lastly, Peter Nockles made the criticism of the Tractarians that they used material selectively for the purposes of their own arguments. He contended that because of this, history was rewritten and the beliefs of the English Divines were misrepresented.[33] All writers carefully select and present evidence to support their argument; in this Newman was doing nothing more or less than any other. The aforementioned contemporary historians and others argued that *Tract 90* was innovative in its style and content and selective in its material.[34] However, such judgements were made without reference to the original sources quoted by Newman. None have investigated if Newman's sources cited in *Tract 90* were used accurately.

A Rereading of Tract 90 sets out to redress many of the inaccurate observations made about Newman and *Tract 90*. At first glance the Tract appears to be a *catena* selected from the Anglican Divines and the *Books of Homilies*, complemented by a few summary statements of introduction or conclusion written by Newman. This view belies the complex doctrines which underpin the document. With respect to Newman's use of the *Homilies*, a reading of the primary documents often revealed a surprising amount of

---

[31] Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), *Passim*.
[32] Frederick D. Aquino, "John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion", *Theology Today* (April, 2004); http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3664/is_200404/ai_n9374301; retrieved: 9 June, 2008.
[33] Nockles. "Survivals or New Arrivals? The Oxford and the Nineteenth Historical Construction of Anglicanism", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion.* 176-7. This was one reference in this work, the purpose of which was to demonstrate the Tractarian methodology misrepresented the theology and doctrine of the earlier Anglican Divines, particularly the Caroline Divines.
[34] See especially: Ibid., 172-3.

material that supported Newman's arguments, yet it was material he had not included in *Tract 90*. Further, any attempt to mark the contents of *Tract 90* as 'new' or 'innovative' ignored the reality that much of the material not taken from the *Homilies* was taken from earlier tracts written by Newman. Finally, many modern-day historians considered that the furore caused by *Tract 90* was because it argued that Roman Catholic and Anglican doctrines should not be considered as exclusive of each other. To achieve its goal the charge of innovation and sophistry was often levelled against the document. Overwhelming evidence demonstrated that earlier Tractarian literature contained far more provocative statements than those which appeared in *Tract 90*.[35] The condemnation of the tract, made both at the time it was written and by many subsequent historians, has ignored the fact that the document was a summary of Tractarian doctrine and as such contained nothing new. The central contention of Tractarianism, that all teaching should only reflect that of the primitive Church, mirrored through the Divines, was also palpably evident in *Tract 90*. Hence, any assumption that the Tract was new or innovative had no basis.

A thorough rereading of *Tract 90* required three questions to be addressed. First, was anything in *Tract 90* new, in the sense that it has not been previously presented in Tractarian literature? Second, was Newman quoting his sources accurately, or was he using the excerpts inconsistently when compared to their original context? As already indicated, some authors fail to investigate the original sources used by Newman in *Tract 90*.[36] Even the literature written in support of *Tract 90* failed to return to the primary

[35] Reflecting this reality, Newman considered that the tract would not excite attention. To: Mrs. T Mozley. March 9 1841. John Henry Newman, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, Gerard Tracey *et al.* editors, 33 Volumes. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), VIII: 61.

[36] For example, Nockles raised Anne Mozley to the status of an unimpeachable witness. There was no evidence presented that Anne Mozley has read any of the sources used in *Tract 90*, or attempted to understand how and why Newman used them. Mozley had made a subjective assessment which had been in turn accepted as an authority by Nockles for the purposes of his argument. Both have failed the primary rule of any historical research to 'check the original sources'. See: Nockles, "Survivals or New Arrivals?

sources found in the document, rather the writers relied on the work of Newman which was largely accepted without critical assessment. Notably, even Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-82) did not build upon the work of Newman, but took it largely as it was written. Writing on the Thirty-nine Articles, Pusey considered of his work that: "This is but the echo of a part of what was said over and over again twenty-six years ago; and our dear friend's tract… ."[37] An earlier work written by Frederick Oakeley (1802-80) in defence of *Tract 90* added no new information to that presented by Newman.[38] Other books written from a High Church perspective also examined the Thirty-nine Articles, prominent among these was the work by Edgar Gibson (1848-1924), but as with previous literature he followed the contentions set out in *Tract 90* without any significant alteration to the arguments.[39] Only an examination of the primary sources employed by Newman provided the insight that he did use them with far greater accuracy than has been accorded to him, this was demonstrated by a thorough rereading of the Tract.

Third, why did *Tract 90* create such uproar? A reading of the relevant manuscripts demonstrated that many who criticised *Tract 90* had either not read it or not understood it.[40] Rather than being a text that exhibited the influence of the 'Romanizing party' within the Oxford Movement, *Tract 90* was intended to prevent defections to Rome by young students at Oxford.[41] The document was not addressed to anyone beyond this particular

---

The Oxford Movement and the Nineteenth Historical Construction of Anglicanism", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion.* 173.

[37] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *The Church of England A Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity. An Eirenicon in a Letter to the Author of "The Christian Year* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1866), [13].

[38] Frederick Oakeley, *The Subject of Tract XC Historically Examined: With the View of Ascertaining the Object With Which the Articles of the Church of England Were Put Out* (London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1841), *Passim.*

[39] Edgar C. S Gibson, *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England* (London: Methuen & Co., 1904), *Passim.*

[40] Austin Cooper noted that most of the bishops who condemned *Tract 90* had not read it. Austin Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *The Australasian Catholic Record* (October, 1976): 356.

[41] Newman, *Apologia.* 131. Also see: John Henry Newman, *The British Critic.* (January, 1843). Cited in: Maisie Ward, *Young Mr. Newman* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1948), 362. Also see: To: R. W. Jelf, 15 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 88. A document which was not pro-Newman and yet supported this contention is: (Unknown author), "The Subject of Tract XC Historically Examined, &c. By the Rev.

group. The reaction to *Tract 90* was largely instigated by Charles Golightly (1807-85), Newman's curate,[42] a member of the 'ultra Protestant party' at Oxford. The reaction needed to be seen in the context of a number of Oxford men becoming Roman Catholics and in the wider context of Catholic emancipation in 1829. These reasons, among others, caused the strong reaction to the tract. Rune Imberg argued that, by the time of his writing *Tract 90*, Newman had given up on the *Via Media* and the Caroline Divines.[43] This was not supported by textual analysis of the document. There was no evidence in *Tract 90* to suggest that it exhibited evidence of a Rome-ward movement by Newman.[44] Confirmation did exist that he did not wish to force a sense on the Thirty-nine Articles which they would not admit, but, rather, *Tract 90* was designed to demonstrate that the Articles could be open to a broad Catholic interpretation.[45] Examination of all sources demonstrated that the reaction to the tract was politically inspired rather than based on a reading of the document itself.[46] Again, a careful examination of primary documents had dispelled what had been a long-held historical detail. Indeed, the pursuit of all three enquiries, as to the content and veracity of *Tract 90* and the aftermath of its publication, has led to conclusions that are contrary to those

---

Frederick Oakeley M.A. Second Edition. London: Toovey", *The English Review or Quarterly Journal of Ecclesiastical and General Literature*, Vol. III. (March – June) (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1845), 158.

[42] W. G. Ward to R. W. Church. 10 March 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 63-4. This was one of many pieces of correspondence on this matter which appear in the *Letters and Diaries*.

[43] In January 1841 Newman communicated to both Pusey and Charles Crawley that The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology must include the works of both the Caroline Divines and non-jurors. To: E. B. Pusey. 12 January, 1841. To: Charles Crawley 14 January 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 14-17.

[44] Imberg, *In Quest of Authority: The Tracts for the Times and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-1841. Passim*. This was Imberg's argument, but it was based on an examination of only some *Tracts*, and not all the editions.

[45] To: H. E Manning. 27 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. Vol. XVIII: 101-2. The letter written to Manning was a recollection of a conversation between the two. See: Newman. *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 128-129. n. 3. Cf. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol at his Visitation in August and September, MDCCCXLI, by the Right Reverend James-Henry, Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.* Ibid. VIII: 582. The Bishop offered the opposite opinion.

[46] The publication of *Tract 90* highlighted the stark differences between the majority of Anglicans and the Tractarians. There was evidence that the 'Romanizing party' had become the focus of all criticism of the Oxford Movement. Ironically, *Tract 90*, which was written to appease the extreme party and keep the 'waverers' within the Church of England became the lightning rod which attracted criticism which was really meant for the 'Romanizing party'. See the partisan, but nevertheless accurate account in: Frederick Oakeley, *Historical Notes on the Oxford Movement (1833-45).* (Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green. 1865), 53-6.

found so far in publications, which were both sympathetic and antagonistic toward Newman as a person and theologian.

CHAPTER 1

THE GLORIOUS LEGACY OF THE CAROLINE DIVINES

A study of the Oxford Movement must begin with an understanding of the importance of the Caroline Divines. The Tractarians were the true nineteenth-century inheritors of the Caroline tradition.[47] The Caroline Divines were exponents of High Church principles who wrote solely or especially within the reigns of Charles I (1625-49) and Charles II (1660-85).[48] Notable figures in the Caroline school included Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), Richard Montagu (1577-1641), John Cosin (1594-1672), John Bramhall (1594-1663), Jeremy Taylor (1613-67), George Herbert (1593-1633) and William Laud (1573-1645).[49] The High Church doctrines which made this body of Churchmen distinct were: their elevated understanding of the Sacraments; an adherence to the tenet that the Church was a divine society (not a loose grouping who held personal beliefs); and, a deep conviction the Church of England was a branch of the universal Church. Often criticised for being too 'Roman', the Caroline Divines nevertheless were the cornerstone upon which subsequent generations of Anglicans would build the roots of their Catholic heritage.[50] But in order to understand the Caroline Divines, indeed all Anglican High Churchmanship, a study of the events of the sixteenth century was necessary.

---

[47] Aidan Nicholls, *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1993), 18, 34, 60.
[48] Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 241.
[49] Gordon S. Wakefield, ed, *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1983), 73. This was by no means an exhaustive list of the Divines whom the Tractarians cited as their authorities. See: Appendix IV.
[50] Nicholls, *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism.* 54*f.*

The English Reformation (usually dated from 1532), unlike the Reformation on the European Continent, did not take on a uniform theological character.[51] The *Supremacy Act, 1534* declared Henry VIII (1491-1547) to be "…the only supreme head in Earth of the Church of England, called the *Anglicana Ecclesia*…" for the "…increase in virtue of Christ's religion… ."[52] This was a declaration of supremacy; it was not an adoption of Continental Protestantism. What existed before continued to exist after Henry's elevation to head of the Church of England. The Latin Mass continued, so did much of the canonical and theological workings of the Church. But, whereas the final arbiter in matters canonical was once the Pope, now such power lay with the King who exercised his power vicariously through the Archbishop of Canterbury.[53] This power invested in the See of Canterbury was contingent upon the Archbishop carrying out the King's wishes.[54] Despite the political changes there was strong evidence the Catholic faith did not disappear, indeed its outward expression hardly altered at all.

Two documents, which illustrated the transient nature of the English Reformation doctrine, were *The Ten Articles* (1536) and *The Six Articles* (1539). The former document demonstrated both a tacit and an implied theology of the supremacy of Scripture over the Sacraments. *The Ten Articles* stated the vernacular should be used in place of Latin, whilst the worship of relics and images, and other 'superstitious' actions, should be discouraged, if not suppressed, by the parish priests of each Archdeaconry.[55] These Protestant Articles stand in stark contrast to *The Six Articles* introduced by Henry VIII to prevent the spread of Reformation doctrines and practices; they were popularly known as

---

[51] This allowed Newman to claim that the English Reformation required a broader interpretation, rather than that which was strictly Evangelical. Newman, *Apologia*. 102.
[52] *The Supremacy Act, 1534*. 26 Henry VIII, cap.1: *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 492 [G. and H. LV]. Cited in: Henry Bettenson, editor, *Documents of the Christian Church*, Second Edition (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992), 227.
[53] *The Ecclesiastical Principle-The Dispensations Act, 1534*. 25 Henry VIII, cap. 21: *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 464. [G. and H. LV]. Cited in: Ibid. 222-7.
[54] Ibid.
[55] *The Royal Injunctions*. (I) 1536. Cranmer's Register, fol.215*b*. [G. and H. LXIII]. Cited in: Ibid. 230-1.

'the whip with six strings.'[56] These Articles maintained the Catholic doctrines of the Real Presence. They also endorsed the disciplines of the Church with respect to communion under one kind, the celibacy of priests, private masses and auricular confession.[57]

The Catholicity of *The Six Articles* stood in contrast to the earlier *Ten Articles*, yet each set of injunctions should not be seen as in contradiction to the other. Regardless of the apparent doctrinal differences, both sets of Articles represented a compromise between the extremes of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. The first Article, for example, gave a conservative definition of the Real Presence in the Sacrament, but nowhere used the term 'transubstantiation.'[58] Likewise, the sixth Article on auricular confession stated the desirability of it, but did not make it a requirement, particularly one imposed by God.[59] These Articles present a picture of a Church which has changed little, despite the seat of ecclesiastical authority having moved from Rome to Hampton Court Palace.

Edward VI's (1537-53) reign brought no real clarity in matters ecclesiastical, theological or liturgical. His reign from 1547 onward was often perceived as a time when the influence of the Continental Protestant Reformers became predominant in England, but this was by no means the whole truth. It was principally because of the influence of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556). There was no doubt the Church of England under Cranmer's guidance moved toward a Protestant stance, but he was, at least during Henry's reign, not a radical. He remained committed to the king's 'middle path.'[60] Cranmer attempted in both the 1549 and 1552 editions of *The Booke of the Common Prayer*

---

[56] Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 1281.
[57] *The Six Articles,* 1539. From the Six Articles Act, 31 Henry VIII, cap. 14: *Statues of the Realm,* iii, 739. [G. and H. LXV]. Cited in: Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*. 233-4.
[58] G. W. Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 501.
[59] Ibid., 504.
[60] Ibid., 506-8.

to craft a liturgy which traced its ancestry back to the Primitive Church and the Catholic Church. It was an attempt to do away with medieval corruptions and "…It was not intended to provide a brand new scheme of worship…" but to refine what had been the liturgy of the Church of England for the total 1500 years of its existence. [61]

In 1548, a combination of Zwinglian and Calvinist doctrines were at the height of their influence in the Church. Together with the repeal of *The Six Articles* in the same year, it could be assumed all things Catholic were expunged from the liturgy, doctrine and theology of the Church of England. This was not the case. A cursory examination of the 1549 and 1552 *Bookes of Common Prayer* demonstrated Cranmer's desire to return to things Catholic and Primitive in that he gave the liturgies characteristics which were distinctly not Protestant. Early attempts to alter the liturgies were minimalist and in 1548 the Latin Mass was still celebrated; the priest would only turn and address the congregation in English after his own communion.[62] Cranmer's first book reflected the transitional nature of Eucharistic Theology: the Eucharistic Prayer continued to contain references to Christ's "*SACRYFICE*."[63] The references demonstrated that Cranmer was not a nominalist.[64] This was best illustrated in the formula, the 'double indwelling.'

> And here wee offre and present unto the (O Lorde) oure self, oure souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and liuely sacrifice unto thee, that whosoeuer shalbee partakers of this holy Communion, may worthely receiue the most precious body and bloude of thy sonne Jesus Christe, that he maye dwell in them,

---

[61] Bp. Gibson, "Introduction", *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI: Everyman's Library* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1949), xii.
[62] Ibid., ix-x.
[63] *The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administracion of the Sacramentes and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Churche after the Use of the Church of England* (London: Edvvarde Whitchurche, 1549). In: *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI: Everyman's Library*. 222-3
[64] Nominalism was usually associated with William of Occam (1285-1347). This theory of knowledge asserted that the universal could not be found at all in reality. God remains exclusively as omnipotence and mercy. Effectively, with respect to the Eucharist, this disallows the Real Presence, indeed any possibility of Christ's presence in the celebration of the Eucharist. Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 979

and he in hym. And although we be unworthy (through our manyfolde synnes) to offer unto thee any Sacryfice…[65]

This prayer reflected the Calvinist doctrine that Christ was not physically present in the elements because he was in Heaven.[66] According to the Calvinists, it was not possible for the Lord to be in two different places at one and the same time.[67] Cranmer, like Calvin, believed that Christ could not be present in a physical or corporeal way, his glorified body was in Heaven.[68] He rejected the Roman Catholic doctrines of sacrifice, transubstantiation and the Real Presence. He did not, however, adopt a mere memorialist position, for Cranmer the Eucharist was rather more than a recollection Christ's actions on Calvary.[69] Reference in the prayer to the type and meaning of sacrifice indicated Cranmer did not adopt a realist position either.[70] In this prayer it was evident that Christ was present both in Heaven and on earth; but received spiritually on earth through the elements which inwardly and invisibly nourish the communicants whilst Christ's glorified body remained in Heaven. Christ was not corporeally present in the elements, but they were the means by which he was made spiritually present.[71] "For the wonder is, not how God worketh in the outward visible sacrament, but his marvellous work is in the worthy receivers of the sacraments."[72]

---

[65] *The Booke of the Common Prayer* (1549). 223.
[66] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Trans. By Henry Beveridge (Christian Classics Ethereal Library) 14.17; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.vi.xviii.html; retrieved 17 November 2009.
[67] Christopher Elwood, *The Body Broken: The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the Symbolization of Power in Sixteenth Century France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 83.
[68] Thomas Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, Edited by John Edmund Cox (Oxford: The Parker Society, 1849), 47.
[69] Ibid., 87. Also see: Paul Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 90.
[70] The doctrine of realism stated that abstract concepts (universals) existed apart from the individuals (particulars) in which they are embodied. In Eucharistic theology this would effectively remove the Real Presence from the Sacrament. Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 1162.
[71] Paul Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology*. 90. This formula reflected Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist. See: Brian A. Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993), 137.
[72] Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. 66.

The Eucharistic Prayer in the 1549 book followed the model of the Roman Catholic Mass.

> Heare us (o merciful father) we beseech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to bl✠esse and sanc✠tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they may be unto us the body and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe. Who on the same nyght that he was betrayed: tooke breade and when he had blessed, and giuen thankes: he brake it, and gaue it unto his disciples, saing: Take eate this is my bodye which is giuen for you, do this in remebraunce of me. Liekewyse after supper he toke the cuppe, and when he had geuen thankes, he gaue it to them, saing: drynk ye all of this, for this is my bloude of the newe Testament…[73]

This prayer illustrated that Thomas Cranmer (later despised by the High Churchmen as the principal advocate of Protestant theology)[74] was not as staunchly Protestant as often assumed.[75] Additional evidence of this may be found in the same prayer book, for it also sanctioned the use of vestments,[76] and, despite the condemnation of the worship of relics and images it provided:

> ¶ *As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of candles, knocking upon the breast and other gestures: they may be used or left as euery mas deuocion serueth without blame.*[77]

---

[73] *The Booke of Common Prayer* (1549). 222-3.
[74] A view expressed strongly by Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-36). Richard Hurrell Froude, *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A.*, John Henry Newman & John Keble, editors, 2 Volumes (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1839), I: 389.
[75] Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church*. 506.
[76] "Certayne Notes for the More Plain Explicacion and Decent Ministracion of Thinges, Contained in Thys Booke", *The Booke of the Common Prayer.* (1549). 288
[77] Ibid., 289.

The inclusion of the rubric further illustrates the conflicting doctrines which existed throughout the period of the English Reformation.

By 1550 Cranmer considered the Lord's Supper served three essential functions. It was a memorial of Christ's sacrifice; it was a 'Sacrifice of praise'; and through it the faithful partook in the action of 'spiritually feeding upon Christ.'[78] Cranmer believed that the grace of God was undivided, and the grace that was given in the word was the same as that given in the Sacraments. Moreover, Christ's grace and presence in the Eucharist was the same as that in baptism.[79] The 1549 and 1552 prayer books showed Cranmer's theological movement from that of scholastic medieval Roman Catholic Eucharistic doctrine to that which reflected a Calvinist position.[80] He saw the presence of Christ in the elements to be "spiritual", "effectual" and "true".[81]

Like Cranmer, Richard Hooker also rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation and believed Christ was made present by faith in those who received the Eucharistic elements, not in the elements themselves.

> …this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, I give them in hand an actual possession as all such saving grace as my sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them my body.[82]

---

[78] Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999), 257.
[79] Paul Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology*. 90.
[80] Ibid., 89.
[81] Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. 232.
[82] Richard Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* Book V, lxvii, § 12. In: *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of His Life and Death, by Isaac Walton*, arranged by John Keble, 2 Volumes, 2nd Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1865), II: 359.

Hooker rejected any notion the Eucharist was a mere memorial, but his doctrine of the Real Presence was far from the Roman Catholic position. It was a doctrine of 'dynamic receptionism' which declared that the objective reality of divine power and the subjective necessity for faith must exist.[83] The subjectivity of the faith of the receiver contradicted Hooker's ecclesiology. He thought "…the Church which was assembled doth no less continue afterwards than before."[84] As with Cranmer, there existed in Hooker's thought a combination of doctrine from the old and new religions. In forming a *Via Media*[85] Hooker created key doctrines which would become standards in the Anglican Church. The Incarnation was at the core of each of these doctrines. Hooker was not interested in describing how Christ was present in the Eucharist. He believed that, in the Eucharist, Christ made his presence known to us and we were co-mingled with him.[86] Likewise, the presence of Christ in the Church made it a body of loved and loving believers.[87]

Lancelot Andrewes became a principal influence in the development of Anglican Eucharistic doctrine. Andrewes was not a Calvinist; he thought the doctrine should be both reasonable in its outlook and Catholic in its manner.[88] His 'high' theology of the Eucharist allowed for both the Real Presence in the elements and for a memorial of Christ's sacrifice to be made present at the words of institution. Andrewes accepted all the patristic "…witnesses speak of mutation, immutation, transmutation."[89] Also, he added: "As for ourselves, we do not deny this preposition *trans* here, and we grant that

---

[83] Horton Davies. *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690*, 6 Volumes (Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), II: 293.
[84] Richard Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Book III, i, § 14. In: *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of His Life and Death, by Isaac Walton*, arranged by John Keble, 2 Volumes, 2nd Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1841), I: 351.
[85] Nicholls, *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism.* 37-53.
[86] Phillip B. Secor, *Richard Hooker: Prophet of Anglicanism* (Tunbridge Wells, Kent: Burns & Oates, 2000), 201.
[87] Ibid., 202.
[88] Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* 52.
[89] Lancelot Andrewes, *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* (Oxonii: Johannes Henricus Parker, 1851), 262.

the elements are transmuted."[90] He rejected the Catholic doctrine of sacrifice as one which was a "…Christ made of bread… ."[91] Andrewes' doctrine of sacrifice was expressed through the image of the Good Shepherd, an image depicted on the bowl of his own chalice.[92] The image of Christ the Good Shepherd carrying the lamb on his shoulders had no parallel in contemporary European art but was uniquely seventeenth-century Anglican.[93] The image represented the twofold signs of Christ caring for his sheep and willing to sacrifice his life for them. (cf. John 10:14-18.) It was assumed that, as a scholar of the Patristic period, Andrewes knew of the reference made by Tertullian in the *De Pudicitia* "…the Shepherd will play the patron whom you depict on your chalice."[94] Andrewes considered the mixed chalice represented the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross when blood and water flowed from his side. This was evidence he perceived the sacrificed Christ and the Church to be intrinsically linked. Yet further evidence of Andrewes' high doctrine of the Eucharist was demonstrated by the symbol of a star on his Communion plate. This represented the star of the wise men. In a sermon delivered on Christmas Day 1620 Andrewes preached "…in the old ritual of the Church we find on the cover of the Canister wherein was the Sacrament of His Body, there was a star engraven to shew us that now the Star leads us thither, to his Body there."[95] This could only mean that Christ was truly present on the altar.[96]

> And what shall I say now, but according as St. John saith, and the star, and the wise men say, 'Come.' And He, Whose the star is, and to Whom the wise men

[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Lancelot Andrewes, "A Sermon Preached Before Queen Elizabeth, at Greenwich on the Twenty-fourth of February, A.D. MDXC, Being St. Matthias' Day", *Ninety Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes*, J. P. Wilson & J. Bliss, eds, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 11 Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841), II: 29.
[93] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690*, 6 Volumes (Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), II: 306.
[94] Tertullian. *De Pudicitia*. Chapter X.
[95] Lancelot Andrewes, "A Sermon Preached Before The King's Majesty at Whitehall on the Twenty-fifth of December, A.D. MDCXX, Being Christmas' Day", *Ninety Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes*, J. P. Wilson & J. Bliss, editors, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 11 Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841), I: 248.
[96] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690*. II: 307.

> came, saith, 'Come.' And let them who are disposed, 'Come.' And [247/248] let whosoever will, take of the 'Bread of Life, which came down from Heaven' this day into Bethlehem, the house of bread. Of which Bread the Church is this day the house, the true Bethlehem, and all the Bethlehem we have now left to come to for the Bread of life…[97]

This was a remarkably Catholic view of the Sacrament, one which Newman would proclaim as the Mass in all but transubstantiation.[98]

Andrewes' doctrine of Sacrifice further reflected Catholic belief, he noted: "Our men believe that the Eucharist was instituted by the Lord for a memorial of Himself, even of His Sacrifice…not only to be a Sacrament and for spiritual nourishment."[99] For Andrewes, Christ's Presence was real. He did not seek to explain the method of the Presence but believed the Word changed what were mere elements into the Sacrament. The substance remained as it was.[100]

The belief that grace was transmitted through the Eucharist was in evidence elsewhere in Andrewes' writings. His poems were a particularly rich source of Eucharistic doctrine, no more so than those which appeared in *The Greek Devotions*. Newman translated, arranged and published *The Greek Devotions* in 1840 as *Tract 88*. It has been described as a "glorious bejeweled patchwork"[101] sitting second only to the *Book of Common Prayer* as a guide to prayer. The work was drawn from sources which were important to all Anglicans from

---

[97] Andrewes. "A Sermon Preached before the King's Majesty at Whitehall on the Twenty-fifth of December, A.D. MDCXX, Being Christmas' Day", *Ninety Six Sermons*. I:248-9.
[98] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 84. Also see: Newman, *Apologia*, 102.
[99] Andrewes. *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini*. 266.
[100] William Barclay, *The Lord's Supper* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 99.
[101] Christopher L. Webber, compiler, *Give us Grace: An Anthology of Anglican Prayers* (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 2004), 30.

the time of the Reformation, "…the Bible, the Prayer book, the early fathers and the Eastern Church."[102] Andrewes' *Manual of Private Devotions* contained prayers in which the petitions of the faithful were carried in to heaven by angels and were answered with the gift of grace.[103] The gift of God's grace was given in the Eucharist. What was significant in Andrewes' prayers was the intercessory action of the angels. This was in apparent contradiction of *Article XXII*, which railed against the invocation of any authority other than Scripture to secure salvation. All were conformed to the perfection of God by becoming what was eaten in the Eucharistic banquet.[104]

John Cosin followed in the tradition of both Hooker[105] and Andrewes. Like them, he also argued against the doctrine of transubstantiation, but looked to the early Church for a doctrine of the Real Presence.[106] Christ's Real Presence could not be apprehended by human minds; rather it was gifted through God's omnipotence. The human mind, "…whether it can do this or that…" cannot presume "…to measure an infinite power by (its) poor ability… ."[107] Cosin stated that when Christ at the Last Supper declared "This is my body" and "This is my blood" he did not say how his body and blood existed in the elements of the bread and the wine. Cosin argued that the doctrine of transubstantiation's insistence this reality came about because of a formula of 'accident' and 'substance' was to confuse the sign with the substance – the bread with the Body.

---

[102] Ibid.
[103] Lancelot Andrewes, *A Manual of the Private Devotions and Meditations of the Right Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes*, Richard Drake, translator & editor (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1648), 86-9.
[104] Lancelot Andrewes, "A Sermon Preached Before Queen Elizabeth, at Greenwich on the Twenty-fourth of May, A.D. MDCXVIII, Being Whit-Sunday", *Ninety Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes*, John Posthumus Parkinson, translator, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 11 Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1850), III: 309.
[105] Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses 1600-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 48.
[106] John Cosin, *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham*, George Ornsby, editor, 5 Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1851), IV: 178*f.*
[107] John Cosin, *The History of Popish Transubstantiation*, John Sherren Brewer, editor (London and Oxford: J. Leslie & John Henry Parker, 1840), 57.

Christ, signified in the bread, did not require the destruction of the elements. Cosin affirmed the omnipotence of God.[108]

John Bramhall professed a Sacramental and Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and also argued the human mind should not presume to analyse the mysteries or omnipotence of God.

> …whether it be in the soul only, or in the Host also, and if not in the Host, whether by consubstantiation, or transubstantiation, whether by production, or adduction, or conservation, or by assumption, or by whatsoever other way bold and blind men dare conjecture – we determine not.[109]

Bramhall did not accept the doctrine of 'dynamic receptionism.' It was impossible for human minds to determine the Real Presence.[110] He referred to the Eucharistic element as the Host, rather than the Bread. This was exceptional, even amongst the Divines.[111]

Cosin believed Christ was present in the Eucharist sacramentally, spiritually, truly and really.[112] Unlike Bramhall, Cosin maintained the theology of 'dynamic receptionism.' Christ was made present "…to the souls of all them that come faithfully and devoutly to receive Him according to His own institution in that Holy Sacrament."[113] He asserted

---

[108] Cosin, "A Paper Concerning the Chief Points of Differences in Religion betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England, Written to the Late Countess of Peterborough, By Dr. John Cosin, Afterwards Lord Bishop of Durham." "The Differences." *Works*. IV: §6. 333.
[109] John Bramhall, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall D.D*. John Vesey, editor, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 5 Volumes. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), I: 22.
[110] Davies. *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 298.
[111] Jack Cunningham, *James Ussher and John Bramhall: The Theology and Politics of Two Irish Ecclesiastics of the Seventeenth Century* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 74.
[112] John Cosin, "A Paper Concerning the Chief Points of Differences in Religion Betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England, Written to the Late Countess of Peterborough, By Dr. John Cosin, Afterwards Lord Bishop of Durham." "Our Agreements." *Works*. IV: §8. 336.
[113] Ibid., 156, 179.

that Scripture did not report how Christ was present in the bread and wine, neither did the Primitive Church. But Cosin went beyond 'dynamic receptionism.'

> …we do not say that that in the Lord's Supper we receive only the benefits of Christ's Death and Passion, but we join the ground with its fruits, that is, Christ, with those advantages we derive from Him, affirming with Paul, that "the bread that we break is *κοινωνία* and the cup that we bless the communion cup of His Blood, -of that very substance which He took of the Blessed Virgin and Carried into Heaven…[114]

John Cosin argued the Eucharist was not merely a memorial consisting only of signs. Cosin's Eucharistic theology concurred largely with that of John Calvin (1509-64).[115]

> "If any one," saith he, "ask me concerning the manner, I will not be ashamed to confess that it is a secret too high for my reason to comprehend, or my tongue to express; or to speak more properly, I rather feel than understand it: therefore without disputing I embrace the truth of GOD, and confidently repose on it."[116]

Both argued that the omnipotence of God brought about the change in the bread and wine to become the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.[117]

Cosin considered there were four areas of disagreement between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed churches regarding the Real Presence. Firstly, the 'Popish' argument that the accidents, the outward signs of bread and wine, were not representative of the inner substances of the Body and Blood of Christ. Cosin argued the inner substances of bread and wine did not change, but they remained what they were. There was no

---

[114] Ibid., 174.
[115] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 298.
[116] Cosin, *The History of Popish Transubstantiation*. 48-9. Cosin quoted from Calvin's, *Epistolae*. 575, 588.
[117] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 293-4. Barclay, *The Lord's Supper*. 87.

outward sign of an inner reality. Secondly, the assertion the Protestants held that the merits of Christ's death were represented in the Eucharist merely as a memorial of Christ's passion. Cosin stated the Body and Blood of Christ were present in the Eucharistic elements and truly received by the faithful. The elements were changed from what they were prior to the words of institution, but in an unspecified and unknown way. Thirdly, there was a union between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ, but the substance of bread and wine was not abolished. Moreover, the Sacramental presence of Christ did not continue when the elements were not in use. The doctrine of 'divine receptionism', which placed the Real Presence within the hearts of men and women of faith, stated that Christ should be worshipped in the Eucharist, but there should not be 'bread worship.' Finally, Cosin rejected any notion that Christ was corporally, carnally or naturally present in the Eucharist. Rather, the faithful with their hearts and discernment received the Holy Sacrament. But, without a faithful heart there could be no reception, hence, the concept that any person could efficaciously receive the Sacrament because Christ was present in it was rejected.[118]

The difficulty remained as to how Christ was present on the altar. The Creeds of the Church stated that after Christ's rising from the dead he was now "…seated at the right hand of God the Father." If Christ was in heaven, how could he be also present in the Eucharist? The principle of 'dynamic receptionism' placed the Real Presence within the hearts of those who were of faith. Christ was not otherwise present. Moreover, it was the Holy Spirit within the faithful which opened them to the Presence of Christ within the Sacrament. In what way, therefore, was Christ's Eucharistic Presence distinct from his presence in the Scriptures? At the Last Supper Christ said "Take eat, this is my Body" not "This is my Spirit." The faithful were nourished by the Holy Spirit, but they could

[118] Cosin, *The History of Popish Transubstantiation*. 56*f*.

not "eat" the Spirit.[119] Cosin glossed over this serious difficulty by arguing the bread was both Mystical and Sacramental. He argued that as Baptism changed children into spiritual beings through Regeneration, so in the same way the words of consecration change common bread into the Sacrament. Cosin stated it was the words which effected the transition.[120] But it was difficult for Cosin to maintain Christ was mystically present in the Sacrament without some change, abolition or diminution of the physical elements.[121] Whilst he advanced the Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence beyond one which relied wholly on faith within the believers, Cosin did not successfully answer the question as to how Christ was present.[122]

The difficulties concerning Christ's presence in the Eucharist were addressed by Bishop William Nicholson (1591-1672). Christ was present:

1. Divinely, as God, and so He is present in all places. *Whither shall I flee from Thy presence? I, the Lord, fill heaven and earth.*
2. Spiritually, and so He is present in the hearts of true believers. *Christ dwells in our hearts by faith.*
3. Sacramentally, and so He is present in the Sacrament because He hath ordained the Sacrament to represent and communicate Christ's death to us. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of Christ, etc.?
4. Corporally, so present in Judea in the days of His flesh.[123]

---

[119] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 295.
[120] Cosin, *The History of Popish Transubstantiation*. 77*f*.
[121] Clifford William Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland* (London & New York: S.P.C.K & The Macmillan Company, 1942), 89-90.
[122] This was a difficulty which Newman addressed in Section 8 of *Tract 90*.
[123] William Nicholson, *An Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England. By the Right Reverend Father in God William Nicholson, Sometime Lord Bishop of Gloucester* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), 179.

Bishop Nicholson also contributed a further clarification of the theology of the Real Presence. He defined the meaning of the term 'Real' in the context of the Eucharistic Presence. Christ's presence was real, as opposed to pretended, imaginary, fanciful, figurative, barely representative, or metaphorical. Christ was present "…divinely after a special manner…spiritually in the heart of the communicants (and) sacramentally or relatively in the elements." But, Christ was not present "…corporally, bodily, casually or locally… ."[124]

Despite Nicholson's attempts at clarification, his position was difficult to apprehend. Whilst he accepted Christ was sacramentally present in the elements, he did not accept Christ was corporally present. Hence, the difficulty remained, as it did for all the Anglican Divines, to provide an adequate explanation as to how Christ was present. To argue Christ was present sacramentally in the elements, but not corporally present, was fraught with difficulties. If Nicholson had argued Christ was sacramentally present in the action of the celebration of the whole Eucharist his contention would have been on stronger ground.[125]

To separate the Church of England further from Roman Catholic and Protestant Eucharistic doctrines, the Caroline Divines sought to present a doctrine on the nature of Sacrifice. Individually they presented a doctrine of Sacrifice which demonstrated a remarkable conformity, one which closely approximated to Cranmer's theology of 'double indwelling.' The Divines sought to address the nature of Sacrifice in the Communion liturgy. The Divines recognised Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross was unique and could not be repeated, hence any notion of a propitiatory Sacrifice was not

---

[124] Ibid.
[125] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 296.

acceptable, and neither was the Communion liturgy a mere memorial. Among the Divines who addressed this difficulty was Jeremy Taylor.

> …as Christ is a priest in heaven for ever, and yet does not Sacrifice Himself afresh, nor yet without a Sacrifice could be a priest; but by a daily ministration and intercession representeth His Sacrifice to God, and offers Himself as sacrificed; so he does upon earth by the ministry of His servants; He is offered to God, that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented or offered up to God, as Sacrificed.[126]

This doctrine contained three clear elements: the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ was unique; the Son as the High Priest was required to present Sacrifice to God the Father through prayer and intercession; and, the Church represented the Body of Christ. In the same way Christ presented Sacrifice to God, so did the Church by way of prayer and intercession.

> There He sits (in Heaven), a High Priest continually, and offers still the one perfect Sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate, in order to perpetual and never failing events. And this His ministers do on earth. They offer up the same Sacrifice to God, the Sacrifice of the Cross by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment according to His Holy institution…[127]

---

[126] Jeremy Taylor, "The Corruptions of the Church of Rome", *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor and Dromore*, Reginald Heber, editor, 10 Volumes (London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans *et al*, 1850), II: 643.

[127] Jeremy Taylor, *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor and Dromore*, Reginald Heber, editor, 10 Volumes (London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans *et al*, 1859), I: 33.

Taylor was both a Virtualist[128] and Receptionist[129]; he also recognised that the Holy Spirit united the faithful on earth and the glorified Body of Christ in Heaven.[130] In 1658 he published *A Collection of Offices* which restored the ἀνάμνησις (missing since the 1549 *Prayer Booke*) to the Communion Rite.[131] The Spirit was called upon to transform the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, but to illustrate the Anglican dilemma the Holy Spirit was also called down to "…sanctify and enlighten our hearts." Hence the impasse remained: how was Christ present in the Eucharist? Taylor recognised the role of the Holy Spirit in the transformation of the bread and the wine, but he also remained committed to the Anglican doctrine of 'dynamic receptionism.' Taylor also advanced the Eucharistic doctrine further by recognising it was not the Spirit being held up to God in Sacrifice but Christ's Body. "Our very holding up the Son of God and representing Him to His Father is the doing an act of mediation and advantage to ourselves in the virtue and efficacy of the Mediator."[132]

The view held by Jeremy Taylor was similar to that later held by Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672)[133] who concluded:

> …the Sacrament of the Eucharist is at the same Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross (as that which representeth is truly said to be the thing which it

---

[128] The bread and wine remain unchanged after consecration, but through faith the communicant received through them the virtue and power of the Body and Blood of Christ. John Calvin was a main exponent of this doctrine. Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 1163.
[129] The bread and wine remain unchanged after consecration, but through faith the communicant received them as the Body and Blood of Christ. Ibid.
[130] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 298.
[131] Jeremy Taylor, *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor and Dromore*, Reginald Heber, editor, 15 Volumes (London: Ogle, Duncan & Co. *et al*, 1822), XV: 299-300.
[132] Jeremy Taylor, *The Great Exemplar: Or, The Life of Our Ever-Blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ*, 2 Volumes (New York: Robert Carter & Bros., 1859), II: 241.
[133] Herbert Thorndike, *The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike*, 6 Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1852), IV: 108.

> representeth) is also propitiatory and impetratory by virtue of the consecration of it, whereby it becometh the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross.[134]

Thorndike had introduced the view that the Eucharist was propitiatory and moved away from the notion it was a memorial Sacrifice. He further concluded the elements, before they were consecrated, were to be counted as oblations or sacrifices.[135] The different attempts by the Divines to define a particular Anglican doctrine of sacrifice set the Anglican Eucharistic doctrine apart from Calvinism.[136] In essence it was Thorndike's definition of the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which pointed to the problem of the Anglican position. The Caroline Divines had moved away from the Calvinist position to one which was as close as possible to the Roman Catholic Eucharistic doctrine. In doing so, they adopted much of the language of transubstantiation. The Divines rejected this doctrine as a later Roman error. Consequently, the Anglican doctrine was neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant; it represented the *Via Media* between the two extremes. This was the ground on which the Tractarians would build their later arguments.[137]

Beyond the arguments concerning the doctrines of Sacrifice and Eucharistic Presence lay yet another conundrum. If Christ was present in the Eucharist, what effect did participation in the Sacrament have? Cosin argued participation in the Eucharist resulted in κοινωνία with Christ and with fellow communicants.[138] Taylor contended through prayer and intercession the Church offered sacrifice on earth paralleling Christ who offered the one perfect sacrifice to his Father in heaven.[139] In this sense the Church acted

---

[134] Ibid., 117.
[135] Ibid., 107.
[136] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. II: 298.
[137] Phillip Sheldrake, editor, *The New Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 109-111.
[138] Cosin, *Works*. IV: 174.
[139] Jeremy Taylor, "The Corruptions of the Church of Rome." *Works*, 10 Volumes, II: 643.

as the Body of Christ. The Eucharist and liturgical prayer were, according to Andrewes, the sources of divine grace. [140] Bramhall believed divine grace came from the Sacraments; it motivated men and women to do good works and to be 'naturally' motivated towards God.[141] Nature ordered the existence of religion and the worship of God.[142] Bramhall perceived religion was "…efficacious towards the preservation of a society… ." He considered societies "…without religion…are but like soapy bubbles, quickly dissolved."[143] The Caroline Divines had a strong sense of God's grace at work in the world to form a divine society. The Protestant doctrine of individual election was not accepted, rather, grace and salvation were conveyed through the Sacraments.[144] The manner in which the Church of England was formed meant separation of Church and State was not possible.[145]

In *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1595) Hooker placed a great deal of emphasis on the requirement for government in both Church and State for the supernatural and natural good of society.[146] He believed in the authority of Scripture, reason and tradition as the basis for understanding God's revelation in the world.[147] Hooker also believed the good ordering of God's creation was found within the laws of nature.[148] This presented the Church as an organic entity with the possibility for change; it was not a static institution.[149] The laws of nature precluded the Church and the State from being one

---

[140] Ronald H. Fritze & William B. Robison, editors, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 15.
[141] Cunningham, *James Ussher and John Bramhall.* 43.
[142] Ibid.
[143] John Bramhall. *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall D.D.* 5 Volumes. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844) IV. 520.
[144] Cf. John Henry Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), 303.
[145] Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Church of England 1533-1603." Eamon Duffy; Peter Lake; Dairmaid MacCulloch; Judith Maltby; Peter Nockles; *et al.*, *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, Stephen Platten, editor (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 38.
[146] Nicholls, *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism.* 50.
[147] Secor, *Richard Hooker: Prophet of Anglicanism.* viii, 112.
[148] Austin Cooper, editor, *The Church in the Modern World: A Handbook* (Melbourne: CTC, 1991), 66.
[149] Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 665.

entity. The Church of England and the Commonwealth were distinguished in nature and definition. The society politic which embraced the true religion adopted the name Church.

> …so, albeit properties and actions of one kind do cause the name of a commonwealth, qualities and functions of another sort the name of a Church to be given unto a multitude, yet one and the selfsame multitude may in any such sort be both, that no person appertaining to the one can be denied to also be of the other….[150]

Whilst it may appear the Church was beholden to the State, as in the Erastian model, Hooker stated the Church held the truth of religion, and therefore this made it distinct from any other body politic. This, along with other arguments, lacked some clarity, for in his defence of the right of Christian princes to govern the Church, the laws of nature allowed for the Church to develop separately.

According to Richard Field (1561-1616) the Church differed from all other human societies in three ways. First, all accepted the supernatural truths which were revealed in Christ. Second, the faithful participated in the ceremonies and Sacraments of the Church instituted by Christ, and through their participation they were called to Godliness, to remain sinless, maintain the memorials of Christ's gifts to all, maintain the purity and integrity of belief and keep distinct all which marked a Christian Church from all other human societies. Lastly, the Church was governed by ministers who were "…appointed, authorised and sanctified…" to lead the faithful to eternal salvation by the administration of the Sacraments.[151]

---

[150] Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Book VIII, Ch. I. 3. [3], *Works*. II: 486.
[151] Richard Field, *Of The Church, Five Books*, 3 Volumes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), I: Book I, 65.

Field believed the marks of the true Church were antiquity, succession, unity, universality, and the name 'Catholic.'[152] There was no suggestion in his writings the Church was anything other than a society of the faithful. It was not to be perceived as a grouping of individuals who held the same or similar views.[153]

Richard Montagu (1577-1641) also defined the nature of Church, its ministry and its Sacraments.

> What the Church [*i.e.*, the Church of England] believeth, I believe; what it teacheth, I teach; what it rejecteth, I reject; what it doth not tender, I am not tied unto. …by the means and ministry of that Church, I received that earnest of my salvation, when by baptism I was inserted into Christ. In the union and communion of that Church I have lived…[154]

Montagu identified the key elements of the Church as adherence to the faith, baptism into the Body of Christ and participation in the Sacraments so as to remain in communion with the Church. The elements identified by Montagu paralleled those of Cosin. Likewise, Montagu mirrored Jeremy Taylor's assertion that the Sacrifice of the Church as Christ's Body on earth was proximate to the Son's Sacrifice to God the Father in heaven. Those who were members of the Church could not but help be, through participation in the Sacraments, participants in a divine action and participants in a divine society. Montagu had a 'high' view of the Church; he considered ordination without

---

[152] Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 512.
[153] Paul D. L. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (London: T & T Clark/Continuum, 2002), 52.
[154] Richard Montagu, *Appello Caesarem. A Iust Appeale From Two Vniust Informers* (London: Humphrey & Matthew Lownes, 1625), Part I, Chapter V, 48.

bishops was no ordination and a Church without episcopacy was no Church. He accepted the Church of Rome to be a true Church and accepted Roman orders.[155]

This view of the Church was also held by William Laud. In holding such a 'high' view, the Caroline Divines set themselves a conundrum, for they were also proponents of the divine right of kings. But, for Laud and Andrewes the power of Christ was ascribed to the king. Laud announced at Charles I's accession service: "The King is God's immediate lieutenant upon earth, and the power which resides in the King is…God's."[156] Protestant doctrine required individuals to form their own faith; the High Church perceived the faithful were under the governance of God, the king and the bishops. Each of this triumvirate was seen to be essential. The two human powers received their authority from the divine power and the hierarchy set up in this schema demanded there be a further hierarchy, a divine society owing their fidelity to God, but a God experienced through temporal powers.[157] The Erastian model, which saw intermingling of Church and State, would later be rejected by the Tractarians. Richard Hurrell Froude perceived the power of the Church came from God. In this he found himself in surprising agreement with Calvin.[158]

The Caroline Divines also held the doctrine that the Church of England was a branch of the Catholic Church.[159] They sought to establish a nexus between the English Church and the Church Catholic by seeking to ascertain the universal beliefs held by those who

---

155 Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*. 140.
156 Ibid., 62.
157 Montagu. *Appello Caesarem*. Part I, Chapter V, 65-6.
158 Richard Hurrell Froude, *The Remains of the Late Richard Hurrell Froude M.A.*, John Henry Newman & John Keble, editors, 2 Volumes (Derby: Henry Mozley & Son, 1839), I: 394.
159 Paul D. L. Avis, *Beyond the Reformation: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition* (London: T & T Clark/Continuum, 2006), 13.

remained within the tradition of the ancient Church and those Churches which had strayed from the path of orthodoxy. Richard Montagu wrote of the Church of England:

> …I hope to live and die in the Faith and Confession of that Church, than which I know none, nor can any be named, in all points more conformable unto purest Antiquity in the best times.[160]

Richard Hooker wrote that the Catholic Church was like the sea; it was constituted by "divers names" and "divers precincts." Likewise, "…the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a member of different Societies."[161] Hence the Caroline Divines presented the argument that whilst there was one Catholic Church it existed in different, sometimes national, Churches and its integrity was measured against the teachings which pre-dated the later corruptions introduced by the Roman Catholic Church. William Sherlock (1641-1707) wrote:

> The profeffion of the true Faith and Worship of Chrift makes a true Church, and all true Churches are the One Catholick Church…Now as no Church is the Catholick Church of Christ, how far foever it has fpread itself over the world, unlefs it profefs the true Faith of Chrift, no more is any Faith the Catholick Church, however universally foever it be profeffed, unlefs it be the true faith of Chrift.[162]

Lancelot Andrewes believed "…the English Protestant Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church to be the one the same Church of Christ."[163] In this statement he used the antithetical terms "Protestant" and "Catholic" to describe the one entity. He qualified

---

[160] Montague, *Appello Caesarem.* Part I, Chapter v, 48.
[161] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Book III, i, § 14. *Works.* I: 351.
[162] William Sherlock, *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Bleffed Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Son of God* (London: W. Rogers, 1690), 35*f.*
[163] Tobie Matthew & Arthur Harris Mathew, *A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobi Matthew to the Holy Catholic Faith with the Antecedents and Consequences Thereof* (Genoa, IL: Benzinger, 1904), 99.

his use of the term "Protestant" on the grounds it was of "temporary convenience"[164] until the Church of Rome had rid itself of those abuses which caused the unity of the Church to fracture. The Church of England was not a Reformed Church, according to Andrewes, in the sense the Protestant Churches on the Continent were, but in the sense the Church of England had put its house in order, whilst the Roman Catholic Church remained unreformed.[165] The English Church was the Catholic Church, but "…the one better swept, and more cleanly kept, and more substantially repaired…"[166] than the Church of Rome. Bramhall also used a metaphor to define the Church of England.

> I make not the least doubt in the world, but that the Church of England before the Reformation and the Church of England after the Reformation are as much the same Church, as a garden, before it is weeded and after it is weeded, is the same garden; or a vine, before it is pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxuriant branches is one and the same vine.[167]

In his work, *A Just Vindication of the Church of England*, Bramhall railed against schism within the Catholic Church. He wrote in the flyleaf "…my name is Christian, my surname is Catholic: by the one I am known from infidels; by the other from heretics and schismatics."[168]

> If one part of the universal Church do separate itself from the another part, not absolutely, but respectively in abuses and innovations; not as it is a part of the universal Church, but only so far as it is corrupted and degenerated; it doth still retain a communion, not only with the Catholic Church, and with all the

---

[164] Lancelot Andrewes, *The English Theological Works of Lancelot Andrewes, Sometime Bishop of Winchester*, J. Bliss and J. P. Wilson, editors, 11 Volumes, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854), VIII: 26.
[165] Ibid.
[166] Matthew & Mathew. *Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobi Matthew to the Holy Catholic Faith*. 99-100.
[167] Bramhall, *Works*. I: 113.
[168] Bramhall, "A Just Vindication of the Church of England From the Unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schism", *Works*. I: 84.

> orthodox members of the Catholic Church, but even with that corrupted Church from which it is separated, except only in corruptions.[169]

Bramhall perceived all the national Catholic Churches were equal, but Rome had usurped a greater share of power and hence created the schism.[170] He considered the terms 'Roman' and 'Catholic' were not 'convertibles.'[171]

The writings of the Anglican Divines were imbued with the concept that the Church to which they belonged was the same Church which had begun not in the year 1537, but one thousand years before.[172] *The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion* defined the three measures of authenticity were the Church's subscription to the Creeds (*Article VIII*), the first four œcumenial councils (*Article XXI*) and the form of the Church (*Article XXXIV*). John Cosin[173] and Jeremy Taylor[174] used similar measures of genuineness to determine the Catholicity of the Church of England. Andrewes considered the authenticity of Catholicity to be measured by "…one canon, two testaments, three creeds, four general councils, five centuries and the series of fathers in that period… ."[175]

The legacy of the Caroline Divines was incalculable. In a period of revolution and change, both ecclesiastical and political, they represented and protected the golden thread of Catholicity which had always permeated the Anglican Church. The Divines protected the heritage of the Catholic Church in its orthodoxy, its form and its

---

169 Bramhall, *Works*. I: 100.
170 Cunningham, *James Ussher and John Bramhall.* 36.
171 Bramhall, *Works*. I: 42.
172 Martin Thornton, "John Cosin: Foundation or Embarrassment", *The Month* (January 1975), 13.
173 Cosin, "A Paper Written to the Late Countess of Peterborough." "Our Agreements." Cosin, *Works*. IV: §8. 336.
174 Jeremy Taylor, *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor and Dromore*, Reginald Heber, editor, 15 Volumes (London: Ogle, Duncan & Co. *et al*, 1822), XI: 185.
175 Lancelot Andrewes, *Opuscula*. 86. Cited in: Henry R. McAdoo, *The Sprit of Anglicanism: a survey of Anglican Theological method in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1965), 320.

teaching. The liturgy was held precious throughout the period of the Long Parliament. Against the extreme of Puritanism and against many of the innovations of the Continental Reformation, the Caroline Divines held core tenets of faith, theology and ecclesiology, which defined the Church of England as unique amongst those Churches which were dismembered from Rome. Unique in the theology of the Church of England was the doctrine of 'dynamic receptionism', an attempt to explain the Real Presence in the Eucharist without diminishing the mystery of the Holy Communion. While not unique amongst Reformed Churches with regards to the preservation of the episcopacy, there were particular truths held by the High Church party which were unique. Examples of these were their doctrine of the Apostolic Succession and their belief in the Cyprianic precept.[176]

The Caroline Divines, as with Cranmer, appealed to antiquity for the authority in which to ground the *bona fides* of The Church of England. This was a Church swept clean of the excrescencies of the Church of Rome. These, particularly the doctrine of transubstantiation, were held to be later developments, which found no authority in Scripture or the Creeds, Councils or Fathers of the first five centuries. The appeal to the authority of the Church's teachings had an important implication. The Church of England was brought to look beyond its foundation by a political action and, in doing so, perceived itself to be a separate entity to the State. Even the leading Erastian Richard Hooker understood the Church was a unique polity. Andrewes and Laud in particular founded a theological view of the Church which was founded on a

[176] Cyprian (258) argued that where "…bishop has followed bishop in succession, and the office of the episcopate and the system of the Church has been handed down…" those bishops have authority given to them precisely because they are successors of the Apostles who received their authority from Christ. Because the Bishops of the Church of England met all three of these conditions, despite the Reformation, they were still in Apostolic Succession. See: *Cyprian on the Episcopate. Epistle* xxxiii. 1. Cited in: Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*. 73.

'high' understanding of the Real Presence, the episcopacy and beauty.[177] Laud's insistence that the Catholic form of the Church remained, particularly in its liturgy and buildings, provided the unshakable foundations upon which the Catholicity of the English Church was founded.[178] These beliefs held by Caroline Divines were the basis on which the Tractarians built their arguments, initially against the direct intervention of the government in the affairs of the Church, and then to the revitalisation of the Church.

[177] MacCulloch, "The Church of England 1533-1603", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 41.
[178] Cunningham, *James Ussher and John Bramhall*. 64.

CHAPTER 2

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

In the years 1833-45, the Oxford Movement developed the most comprehensive corpus of Anglican systematic theology and ecclesiology since that presented by the Caroline Divines.[179] In this twelve-year period, the Oxford Movement was foremost an association of university dons, which presented intellectual evidence to support the concept of the Church of England as one which remained firmly within the Catholic tradition.[180] Such tradition was also enshrined in *The Book of Common Prayer*, which overtly presented a Catholic concept of the Church. This was one of Church order, of commitment to services, which, in all but name, represented the seven Catholic Sacraments, and in the three-fold ministry of bishop, priest and deacon.[181] The Church had not encountered this level of challenge to its authority and stability since the time of Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) and Parliamentary supremacy. The Tractarians sought to counter this challenge by reference to the tradition of the Church. The vital matter confronting the Tractarians concerned the Church's basis of its authority.[182]

The series of documents, which was pivotal in mounting a defence of the Church, was the *Tracts for the Times*. Members of Oxford University published ninety Tracts in all. They ranged from short pamphlets through to publications that were 400 pages in length.[183] A number of writers wrote the tracts, but the driving force was undoubtedly Newman. He wrote both the first and the last in the series, and both caused considerable furore and

---

[179] Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times.* ix, 33.
[180] Ibid., 19, 34.
[181] Ibid., 37, 52, 60-1.
[182] Ibid., 5*f.*
[183] Cooper, "Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record.* 347.

significant controversy for their unsubtle assault on the lethargy of the clergy and the doctrine of the Church.

Fundamental to Tractarian doctrine was the principle of the *Via Media*, which the Tractarians found within the works of the Caroline Divines. The Caroline Divines promoted the reasoned religion of the English Church as the true religion, the same religion brought to England by Augustine of Canterbury (*d.* 604/5) in the sixth century. Bishop John Jebb (1775-1833) considered:

> The Protestant communions on the continent have not so much pretended to revere antiquity. The Church of Rome has not been wanting in the pretension; but instead of revering antiquity she has idolized herself. The Church of England alone has adopted a middle course; moving in the same delightful path and treading the same hallowed footsteps with Vincentius and the Catholic Bishops and ancient Fathers; proceeding as far as they proceeded; and stopping where they stopped.[184]

The Tractarians further argued that the Church of England must refer to antiquity to establish its *bona fides* as a Church whose bishops were true descendents of the Apostles.[185]

The seventeenth century witnessed a rupture between the fundamentalist Puritans and the Caroline Divines, who held a moderate religious position.[186] During the period of Cromwell's Commonwealth, the Puritans took extreme measures to repress the Church

---

[184] John Jebb, *Sermons on Subjects Chiefly Practical; With Illustrative Notes and an Appendix, Relating to the Character of the Church of England, as Distinguished Both From Other Branches of the Reformation, and From the Modern Church of Rome* (London: James Duncan, 1838), 386.
[185] James Pereiro, *"Ethos" and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 82.
[186] Nicholls, *The Panther and the Hind.* 54*f.*

of England. For his courageous love of the Church of England, Archbishop Laud was martyred in 1645.[187] Others, including John Cosin, were compelled to flee to France, where he served at the English Court in exile. There were aspects of this period that held particular significance for the much later development of Tractarianism. Firstly, by the end of this century Anglicanism had survived numerous religious wars and divergences in the religious loyalty of Britain's monarchs. Both Charles II (1630-85) and James II (1633-1701) attempted to allow greater toleration of Catholics and others who dissented from the Anglican hegemony.[188] The Glorious Bloodless Revolution of 1688 and the accession to power of William of Orange (1650-1702) marked the end of the seventeenth-century attempts at religious toleration in England. The Hanoverians later adopted Hooker's slightly Erastian principles in their purest interpretation.[189] A group of Churchmen, the Nonjurors, refused to swear the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to William and Mary because this action would abrogate their previous oaths sworn to James II and his successors. The Nonjurors were significant in that they believed the Church was a divine society with its own laws. They laid a strong emphasis on the external forms of liturgical worship. These concepts had strong resonance with the Oxford Movement.[190]

A religious torpor marked the beginning of the nineteenth century. There was evidence of decline in the religious fervour of the English people. The Church failed to awaken spirituality in the believers. There was also the failure of the Wesleyan movement to engender a revival of faith. On Easter Day, 1800, in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, there was one celebration of the Lord's Supper. Perhaps, even more alarmingly, there were

---

187 Ibid., 58-60.
188 Ibid., 1*f.*
189 Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker.* 196.
190 Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 979-80.

only six communicants.[191] The Nonjurors, small in number, cut themselves off from the mainstream Church and had no power or influence in ecclesiastical matters. After the upheaval of the previous three centuries, Britain had enjoyed a period of relative calm and many had turned their attention to other pursuits, notably that of attaining wealth and empire. Yet there remained the vestiges of the High Church party, especially during the reign of George III (1738-1820).[192] From 1760 onwards, High Churchmen received preferment for appointment as bishops. In the early part of the nineteenth century, a group of Churchmen, later known as the Hackney Phalanx, was notably influential in government circles in promoting the cause of clergy to fill vacant Sees.[193] The question remained open as to what part, if any, this group had in ensuring the High Church tradition remained intact. They did claim to be Laudians. A member of the Phalanx, Charles Daubeny (1745-1827), the Archdeacon of Surrey wrote:

> By the Catholic Church was heretofore understood that visible society of Christians assembled under that form of government established by apostolic authority; of which the national church in this country constituted a conspicuous branch.[194]

The Phalanx was committed to the view of the Church as having an exalted place in the salvation of humankind.[195] The reality was that they were more interested in preserving the privileges and property of the Church.[196]

---

[191] Evelyn Underhill, *Hibbert Journal*. Vol. xxx (1932-3): 408. Cited in: Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*: *From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 11690-1850*, Six Volumes (Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), III: 280.
[192] Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*. 1*f.*
[193] Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* 8.
[194] Charles Daubeny, *A Guide to the Church [With] An Appendix,* 2 Volumes (Oxford: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1830), II: Letter 8, 252.
[195] Alec R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution, 1789 to the Present Day: The Pelican History of the Church, 5* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985), 39.
[196] Ibid., 32.

The French Revolution, beginning in 1789, shook the very foundations of English society. The Church, an integral part of the establishment, also felt vulnerable. In the opinion of the bishops, destabilisation of society would lead to the end of the Church as an institution of social stability.[197] While the inseparable twin pillars of Church and State remained in balance, as they had since 1688, the Church of England could be both cosseted and protected. However, the events on the Continent almost demanded change in England, if for no other reason than to prevent the extremes of the French Revolution from being imported into Great Britain. Change was soon to come and the relationship between Church and State would be shattered. The death of Lord Liverpool, the Tory Prime Minister, in 1827 marked the end of any influence the Hackney Phalanx had exerted in being 'bishop makers'. The repeal of the Test and Corporations Act and Catholic emancipation in 1827 and 1829 respectively marked the end of Anglican ascendancy. From the Church's perspective worse was to come. In 1830, a Whig-dominated administration under the leadership of Lord Grey formed the government and the process of reform, begun under the Tories, grew in momentum.[198]

The Whigs introduced reforms to improve the lot of working people. They also introduced political reform to give the vote to those in the new cities, who had been disenfranchised as a result of the Industrial Revolution and urbanisation. William Palmer (1803-85) reflected:

> All who have written of the events of that time, such as Mozley, Newman, Percival, Churton, and others, have noticed the extreme and dangerous unsettlement of opinion about the year 1830, the era when the Reform mania

[197] Ibid., 34.
[198] Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*. 1*f.*

> was at its height, and when Reform was decided to be the panacea for every human ill, and was made to supply the defects of Divine Providence.[199]

The reform of the Church (rumoured in London's political clubs in 1833) included a range of proposed changes. Among these was a change to the Liturgy, a revision of the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion* and the drafting of new forms of prayer. The cornerstones of Anglican doctrine were under assault.

> Nothing was heard but wide dissatisfaction with the Church – with her abuses – her corruptions – her errors! Each sciolist presented his puny design for reconstructing this august temple, built by no human hands. …Reports, apparently well founded, were prevalent, that some of the prelates…were favourable to alterations in the Liturgy. Pamphlets were in wide circulation, recommending the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), and especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed; the removal of all mention of the Blessed Trinity; of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; of the practice of absolution.[200]

The old High Church party, interested in preserving the *status quo*, had ceased to have any real influence in the government. Ironically, in seeking to reinforce its ascendancy it had contributed to the development of a Church, which was fat and slothful, entrenched in its own self-created privilege and lacking the wherewithal to defend itself against the onslaughts of the State.[201] Into this vacuum stepped the Oxford Movement, a party not

---

[199] William Palmer, *Narrative of Events Concerned with the Tracts for the Times* (London: Rivingtons, 1883), 29.
[200] William Palmer, *Narrative of Events Concerned with the Tracts for the Times, With Reflections on Existing Tendencies to Romanism, and on the Present Duties and Prospects of Members of the Church* (Oxford, John Henry Parker, 1843), 4.
[201] This is not a universal view. See: John Walsh and Stephen Taylor, "Introduction: The Church and Anglicanism in the 'long' eighteenth century", *The Church of England c.1689 – c.1833 From Toleration to Tractarianism*, John Evangelist Walsh, John Walsh, Colin Haydon, Stephen Taylor, editors (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1*f.*

founded on entrenched preferment but one that looked to the history of the Church to find the basis for its authority.

A decisive indication of the diminution of Church ascendancy occurred in 1833. The Whig government introduced the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill into Parliament. It sought to suppress ten Anglican dioceses, assuage Irish Catholic opinion, redistribute the rich ecclesiastical incomes and restore peace to Ireland. This action was reasonable given the number of Anglicans in Ireland. Yngve Brilioth asserted that the actions of the State should be appreciated in the context as an application of the rationalism of The Enlightenment.[202] Not all in the Church of England were opposed to State intervention in Church affairs. The Latitudinarians of the eighteenth century were overly accommodating of both intervention and Deism, and their views presented a challenge to the Catholic tradition of the Church of England.[203] The Church was under assault immediately from Parliament, which sought to destroy its worldly ascendancy, but more insidiously by an undercurrent of thinking which it could only counter with intellectual endeavour of the highest order.

The sermon "National Apostasy" preached by John Keble (1792-1866) on 14 July 1833, in the university church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, declared that the parliamentary reformers were assaulting the rights of the Church.

> (England is)…a nation which for centuries acknowledged, as an essential part of its theory of government, that, *as* a Christian nation, she is also part of Christ's

[202] Yngve Brilioth, *Three Lectures on Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934), 9-10.
[203] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record*. 346.

> Church, and bound, in all her legislation and policy, by the fundamental laws of that Church.[204]

The notion of the Christian nation, forged by Richard Hooker, was considered by Keble to be under assault by the State which, through its actions, demonstrated a "…direct disavowal of the sovereignty of God."[205] Brilioth noted:

> Hooker's work marks the end of the only period in the history of the nation when the realisation of this high ideal of a Christian State, whose other name is the Church, seemed possible. The history of the following centuries shows us only how gradually it was destroyed.[206]

The destruction of Richard Hooker's model required a reappraisal of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. In the Elizabethan Settlement, natural law demanded the Church and State be as one under the governorship of the sovereign. By 1833, that same good ordering of natural law allowed for the development of a Church in continuity with the medieval and Primitive Churches. Richard Hooker argued the Church was not a static institution. He developed the doctrine that the governor of the Church and the sovereign were one and the same. Thus, natural law demanded that if the monarch abrogated his or her responsibility as defender of the faith, the Church should seek to defend its position and find its authority beyond that given it by the sovereign.[207] This point was pertinent to Tractarian arguments.

---

[204] John Keble, "National Apostasy", *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, second edition, (Oxford & London: John Henry Parker & F. & J Rivington, 1848), 134.
[205] Ibid.
[206] Yngve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival: Studies in The Oxford Movement* (London: Longmans, Green, 1925), 3.
[207] Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London & New York: Methuen, 1986), 169*f.*

Further action followed Keble's Assizes Sermon. A meeting took place in the rectory at Hadleigh, Suffolk, between 25 and 29 July 1833. Present was a concerned group of High Churchmen, including the incumbent of the parish, Hugh James Rose (1795-1838), together with Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-36), William Palmer (1803-85) and Arthur Philip Perceval (1799-1853). Froude and Palmer were the representatives from Oxford sent ostensibly to consider an appropriate response to the Irish Temporalities Bill. The meeting decided the appropriate response was to establish an Association of Friends. After three attempts, and in consultation with Keble and Newman, Palmer wrote *The Objects of the Association*:

> To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services and discipline of the Church; that is, to withstand all change, which involves the denial and suppression of doctrine, and departure from primitive practices in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogatives, order, and commission of bishops, priests and deacons.[208]

Palmer had connections with "…the Establishment, consisting of high Church dignitaries, archdeacons, London rectors…who belonged to what is commonly called the high-and-dry school."[209] Moreover, he wanted an official organised association, one with Episcopal sanction, "…a board of safe, sound sensible men…"[210] who would protect the Church during the period of existing danger. Newman on the other hand wanted individuals to express their opinions. He wrote to Perceval:

> …individuals, feeling strongly, while on the one hand they are incidentally faulty in mode and language, are still peculiarly effective. No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. …The very faults of an individual

[208] Palmer, *Narrative of Events* (1883). 105.
[209] Newman, *Apologia.* 60.
[210] Ibid., 61.

> excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerful-minded) gains. This is the way of things; we promote truth by a self-sacrifice.[211]

Newman believed that disestablishment was unavoidable. However, he contemplated the idea with apprehension, for he disliked revolutions and he thought that the upper classes would be almost religionless because there would be no security of doctrine ensured through Act of Parliament.[212] In the midst of uncertain times Newman sought a means by which he could be heard.[213] This means was the *Tracts for the Times*.

The authority of the Church was founded on apostolic descent was the primary claim of *Tract 1*.[214] It described the Church of England as an organisation which had grown into "…idle habit…" unable to effectively deal with the "…times (which) are very evil… ."[215] The Tractarians sought to recover the doctrine which professed the Church to be an autonomous community. "Recognition of this actual visible body involved a new outlook on human society, so long accepted as 'Christian'."[216] They believed the bishops were the direct successors to the Apostles. In them resided authority over the divine society: the Church. Many bishops were undoubtedly alarmed when they read in *Tract 1*:

> …black event as it would be for the country, yet (as far as they are concerned) we would not wish them more blessed termination of their course than the spoiling of their goods and martyrdom.[217]

---

[211] Ibid.
[212] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 34-5.
[213] Ibid., 340.
[214] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 6.
[215] Ibid., Paragraph 1.
[216] Meriol Trevor, *Newman's Journey* (London: Harper Collins/Fount Classics, 1996), 44.
[217] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 3.

Those bishops in the House of Lords who voted against the reform Bill did so to protect their benefices and power. Herein lay a major difficulty for the Movement. In seeking to define the authority of the Church, the Tractarians argued for the supremacy of the episcopacy. These radical notions were hardly acceptable to the bishops and they chose to protect their cosseted positions. In the old order, authority was given to the bishops by the same power which now sought to divest them of it: the State.[218] The *Advertisement* to the Tracts described the condition of the Church as it was perceived by Newman.

> The Apostolic succession, the Holy Catholic Church, were principles of action in the minds of our predecessors of the 17th century; but, in proportion as the maintenance of the Church has been secured by law, her ministers have been under the temptation of leaning on an arm of flesh instead of her own divinely-provided discipline, a temptation increased by political events and arrangements which need not here be more than alluded to.[219]

Political preferment over and against apostolic succession was a difficulty about which Newman had no illusion; it was a major obstacle to the arguments put forward by the Tractarians. Even the Divines who held the doctrine of apostolic succession "…had deemed it fit to hold it in their closets… ."[220] The laity did not deem it an important doctrine and the Church's governors did their best to hide it for their own political ends.[221]

---

[218] Keble was particularly scathing of the bishops. See: Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*. 5.
[219] John Henry Newman, *Advertisement to the Tracts for the Times* (London: Rivingtons, 1834), Paragraph 2.
[220] John Henry Cardinal Newman, "Essay V: Palmer on Faith and Unity", *Essays Historical and Critical*, 2 Volumes (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910), I: 195.
[221] Ibid., 194.

Tract 1 set the pattern for what was to become a series of works written by different individuals. They were designed to provoke, even shock, the Established Church out of its torpor. In December 1833, Newman reported to Froude that the response had been "furious" and this was most encouraging. He wrote "…men do not cry out till they are frightened."[222] For Newman these times drew him to work for a cause which he found both "momentous" and "inspiring."

> I had a supreme confidence in our cause; we were upholding that primitive Christianity which was delivered for all times by the early teachers of the Church, and which was attested in the Anglican formularies and in the Anglican divines.[223]

The Oxford Movement demanded a return to the theology and ecclesiology of the seventeenth century; that of the Caroline Divines.[224] Moreover, the prescription repeated, time and again, as the standard by which orthodoxy would be measured included not only the Caroline Divines, but also the Primitive Church.

The unbroken bond which traversed the centuries was that of the episcopacy. In this the Tractarians repeated what they had already read in the works of the Caroline Divines. Recent scholarship has suggested the Oxford Movement was not in keeping with the inheritance of the scholarship found in the works of the Caroline Divines. George Herring argued the Tractarians used the writings of the Caroline Divines selectively, and were themselves revolutionary in their theology and ecclesiology, rather than preservers of tradition.[225] He regarded a major point of divergence between the Oxford Movement and the Caroline Divines to be the formers' emphasis on the importance of the

---

[222] To: R. H. Froude. 15 December 1833. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. IV: 141-2.
[223] Newman, *Apologia*. 63.
[224] Ibid., 33.
[225] Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* 7.

episcopacy as the foundation of authority in the Church. The Divines, noted Herring, placed no such importance on the successors of the Apostles.[226] Nevertheless, there existed an ambiguity within the writings of the Divines on the episcopacy. Hooker's threefold test defined the marks of a Church: "…a sensible excellency…the judgment of antiquity, and…the long-continued practice of the whole Church, from which unnecessarily to swerve, experience never as yet found it safe…(and)…the Church by her ecclesiastical authority."[227] Innate in this threefold test was the perception that apostolicity guaranteed the tradition of the Church. Apostolic authority was integral to the maintenance of the Church's authority and the ordaining of bishops constituted an unbroken practice of the Church. Hooker's patron, Jewel, made the argument for apostolic authority. He wrote of the Elizabethan Settlement that it had "…come as near as we possibly could, to the church of the apostles, and of the old Catholic bishops and fathers."[228] Lancelot Andrewes considered: "All Churches everywhere received this Form of government. Nor were there ever, before this Age, any Churches which were governed by any other, than by Bishops." Moreover, the episcopacy existed "…from the very infancy of the Church."[229] The idea of the Christian State presented by Richard Hooker was no longer extant in late 1833. Andrewes' argument was now advanced by the Movement to assert the independence of the Church from the State. The divine society was the Church. In maintaining the doctrine of apostolic succession as a core tenet, the Tractarians presented "…something objective in the deepest sense to put as a

---

[226] Ibid., 6-7.
[227] Richard Hooker, *The Works of Mr Richard Hooker in Eight Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: With Several Other Treatises and a General Index*, Isaac Walton, editor, 3 Volumes, second edition (London: W Clark *et al*, 1821), II: Book V, §6, §7, §8, 18, 22.
[228] John Jewel, "Defence of the Apology of the Church of England", *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, John Ayre, editor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850), The Apology, Chap. xvi. Division 1, Pt. vi., 1040.
[229] Lancelot Andrewes, "Of Episcopacy, Three Epistles of Peter Moulin Doctor and Professor of Divinity, Answered by the Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes, Late Lord Bishop of Winchester", *The Works of Lancelot Andrewes*, J. Bliss and J. P. Wilson, editors, 11 Volumes, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854), IX: 173*f.*

breakwater against what was regarded as the inundation of Liberal subjectivism… ."[230]

Christopher Dawson noted:

> The Oxford Movement …brought a new element into the religious life of the nineteenth century. It stood above all for the preservation of the spiritual identity of Christianity, and represents an attempt to restore the Catholic conception of an objective supernatural order and the catholic idea of divine authority within the boundaries of the Established Church of Protestant England.[231]

Nothing less than the Christian order of the Primitive Church under the successors of the Apostles would satisfy the Tractarians. Their reliance on the tradition of the Church and the authority of the Church residing in the bishops was the basis upon which they built their resistance to the change sweeping the nation.[232]

The Tracts presented these arguments consistently. Episcopacy was intrinsic to the Catholic Verities held by the Oxford Movement. It was through apostolicity that the Church had "…access to the Body and Blood of the Redeemer."[233] The bishops were the keepers of the tradition of the Primitive Church, a divine society ordained by God through baptism and nourished by the Sacraments. The validity of the Sacraments was assured by apostolic succession, which was linked with the ministry of Christ who "…when he ascended did not leave us orphans, but appointed representatives of himself

---

[230] Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival.* 183.
[231] Christopher Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1945), 118.
[232] Paul Vaiss, *From Oxford to the People* (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 1996), 48, 49, 90, 188.
[233] John Keble, *Tract 52* (London: Rivingtons, 1835), Paragraph 26.

to the end of time."[234] Through apostolic succession bishops "…impart the power which they received from CHRIST."[235] Keble wrote:

> …the Holy Feast of our Saviour's sacrifice, which all confess to be "generally necessary to salvation" was intended by him to be constantly conveyed through the hands of commissioned persons.[236]

The Visible Church, the divine society, made the means of salvation available through the Sacraments which were the "…ordinary means of grace…"[237] and committed to "…certain definite persons… ."[238] Pusey believed as "…members of Him we are made and preserved through His Sacraments."[239] After he became a Roman Catholic, Newman considered his opinions about essential dogma had not changed: "…I am now as firm in my belief of a visible church, of the authority of bishops, of the grace of the sacraments, of the religious works of penance, as I was in 1833."[240]

The four *Catenae Patrum*, *Tract 74* (Apostolical Succession), *Tract 76* (Baptismal Regeneration), *Tract 78* (the Vincentian Canon) and *Tract 81* (the Eucharistic Sacrifice) contained excerpts from Anglican authorities. They presented a comprehensive doctrinal foundation for Anglo-Catholicism.[241] Newman reflected, "…after reading Laud,

---

[234] John Henry Newman, *Tract 2* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 7.
[235] Jeremy Taylor, "Jeremy Taylor, Episcopacy Asserted", *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor and Dromore*, Reginald Heber & Charles Page Eden, editors, 10 Volumes (London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans *et al*, 1859), V: 19. Also, see: John Henry Newman, *Tract 74. Catena Patrum No. 1. Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession.* (London: Rivingtons, 1836), TAYLOR, BISHOP, CONFESSOR, AND DOCTOR.--On Episcopacy. Introduction. Paragraph 4.
[236] John Keble, *Tract 4* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 6.
[237] John Henry Newman, *Tract* 11 (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Letter II, Paragraph 3.
[238] Ibid. Paragraph 4.
[239] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1848), 220.
[240] Newman, *Apologia*. 69.
[241] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record.* 351.

Bramhall, Stillingfleet and other Anglican Divines …the doctrine of 1833 was strengthened in me, not changed."[242] The Catenae were not intended to provide a body of uniform doctrine. The last Catena, for example, quoted the Protestant Reformer Nicholas Ridley (1500-55). According to Pusey they were compiled:

> …to exhibit the practical working of the system and peculiar temper and principles of our Church upon the minds of the more faithful of her sons, whether acting upon them through the channel of learning, or through the deference of a single-hearted simplicity.[243]

The Tractarians were comprehensive in their approach to seeking the Catholic Verities, their intention being to reject any allegations against their doctrines as mistaken novelties, injudicious theories, or essentially Romanist.[244] Newman's *Tract 76* set out in its introduction the ground on which Tractarian doctrines were established. He looked to the seventeenth century Divines for the standard doctrines and derided "…the confidence and zeal with which modern and unscriptural views…are put forth at the present time."[245] *Tract 78* written by Charles Marriott (1811-58) and Henry Edward Manning (1808-92) repeated this assertion:

> It has been thought safer to show the Succession of our Standard Divines ever since their times, understood them to hold that view of doctrine which it has been the endeavour of these Tracts to recommend; and that no other can be taken without

---

[242] Newman, *Apologia*. 68.
[243] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Testimony of Writers of the Later English Church To the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, With an Historical Account of the Changes Made in the Liturgy as to the Expression of that Doctrine. Tract 81. Catena Patrum No. IV*. (London: Rivingtons, 1837), Introduction, Paragraph 1.
[244] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record.* 351-2.
[245] John Henry Newman, *Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.Tract 76. Catena Patrum No. II.* (London: Rivingtons, 1836), Introduction, Paragraph 1

> contradicting that illustrious Succession itself, and its judgment, concerning the Reformers.[246]

The four Catenae were the prototype for the structure of *Tract 90*, which also included extracts from the *Homilies*, *The Book of Common Prayer* and Roman Catholic and Protestant authorities. All five Tracts included minimal commentary alongside their citations.

The Tracts were designed to mould a certain type of Christian, according to Newman. From a preface to a series of sermons written by John Keble, Thomas Keble and Isaac Watts he quoted:

> (Those) who, in the silent humility of their lives, and in their unaffected reverence for holy things, show that they accept these principles as real and substantial, and by habitual purity of heart and serenity of temper, give proof to the deep veneration for sacraments and sacramental ordinances, those persons, *whether our professed adherents or not*, best exemplify the kind of character which the writers of the Tracts for the Times have wished to form.[247]

The Tractarians were, above all, men who had a love of and gave their all to Christ and the Church.[248] The ideal of self-denial was preached by Newman, who perceived holiness to be contained in "…those little things of which obedience is a self denial."[249] The little

---

[246] Charles Marriott & Henry Edward Manning, *Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Duty of Maintaining Quod Semper, Quod Ubique, Quod ab Omnibus Traditum Est.Tract 78.Catena Patrum No. III.* (London: Rivingtons, 1837), Introduction, Paragraph 1.
[247] Newman, *Aplologia.* 107.
[248] John R. H. Moorman, *The Anglican Spiritual Tradition* (Springfield, Illinois: Templegate Publishers, 1985), 160.
[249] John Henry Newman, "Self-Denial and the Test of Religious Earnestness", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 8 Volumes (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1907), I: 69.

things were a sure sign of God's hope, about which he was able to take consolation and write "…let us take comfort, when we despond about the state of the Church."[250] The inner spirituality of the Tractarians was not reflected in any ostentatious external show. They did not adopt, for example, any form of ritualism in their liturgies. The liturgy in St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, was observed strictly by the rubrics of *The Book of Common Prayer*. The prayer book was the text around which the Tractarians formulated their comprehensive doctrines. Because of this the prayer book could not be corrupted.[251]

The majority of Tracts were addressed to the clergy. They made no attempt to address those people who lived in the new industrial cities. The Oxford Movement pre-1845 was academic, clerical and conservative.[252] It sought first to influence the clergy, who in turn would disseminate Tractarian doctrine to the laity.[253] The Tracts were distributed by the simple means of sending them to friends and ex-pupils of the Oxford dons.[254] Newman even delivered pamphlets personally to unsuspecting clergymen in Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire. Newman's desire was to combat liberalism; it mattered little to him if the clergy were of the High Church party or Evangelicals.[255] The popularity of the Tracts could be seen in that, between 1833 and 1845, the total number printed was approximately 750,000. In one month, in 1841, two editions of *Tract 90* totalled some 10,500 copies.[256] The Tracts were published between September 1833 and January 1841. Numbers 1-47 were issued in relatively quick succession. In contrast, *Tract 90* appeared ten months after *Tract 88*, (the date of *Tract 89* remains unknown).[257] The documents

---

[250] Ibid., 115.
[251] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record*, 347.
[252] Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution: 1789 to the Present Day*. 52.
[253] Ibid.
[254] Trevor, *Newman's Journey*. 44.
[255] Newman, *Apologia*. 62.
[256] Rune Imberg, *In Quest of Authority: The Tracts for the Times' and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-1841* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1987), 33-4.
[257] See: Appendix I.

were called *Tracts for the Times* precisely because they addressed issues of the day. They were variously devotional, controversial, ecclesiastical and historical, some containing than one theme.[258] To prove their credentials, the Tractarians produced new translations of the writings of the Anglican Divines and these were published without commentary. While the Tracts attracted considerable criticism with respect to their broad thrust and confrontational style, the most vociferous criticism was reserved for *Tract 90*, a document that represented the zenith of the Oxford Movement and signalled its impending end.

[258] Owen Chadwick, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), 52-3. See also: Appendix II.

CHAPTER 3

TRACT 90

Three different interpretations have been placed on *Tract 90*. The first was that it was out of keeping with the previous eighty-nine Tracts in both its content and presentation.[259] The second was that its content was pro-Rome and consequently anti-Anglican.[260] The third was that the Tract provided evidence of Newman's impending conversion from Anglicanism to the Roman Catholic Church.[261] This thesis contends that such observations have no grounding in fact. *Tract 90* was written as a reaction against a government bill to remove the obligation to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles before matriculating from Oxford University.[262] In the 'Introduction' to the Tract Newman wrote:

> If in any quarter it is supposed that persons who profess to be disciples of the early Church will silently concur with those of very opposite sentiments in furthering a relaxation of subscriptions, which, it is imagined, are galling to both parties, though for different reasons, and that they will do this against the wish of the great body of the Church, the writer of the following pages would raise one voice, at least, in protest against any such anticipation.[263]

---

[259] Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition.* 172.
[260] Trevor, *Newman's Journey*. 74, 78.
[261] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record.* 355.
[262] This requirement was first introduced at Oxford by the Puritan Chancellor Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (c.1531-88) in the sixteenth century. In making such a requirement Roman Catholics were excluded. It was ironic that three centuries later Newman and the other members of the Oxford Movement would be defending the Anglican institutions by supporting the actions of a Puritan. Edgar C. S. Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (London: Methuen & Co., 1904), 64.
[263] Newman, *Tract 90*, Introduction. Paragraph 1.

Newman considered the relaxation galling to both Evangelicals and High Churchmen.[264] The Protestant doctrine contained in the Articles of Religion prevented High Churchmen subscribing to them. Newman felt it imperative to prove:

> That there are real difficulties to a Catholic Christian in the Ecclesiastical position of our Church at this day, no one can deny; but the statements of the Articles are not in the number; and it may be right at the present moment to insist upon this.[265]

Yet another difficulty facing the Church of England was that of Anglicans converting to Roman Catholicism. In his *Apologia*, Newman related that his aim in writing *Tract 90* was twofold. He wished to quiet the restlessness of those in the Movement who were beginning to question the *Via Media* and also considered the Articles to be "against Rome." Also, he had been "enjoined" by his bishop (Richard Bagot) "…to keep these men straight…," a task which he accepted.[266] He took no responsibility for the defections to Rome which occurred after March 1841, but placed the blame on the authorities who condemned his attempt in *Tract 90* to reconcile the Catholic verities with the Thirty-nine Articles.[267] Newman believed that the Tract did not cause defections to Rome, rather the condemnation of the Tract by the bishops did.[268]

Contemporary historians present different analyses of *Tract 90*. George Herring wrote that, from early 1838, Newman had begun to use the Roman Breviary to hear confessions and to fast. These, Herring argued, were sure signs of a Rome-ward

---

[264] Herring, *What was the Oxford Movement?* 66-7.
[265] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 1.
[266] Newman, *Apologia.* 90.
[267] John Henry Newman, "Sermon XXII. Outward and Inward Notes of the Church." *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, New Edition (London: Rivingtons, 1889.), n. 1, 340-1.
[268] Newman, *Apologia*. 141.

movement.[269] This view was also supported by Sheridan Gilley.[270] Gilley also wrote that Newman's use of the Breviary was based on his perception it contained the essence of the devotional ceremonies of the Church Catholic.[271] Newman regarded the Breviary as a book which had sobriety and restraint; he loved its reliance on the psalms, the shortness of the prayers and the majesty and austerity of the Latin.[272] But the Tractarians:

> …omitted the invocations to the Saints (as incompatible with the Articles) and kept to the Anglican calendar, only adding the saints who were mentioned in the Homilies.[273]

Further indications of Newman's Roman inclinations were seen to exist as early as 1838 by some commentators. Newman heard confessions in the community at Littlemore.[274] However, there was no evidence Newman proposed sacramental confession in anything other than a religious community and nowhere did he promote its universal adoption. Fasting was also more closely linked to the communal life in Littlemore and commitment to his own spirituality. Outside Littlemore, back in Oxford he, along with other members of the community, were not bound by the rules to fast.[275]

Any assertion Newman's Rome-ward movement coincided with his publication of *Tract 90* might also be disputed by reference to Newman's *Letters and Diaries*. A brief survey of these uncovers a letter written by Newman in 1849 to Francis Faber (1804-76).[276] This letter was evidence that Newman was not a 'concealed Romanist.' This addressed the vexed question as to whether or not he had any attachment to the Church of England in

---

[269] Herring, *What was the Oxford Movement?* 60.
[270] Gilley, *Newman and his Age.* 160.
[271] John Henry Newman, *On The Roman Breviary as Embodying the Substance of the Devotional Services of the Catholic Church. Tract 75* (London: Rivingtons, 1836), *passim.*
[272] Ibid., 160.
[273] Ker, *John Henry Newman.* 272.
[274] To: W. Dodsworth. 18 March 1844. Unpublished letters from the Birmingham Oratory. Cited in: Ibid.
[275] Ibid., 271-2.
[276] To: Francis Faber. 6 December, 1849. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* XIII: 327.

the ten years before his conversion to Roman Catholicism. For the years 1839-43 Newman "…wished to benefit the Church of England without prejudice to the Church of Rome."[277] Other letters taken from the years 1841-3 addressed to his Catholic acquaintances indicated he had not contemplated becoming a Roman Catholic. As late as 12 September, 1841, he still referred to Rome as bearing the marks of the 'Antichrist.'[278] These were hardly the signs of a person considering a conversion to Rome.

Rune Imberg argued editorial modifications to the Tracts demonstrated Newman's progression towards Catholicism.[279] These editorial changes removed anti-Roman passages. In 1841, Newman deleted no less than fourteen objections to the Church of Rome from *Tract 38* on the *Via Media*. This Tract, along with *Tract 4*, was presented as a dialogue between a layperson (*Laicus*) and a priest (*Clericus*). The deletion of the fourteen objections in the year in which *Tract 90* was published was no coincidence. Careful examination of the fourteen objections demonstrated these were analogous with the fourteen Articles addressed in *Tract 90*.[280] The reason for Newman altering *Tract 38* was for consistency. "Depend upon it, the strength of any party lies in its being *true to its theory*. Consistency is the life of a movement."[281]

Examination of *Tract 38* provides further insight into possible reasons for the alterations. The layperson asked of the priest: "But in what are your…(opinions)…different from Rome?"[282] *Clericus* considered the objections were those posited by the "…divines of the English Church."[283] For the purposes of this study it was essential to understand that the

---

[277] Ibid.
[278] To: Ambrose L Phillips.12 September, 1842. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 269.
[279] Rune Imberg, *In Quest of Authority: The Tracts for the Times and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-184.*, 17.
[280] See: Appendix V.
[281] Newman, *Apologia*. 177.
[282] John Henry Newman, *Tract 38* (London: Rivingtons, 1834), Paragraph 69.
[283] Ibid., Paragraph 70.

dialogues were set in the context of a discussion about the Articles. Importantly, *Clericus* noted:

> But is not certainly a distinction of doctrine and manner between the Liturgy and the Articles? And does not what I have just stated account for it, viz. that the Liturgy, as coming down from the Apostles, is the depository of their complete teaching; while the Articles are polemical, and except as they embody the creeds, are only protests against certain definite errors.[284]

Clericus went on to present a telling argument, which, written in 1834, was a precursor for the style of argumentation used in *Tract 90*.

> Such are my teachings about the Articles; and if in my teaching, I lay especially stress upon doctrines only indirectly contained in them, and say less about those which are therein put forth most prominently, it is because times are changed…The Christian minister should be a witness against the errors of his day.[285]

The words of *Clericus* suggested it was possible to change emphasis of his teaching to meet the errors of the day, in this sense Newman was almost arguing it was possible to change the wording of the Tracts to meet perceived dangers. The Tracts were meant to be documents related to the times in which they were written.[286]

The congruity which existed in Tractarian argument was demonstrated by comparing *Tract 1* with *Tract 90*. Each Tract contained principles which were consistent with the other. This in itself confirmed there was little new in them. Both Tracts addressed a

---

[284] Ibid., Paragraph 68.
[285] Ibid.
[286] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record.* 354.

particular occasion yet their basic arguments were similar. *Tract 1* and *Tract 90* shared two particular attributes. Both Tracts were written to defend the Church against a threat to its power and both caused a considerable reaction, especially from the members of the institution they were written to defend. Both Tracts were written when the government of the day was seeking to take privileges away from the Church of England. *Tract 1* was written as a clarion call to defend the Church against the government's desire to destroy the apostolical authority of the Church. *Tract 90* was written by Newman to defend the privileged position of the Church of England in the University of Oxford. In it he argued that the Articles were not anti-Catholic, rather they were at one with the Catholic Liturgy in the Prayer Book.[287] Inherent in this argument was that the Catholicity of the Church lay not in its authority derived from any earthly power, but through apostolic succession. The apostolic succession was the subject of *Tract 1*. In this sense Newman had come full circle.

The sentiments in both Tracts demonstrated a remarkable coherence. Identifying the source of the Church's malady, Newman wrote in *Tract 1*:

> Should the government and the country so far forget their God as to cast off their Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance…? Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connexions,; should these secular advantages cease, on what must Christ's ministers depend?[288]

[287] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 1.
[288] Newman, *Tract 1*. Introduction. Paragraph 5.

Similarly in 1841, referring to the government's actions, Newman stated: "…the present writer, for one, will be no party to the ordinary political methods by which professed reforms are carried or compassed in this day."[289]

A strong judgment, which appeared in both documents, was that the Church was a sacred institution that was being oppressed by civil authorities, yet this suffering would not be without a purpose. *Tract 90* observed:

> Till [we] [her children] are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church, [our Mother,] sit still; let [us] be content to live in bondage; let [us] work in chains; let [us] submit to our imperfections as a punishment; let [us] go on teaching [through the medium of indeterminate statements] and inconsistent precedents, and principles but partially developed.[290]

Tract 1 likewise reflected on the deprivations suffered by the clergy though the removal of their authority. Rather than remain silent Newman implored the clergy to "Speak out now before you are forced, both as glorying in your privilege and to insure your rightful honour to your people."[291] The Tract exhorted the clergy to exalt their bishops and to "…magnify your office… ."[292] The priests were taking part in the same ministry of their holy fathers, the bishops, a ministry instituted by Christ which found its authority in Christ. He emphasised that the assault upon the Church had taken away the authority of the bishops, an authority which, through ordination, all priests shared. In the face of such an affront Newman called the bishops to confront the assault through a "termination of their course" a "spoiling of their goods" and "martyrdom."[293] Implicit in

---

[289] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 2.
[290] Ibid.
[291] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 12.
[292] Ibid.
[293] Ibid., Paragraph 3.

the bishops suffering these noble sacrifices was that those who shared in their ministry should do likewise.

In both Tracts, Newman judged that the Church's suffering under the bondage of State intimidation would lead it to search for the bonds which would unite it. *Tract 1* announced to the clergy: "Do we not all confess the peril into which the Church has come, yet sit still each in his own retirement, as if mountains and seas had cut off brother from brother?"[294] Likewise, in *Tract 90* Newman wrote that disunity was the prescription for disaster. But, with unity:

> Our Church's strength would be irresistible, humanly speaking, were it but at unity with itself: if it remains divided, part against part, we shall see the energy which was meant to subdue the world preying upon itself, according to our SAVIOUR'S express assurance, that such a house "cannot stand."[295]

The unity so desired was centred on the episcopal office through which each priest received the Holy Ghost.[296] The proper power, in which each priest shared, came via apostolic succession, not in the Church's property which the government could gift or take away.[297] Newman also wrote that determinations on grave matters should not be made on the grounds of popularity. This would make the clergy rich and indolent, rather it was the duty of their "…office to oppose the world."[298] These same sentiments were repeated in *Tract 90*. He exhorted his readers to reject decisions imposed by the State, ones which would lead to a Church centred on privilege and position:

---

[294] Ibid., Paragraph 1.
[295] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 2.
[296] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 10.
[297] Ibid., Paragraph 13.
[298] Ibid., Paragraph 4.

> Even supposing then that any changes in contemplation, whatever they were, were good in themselves, they would cease to be good to a Church, in which they were the fruits not of the quiet conviction of all, but of the agitation, or tyranny, or intrigue of a few; nurtured not in mutual love, but in strife and envying; perfected not in humiliation and grief, but in pride, elation and triumph.[299]

To accept this state of spiritual imprisonment was to place Christ as the keeper of that gaol, wrote Newman, a place from which escape was only possible by a return to Him with a true heart via a real reformation.[300]

Writing on Article XIX 'The Visible Church,' Newman quoted from the *Homily for Whitsuntide*:

> For, unless the HOLY GHOST has been always present, governing and preserving the Church from the beginning, it could never have suffered so many and great brunts of affliction and persecution, with so little damage and harm as it hath. And the words of CHRIST are most plain in this behalf, saying, that 'the SPIRIT of Truth should abide with them for ever;' that 'He would be with them always (He meaneth by grace, virtue, and power) even to the world's end.'[301]

This excerpt included three motifs also found in *Tract 1*. Firstly, the Church had withstood its afflictions because the Holy Ghost was present and in it. Secondly, it was the Spirit's presence which gave authority to the Church to act in the world. Thirdly, the Holy Spirit governed the Church; no temporal power did so.[302] The *Homily* said that the Holy Spirit was given to the whole Church, not to the Apostles alone, but that the Spirit

---

[299] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 1.
[300] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 1.
[301] Ibid. Section 4. Paragraph 5.
[302] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraphs 6, 10, 11 & *passim*.

was given to those in the Upper Room in a different "form" and "majesty."[303] The *Homily* also contained a formula which described the marks of a 'true' Church.

> The true Church is *an universal congregation or fellowship of* GOD'S *faithful and elect people*, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the head cornerstone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to CHRIST'S holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.[304]

The extract from this Homily resonated with what was contained in *Tract 1*: "The Lord Jesus Christ gave his Spirit to his apostles… ."[305] The Tract also stated that the doctrine contained in the Ordination Service indicated that a priest was "conveying a gift" which he in turn had received through the bishop who ordained him.[306] The outward sign of the sacramental grace of ordination was an inward sign of the grace given to the priest by the Holy Spirit, transmitted by the successors to the Apostles by their laying on of hands.[307] The ordination of priests was a mark of the Church. The priesthood ensured the administration of a Sacrament according to "CHRIST'S holy institution". This was attested to by the fact that the doctrine was located in the Scriptures and had been the consistent teaching of the Church.

Another mark of the true Church was that of ecclesiastical discipline, which was satisfied by following the ordinances of Christ continued by the Apostles and their successors, the bishops. The Church discipline established by Christ was, as Newman wrote in *Tract 1*,

---

[303] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 6.
[304] Ibid.
[305] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 7.
[306] Ibid., Paragraph 10.
[307] Ibid.

continued when "…we (ordinands) have confessed before God our belief that the bishop who ordained us gave us the Holy Ghost… ."[308] The Church thus marked with the three signs of truth was one which "…is agreeable both to the Scriptures of GOD, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith."[309] Consequently *Tracts 1* and *90* again demonstrated a convergence in the doctrine of apostolic descent, which was the mark of the true Church. Through the bishops, the Church's discipline would be established and maintained, the Sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinances and sound doctrine maintained. The Rites administered by the bishops were the outward signs of the inner grace conferred on them at their ordination. That the signs of the true Church were maintained was in itself a proof of grace. A living, visible Church led by the successors to the Apostles was testament to Christ having given them a "sacred gift."[310]

The truth that salvation was transmitted by the Sacraments was yet another argument which formed a connection between *Tracts 1* and *90*. Newman reflected on Article XXV:

> …what we do determine is, that CHRIST has ordained two special sacraments, *as generally necessary to salvation*. This, then is the characteristic mark of those two, separating them from all other whatever; and this is nothing else but saying in other words that they are the only *justifying* rites, or instruments of communicating the Atonement, which is the one thing necessary to us. Ordination, for instance, gives power, yet without making the soul acceptable to God…[311]

---

[308] Ibid.
[309] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 6.
[310] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 8.
[311] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 7.

In *Tract 90* Newman was arguing for the efficacy of seven Sacraments as against the two "sacraments of the Gospel" or "special sacraments" nominated by the Article. In this excerpt Newman stated that the Sacraments of Holy Communion and baptism were necessary for salvation. This Catholic doctrine of sacramental grace was found in what were ostensibly 'Protestant' Articles. Grace, to be transmitted, needs an ordained priesthood and a Church led by bishops. Holy Communion and baptism transmitted the grace of the Atonement, but ordination, which was not the means by which salvation was transmitted, was not excluded from the definition of Sacrament. Ordination, confession, matrimony, confirmation and anointing of the sick were not the vehicles of salvation in the same way as the two "special sacraments" but each transmitted God's presence into the world in its own unique way. In the example of ordination Newman considered it gave "power" to the priest. This argument was the essence of *Tract 1*. No government could ever give spiritual power to the Church. Those in the holy institution who believed their authority did derive from that source were the "enemies of Christ."[312]

Intrinsic to both *Tract 1* and *Tract 90* were the two fundamentals which defined Tractarianism. Both centred on the doctrine of the Church as a divine society. Of the first, the Oxford Movement's high ecclesiology, Michael Ramsey noted:

> The teaching centred on the Church. … It meant the representation on earth of a church which essentially belongs to heaven, because the church contains saints in heaven, as well as its representatives on earth, and must needs do so because the heart of the church is the living Christ himself.[313]

---

[312] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 14.

[313] Michael Ramsay, "John Henry Newman and the Oxford Movement", *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. LIX (Sept. 1990) 333-4. Larry Crockett. "The Oxford Movement and the 19th-Century Episcopal Church: Anglo-Catholic Ecclesiology and the American Experience", *Quodlibet Online Journal of Christian Theology and Philosophy*, No. 5, Vol. 1 (August, 1999): 1. http://www.quodlibet.net/crockett-oxford.shtml; retrieved 25 September, 2008.

This high ecclesiology perceived bishops as the *esse* of the Church, a society which was divinely created. The second element which defined Tractarianism was the doctrine of "…a sacerdotal priesthood conveying the saving grace of God in divinely created sacramental acts… ."[314] These consistent themes throughout the Tracts were the basis for the proposition that they contained nothing new. Rather, they consistently reinforced the doctrine of the Church as a divine society. The Tractarians considered the Church of England in the early nineteenth century to be the same Church founded by Christ some two thousand years before.[315] The parallels, which exist between the first and last Tract, support the argument that there was little development of doctrine in the *Tracts for the Times*. They were written to present proof that the Anglican Church was the Catholic Church in England, one founded on the Primitive Church and preserved through the period of the English Reformation by the Caroline Divines.[316]

---

[314] Crockett, *Quodlibet*. 1. http://www.quodlibet.net/crockett-oxford.shtml; retrieved 25 September, 2008.
[315] Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution, 1789 to the Present Day*. 50-51.
[316] Chadwick, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. 52-3.

CHAPTER 4

TRACT 90 – SECTION β1

ARTICLES VI & XX[317]

Article VI. Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

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. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books:
Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, The First Book of Samuel, The Second Book of Samuel, The First Book of Kings, The Second Book of Kings, The First Book of Chronicles, The Second Book of Chronicles, The First Book of Esdras, The Second Book of Esdras, The Book of Esther, The Book of Job, The Psalms, The Proverbs, Ecclesiastes or Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less.

And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; such are these following:

[317] The thesis follows the order of sections as they appear in *Tract 90*.

The Third Book of Esdras, The Fourth Book of Esdras, The Book of Tobias, The Book of Judith, The rest of the Book of Esther, The Book of Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch the Prophet, The Song of the Three Children, The Story of Susanna, Of Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasses, The First Book of Maccabees, The Second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.

Article XX. Of the Authority of the Church.

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 that is 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 any thing against the same, so besides the same ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

The Tractarians professed the Church to be a divine society founded on and preserved through apostolic succession. The "…the real ground…" wrote Newman "…on which our authority is built (is) - OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT."[318] The Oxford Movement believed this principle was contained in the Nicene Creed. The authority of the Church was founded on this Creed. Newman wrote of the importance of this principle in *Tract 2*:

[318] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 6.

> Bear with me, while I express my fear, that we do not, as much as we ought, consider the force of that article of our Belief, "The One Catholic and Apostolic Church." This is a tenet so important as to have been in the Creed from the beginning. It is mentioned there as a fact, and a fact to be believed, and therefore practical.[319]

He considered this belief to be meaningless unless it had a visible presence, one which linked the Church to the ministry of Christ. Only through this visible link could the Church claim the authority given to it by Christ. Newman claimed there was only one expression of the visible presence of Christ on earth.

> 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 spreads its branches in every place; i.e. the Church Visible with its Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.[320]

This principle could be located in *The Book of Common Prayer*, but Article VI and Article XX determined that the authority of the Church was located in the Scriptures. The intention of *Tract 90* was to reconcile these conflicting views on authority. A reassertion of the necessity of the doctrine of apostolic succession was central to Tractarian polemic.[321] A tension existed between Scripture and the episcopacy as to which provided the foundation for the Church's authority. Newman ascertained the basis for the Church's authority by determining what he described as the "Rule of Faith."[322]

---

[319] John Henry Newman, *Tract 2* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 6.
[320] Ibid.
[321] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context.* 146.
[322] Newman, *Tract 90*. Preamble. Paragraph 4.

Newman's arguments in respect to Articles VI and XX had been presented in earlier Tracts. Newman contested the doctrine that the Scriptures were the sole basis for authority. He returned to a consistent Tractarian argument, which contended that the State had no prerogative to interfere in the affairs of the Church. To support the Tractarian doctrine of authority, Newman reflected on the exclusion of the apocryphal books from the Canon of Scripture. Despite their exclusion, Newman believed the *Homilies* spoke of the apocryphal books in a "reverential manner."[323] Moreover, those books that the Article described as not canonical were accepted as canonical by the same authority cited in the Article as the arbiter of canonicity, St. Jerome (Hierome).[324] If Jerome included the apocryphal books, who, or what, was the source of authority in the Church of England as to the Canon of Scripture? Newman wrote:

> It was made and authorized by royal command, which cannot be supposed to have any claim upon our interior consent. At the same time every one who reads it in the Services of the Church, does, of course, thereby imply that he considers that it contains no deadly heresy or dangerous mistake. And about its simplicity, majesty, gravity, harmony, and venerableness, there can be but one opinion.[325]

The tension, which existed between the State and the Church, was expressed no more clearly than in the debate as to which authority decided the Canon of Scripture. As in earlier Tractarian literature, this tension was carefully elucidated; because from it came a deeper understanding of what it was to be a member of the Church. In *Tract 90* Newman made the essential observation that Scripture and the Church have different roles or "offices" to play. From the Articles he postulated that:

---

[323] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 3.
[324] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 6.
[325] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 7.

> 1. Scripture contains all necessary articles of faith; 2. either in its text, or by inference 3. The Church is the keeper of Scripture; 4. and a witness of it; 5. and has authority in controversies of faith; 6. but may not expound one passage of Scripture to contradict another; 7. nor enforce as an article of faith any point not contained in Scripture.[326]

It followed then that the Church interpreted the faith. The Church required compliance to the faith and it derived the faith "wholly" and completely from Scripture. The office of the Church was to elicit from Scripture an "harmonious interpretation", thus the teaching of the Church and Scripture were at one.[327] Newman thought the Articles did not settle two important questions. First, "…what the media are by which the Church interprets Scripture, whether by a direct divine gift, or catholic tradition, or critical exegesis of the text… ." Second, "…who is to decide whether it interprets Scripture rightly or not;--what is her method, if any; and who is her judge, if any."[328] Only by settling these two questions could the "sole Rule of Faith" be determined. The notion it was Scripture was "…but of recent adoption… ."[329] Newman demonstrated the Divines had a different interpretation.[330] He considered the Creed was the necessary "Rule of Faith."[331]

That Scripture was not the "Rule of Faith" was a contention which proliferated in earlier Tractarian literature. *Tract 24*, *The Scripture View of the Apostolical Commission*, by Benjamin Harrison (1808-87), was the first Tractarian document which proposed there were two different "sources" of authority. Harrison wrote of St. Paul:

---

[326] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 9.
[327] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 10.
[328] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 11.
[329] Ibid.
[330] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraphs17-26.
[331] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 12.

> It was in right of his office that he claimed Authority; it was for the sake of that Office that he endeavoured to give no offence in any thing, but in all things to approve himself as the Minister of God.[332]

St. Paul did not obtain his authority from Scripture, but from the very nature of his office as a 'Minister of God', one of apostolic authority. In a statement which would later be repeated in *Tract 90*, Harrison wrote:

> Down to our days, the Church has been "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ;" (*Art. XX.*) and so faithful a witness, and so watchful a keeper, that we can feel as certain of the facts of the Gospel History, and so of the glorious doctrines which they involve, as if we heard them from the Apostles' own lips.[333]

According to Harrison, Article XX safeguarded the doctrine of apostolic succession. He believed the bishops spoke and acted as the Apostles once did, this concept being found in Scripture. Hence, the authority of the Church was not founded in Scripture; rather a reading of the Scriptures supported the doctrine of authority resting with the Apostles and their successors. Harrison observed:

> …we see the Fathers of our own Church laying their hands on the heads of their sons in the faith, bidding them receive the HOLY GHOST for their high office and work in the Church of GOD, and charging them to be faithful dispensers of the Word of GOD and His Holy Sacraments; and then delivering into their hands that Holy Book which the Church has transmitted, and giving them authority to preach it in the congregation![334]

---

[332] Benjamin Harrison, *Tract 24* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 4.
[333] Ibid., Paragraph 6.
[334] Ibid.

The Church was the keeper of the Holy Writ which, at the Ordination Service, gave its priests the authority to preach by the action of the laying on of hands. The Church alone had sole authority, for it was the Church which kept the Scriptures, not the Scriptures which gave authority to the Church. In this early Tract by Harrison, the tenet of apostolic succession was again stressed as a central Tractarian doctrine.

In *Tract 4*, John Keble had earlier expressed the same argument which was later articulated in *Tract 22*. Location of authority in the Scriptures followed the pattern set in the early Church. *Tract 4* challenged the clergy to defend their ministerial commission against State intervention into the affairs of the Church. Is it, he asked, that the clergy were happily languid because they were reconciled to be instruments of the State?[335]

> Or is our languor rather to be accounted for by the want of express scriptural encouragement to the notion of a divine ministerial commission? Nay, Scripture, at first sight, is express, whether we take the analogy of the Old Testament, the words of our LORD, or the practice of His Apostles. The primitive Christians read it accordingly, and cherished, with all affectionate reverence, the privilege which they thought they found there.[336]

It was the apostolic succession, he wrote, handed down by divine providence, which allowed men and women to gain access to the same gifts Christ gave to the Twelve.[337] Echoing Hooker, Keble also posed rhetorically the question as to why "any man here in Britain" would want to cut themselves off "…from THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS REALM WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE

[335] John Keble, *Tract 4* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraphs 2 & 4.
[336] Ibid., Paragraph 3.
[337] Ibid., Paragraph 11.

LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO HIS PEOPLE?"[338] This Church he described as a "…decent, orderly, useful society…"[339] and, as Hooker before him, stated that to be an Englishman was to be a member of the Church of England.[340] Keble contended that the authority of the bishops and pastors of the Church was not reliant on the "establishment" rather it was reliant on "APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION."[341] The consistency of the doctrine of authority was evident in both *Tract 4* and *Tract 90*.

Tract 4 not only discussed apostolic succession, but also the proposed alterations to the Prayer Book. Both *Tract 3* and *Tract 4* were written in response to suggested reforms circulating in 1833 to alter the liturgy through:

> …the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), and especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed; the removal of all mention of the Blessed Trinity; of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; of the practice of absolution.[342]

John Keble employed the same arguments found in the first three Tracts to address this threat. Beyond the authority of the Church founded on the apostolic succession, he sought to determine who or what could decide the rites and liturgies of the Church. In doing so he prefigured Newman's argument in *Tract 90* concerning the different 'offices' of the Church and State. Keble determined that before any alterations could be made to *The Book of Common Prayer* it was necessary first to determine which power had the authority to do so. A suitable authority would not include a "foreign Power or Legislature" or "private Nobleman or Statesman." As a consequence he then asked:

---

338 Ibid., Paragraph 13.
339 Ibid.
340 Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* Book VIII, Ch. i. 2. *Works*. II: 485.
341 Keble, *Tract 4*. Paragraph 13.
342 Palmer, *Narrative of Events Connected with the Tracts for the Times* (1883). 29.

> Where is the competent authority for making alterations? Is it not also clear, that it does not lie in the British Legislature, which we know to be composed not only of believers, but also of infidels, heretics, and schismatics; and which for what we know may soon cease to be a Christian body even in formal profession? Can even a Committee of it, ever so carefully selected, absolve us from our subscriptions?[343]

The notion of the different "offices" was clearly defined here. The State could not safeguard the doctrine and tradition of the Church, if for no other reason than that the legislature contained those who did not believe the Christian faith. Keble invited his readers to reflect on the source of authority in the Church. He asked: "Whence do the Laity derive their power over the Clergy? Can even the Crown absolve us? or a commission from the Crown?"[344] His final statement was strongly redolent of *Tract 1*, demanding the clergy choose their side. "If then some measure of tyranny be ever practised against us as regards the Prayer Book, HOW ARE WE TO ACT?"[345]

The arguments concerning the primacy of apostolic succession as the source of the Church's authority was paralleled by the statements concerning the Creed. Both John Keble in *Tract 4* and his brother, Thomas Keble (1793-1875), in *Tract 22* concluded that the Creed was the "Rule of Faith."[346] In *Tract 90*, Newman opined that the Divines did not use the term 'Rule of Faith' with any fixed sense. The Divines employed the terminology "…sometimes for Scripture, sometimes for the whole and adjusted Christian doctrine, sometimes for the Creed…", hence, there was no one understanding

---

[343] Keble, *Tract 4*. Paragraph 3.
[344] Ibid.
[345] Ibid.
[346] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 1. Paragraph 4.

which could be determined.[347] While the Divines did not agree, the revered Primitive Church did agree upon one *Regula Fidei*, "…for the ancient Church made the Apostolic Tradition, as summed up in the Creed, and not the Bible…(the) Rule."[348]

The early Church was so highly revered by the Tractarians, that it drew the Tractarians to conclude that the Creed was the 'rule.' Foreshadowing Newman's later claims, Keble wrote in *Tract 4*:

> WE who believe the Nicene Creed, must acknowledge it a high privilege, that we belong to the Apostolic Church. How is it that so many of us are, almost avowedly, so cold and indifferent in our thoughts of this privilege?[349]

The statement boldly pronounced that the Church, which professed the Creed, must pause to ponder the consequences of that profession. Belonging to the Apostolic Church meant being:

> …part of that ineffable mystery …The Communion of Saints, and with all other Christian mysteries, is above the understanding of all alike, yet practically alike within reach of all, who are willing to embrace it by true Faith.[350]

The Creed supported an ecclesiology centred on apostolic succession. This was the unbroken link to the Apostles and carried with it the same authority given to the Twelve by Christ. Beyond the Twelve, the Church was linked through apostolic succession to the Saints in Heaven and Jesus Christ. Those who held the faith received access to these

---

[347] Ibid.
[348] Ibid.
[349] Keble, *Tract 4*. Paragraph 1.
[350] Ibid., Paragraph 15.

mysteries through the Sacraments, which were in turn made present through the authority of the apostolic succession.[351]

Tract 22 also addressed the proposed reforms to *The Book of Common Prayer*. It looked at the role of the Athanasian Creed in the Church. Thomas Keble argued that the tenets it contained must be preserved to protect the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity.

> Now this is the great truth pressed on our thoughts in the second part of the Athanasian Creed, where we are taught boldly to maintain that 'the right faith is, that WE BELIEVE AND CONFESS—not believe only, but believe and confess,—that our LORD Jesus CHRIST, the Son of GOD, is GOD AND MAN.[352]

He "…regarded this Creed in the light of a fence or bulwark, set up to protect the Truth against all innovations and encroachments… ." To remove it from the liturgy would "…be almost high treason against GOD…" for the Creed contains "…the Truth to be trodden down by its enemies."[353]

The Athanasian Creed contained "…doctrine (which) is not simply stated…" in Scripture, and "…so left to every one's own conscience to approve…" complex doctrines would prove to be impossible.[354] And so the role of the Creed was not only to protect the Truth, but also to instruct the faithful in matters of doctrine. Intrinsic to this contention was the argument which distinguished the different "offices" of the Church

---

[351] Ibid., Paragraph 16.
[352] Thomas Keble, *Tract 22* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 75.
[353] Ibid. Paragraph 16. Also see: John Henry Newman, *Tract 3: Thoughts Respectfully Addressed to the Clergy on Alterations in the Liturgy, The Burial Service, The Principle of Unity*, Fifth Edition. (London: J. G. & F Rivington, 1840), 3.
[354] Keble, *Tract 22*. Paragraph 76.

and the State.[355] For the State to remove the Creed from *The Book of Common Prayer* would have signified it had the authority to do so. The inclusion of the Creed in the Prayer Book protected the great truths of the Church, the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, Christ's rising from the dead and apostolic succession. The preservation of the Creed ensured that the authority of the Church came from Christ, not the State.

The Creeds, most particularly the Nicene Creed, held another important place in Tractarian thought. As well as being the means by which the Truth was measured, for Newman, they were the means by which "the great mass of patristic teaching" was judged.[356]

In *Tract 85* Newman argued the latitudinarians were incorrect in their contention that "…there is *no* definite religious information given us in Christianity at all… ."[357] Newman asserted that the Anglican view was that religious information "…*is* given in Scripture in *an indirect* and covert way… ."[358] He stated that although Scripture did contain all things necessary to salvation:

> …there may be things *contained* which are not *on the surface*, and things which belong to the *ritual* and not to *belief*. Points of faith may lie *under* the surface, points of observance may not be in Scripture at *all*.[359]

Newman referred to this as the 'Gospel doctrine.' This demonstrated he had moved away from the Scriptures as the primary source of doctrine.[360] Newman considered the

---

[355] Ibid., Paragraphs 82-5.
[356] Ward, *Young Mr. Newman*. 265.
[357] John Henry Newman, "Lecture 2, The Difficulties of Latitudinarianism", *Tract 85* (London, Rivingtons, 1838), Paragraph 2.
[358] Ibid.
[359] Newman, "Lecture 4 Structure of the Bible in matter of fact", *Tract 85*. Part 3. Paragraph 19.
[360] Mats Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882: A Study in Religious Conflict* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1992), 118.

"…structure of Scripture is such, so irregular and immethodical, that…we must hold that the Gospel doctrine or message is not contained in Scripture… ."[361] Alternatively, his view was that doctrine may not be found in Scripture, it may come from another source, or it may be so hidden as to not be directly evident.[362] For Newman "…the more fundamental that doctrine…the more likely would it be rather implied than directly taught in the writings of the Apostles."[363] Consequently, *Tract 85* determined that the doctrines of the Church were found in Scripture, but it was a 'specious argument' that "…a doctrine or a rite is not divine because it is not clearly stated in Scripture."[364] In qualifying his statement that Scripture contained all things necessary to salvation, Newman contended that the doctrines of the Church must exist outside Scripture in a separate body of teaching to ensure orthodox belief. In positing a familiar argument he stated that apostolic succession was not found in the Scriptures, yet it existed.[365] Likewise, the doctrine of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost "…is nowhere stated in Scripture."[366] The silence of the Bible in relation to both doctrines (amongst others) demonstrated the inconsistency of the argument that Scripture contained all things necessary for salvation. Pusey provided an interpretation of the role of Scripture which paralleled Newman's.

> (It)…only implies the historical fact that the same body of saving truths which the apostles first preached orally, they afterwards, under the inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, wrote in Holy Scripture, God ordering in His providence that, in

---

[361] Newman, "Lecture 3, On the Structure of the Bible, antecedently considered", *Tract 85*. Paragraph 1.
[362] Ibid.
[363] Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 118. Also see: Newman, "Lecture 3, On the Structure of the Bible, antecedently considered", *Tract 85*. Paragraph 1.
[364] Newman, "Lecture 1, Difficulties in the Scripture Proof of the Catholic Creed", *Tract 85*. Part 3. Paragraph 30.
[365] Harrison, *Tract 24*. Paragraph 4.
[366] Newman, "Lecture 1, Difficulties in the Scripture Proof of the Catholic Creed", *Tract 85*. Paragraph 4.

> the unsystematic teaching of Holy Scripture, all should be embodied which is essential to establish the faith.[367]

Newman also rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of a 'Church system' which was partly found in Scripture and partly found in Tradition. He wrote that the Church of England believed though the 'Church system' "…is in tradition, yet it can also be gathered from the communications of Scripture."[368]

Newman questioned the Protestant ideology of *sola Scriptura* in the context of a wider examination of the nature and purpose of the Church. The Tractarians developed an integrated set of standards by which the "True Church" would be measured. Scripture did not suffice as the basis for the formulation of an ecclesiology or set of beliefs. Apostolic succession was the guarantor of the authentic Church, and Tradition spoke where Scripture was silent. The Tradition of the Church was contained within the Creeds. The Church Fathers considered the Creeds were the measure of orthodoxy. This view was also held by the Tractarians. But it was to the Caroline Divines that the Oxford Movement turned to determine the standard by which the true Catholic Church should be measured.

In *Tract 90*, Newman cited Ussher, Taylor, Laud, Bramhall, Thorndike, Stillingfleet, Jackson and Field, to support his assertion that Scripture was not the sole 'Rule of Faith.' Richard Field stated that there were "many things" judged to be "Rules of our Faith."[369] One of the 'Rules of Faith' listed by Field was Scripture, another was the Vincentian Canon. The Canon was the subject of discussion in *Tract 78*, *Catena Patrum III*. This Tract

---

[367] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *An Eirenicon in a Letter to the Author of "The Christian Year"* (Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1865), 40-1.
[368] Newman, "Lecture 2, The Difficulties of Latitudinarianism", *Tract 85*. Part 4. Paragraph 12.
[369] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 1. Paragraph 6.

also argued Scripture was not the sole 'Rule of Faith.' Jeremy Collier (1650-1726) was cited as stating Scripture "…was a maxim for Luther and his adherents…" and yet this was "…nothing but a text…" to which they "…were to be the expositors… ."[370] Likewise, Collier believed: "The Bible was GOD'S, but the comment was their (the Reformer's) own… ." Further, wrote Collier, the Reformers had no regard for "Antiquity."[371] Edward Stillingfleet anticipated the main contention contained in *Tract 78*.

> The Church of England doth very piously declare her consent with the ancient Catholic Church, not in admitting anything contrary as the sense of Scripture, which is contrary to the consent of the Catholic Church of the first four ages.[372]

The 'Rule of Faith', therefore, lay in the authority of Scripture and the early Church where these two sources did not contradict each other. For the Tractarians, the dictum of St. Vincent of Lerins played an essential role in determining the characteristics of the Catholic Church, especially in shaping how a Church may remain in accord with the core truths of the Christian faith. The dictum was the measure by which the accretions of the Roman Church could be identified and condemned.

An examination of other Anglican Divines also provided evidence which supported the contention Scripture alone was not the 'Rule of Faith.' Daniel Whitby (1638-1726) in his work *Of the Guide of Faith* reflected on the principles by which Scripture was to be judged. He wrote that the Church should employ three, the "…principles of Faith…Tradition… (and) Catholic maxims of her own."[373] The document presented what have become the

---

[370] Jeremy Collier, *A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, &c. Part II: Being a Reply to the Second Part of No Sufficient Reason for Restoring Some Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI's First Liturgy* (London: James Bettenham, 1719), 164.
[371] Ibid.
[372] Edward Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion* (London: Henry Mortlock, 1665), 55.
[373] Daniel Whitby, *Dos pou sto, or, An Answer to Sure Footing, So far as Mr. Whitby is concerned in it; Wherein The Rule and Guide of Faith, the Interest of Reason, and The Authority of the Church in Matters of Faith are fully handled and*

three fonts of the Anglican Church: faith; tradition; and, reason. The latter was the particular maxim which belonged to the Church of England. Evidence the 'Rule of Faith' was not reliant on Scripture alone was further attested to by Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Writing on the structure and holiness of the Church he noted:

> We have the Word of God, the Faith of the Apostles, the Creeds of the Primitive Church, the Articles of the four first general Councils, a holy Liturgy, excellent Prayers, perfect Sacraments, Faith and Repentance, the Ten Commandments, and the Sermons of Christ, and all the precepts and counsels of the Gospel…[374]

This comprehensive catalogue by which the Catholicity of the Church of England was measured was also evidence of the different authorities by which this faith was judged, hence there were many 'Rules of Faith.' Further confirmation was provided by William Laud who wrote in his *Conference with Fisher the Jesuit* that an amalgam of the Vincentian Canon and the Creed determined a true faith. Of a universal belief he wrote it must be:

> That which is a foundation for all, cannot be one and another to different Christians in regard of itself; for then it could be no common rule for any, nor could the souls of men rest upon a shaking foundation. No: if it be a true foundation, it must be common to all, and firm under all; in which sense the Articles of Christian Faith are fundamental.[375]

The determinant and guardian of the universal faith for Laud was the Creed because it "…is a common…" and "…a constant foundation."[376] Moreover, the Creed contained

---

vindicated from the Exceptions of Mr. Serjeant and Petty Flirts of "Fiat Lux"; together an Answer to Five Questions propounded by a Roman Catholic (Oxford: W. Hall, 1666), 28*f.*

[374] Taylor, "A Letter Written to a Gentlewoman Seduced to the Church of Rome", *Works*. IV: 647.

[375] William Laud, "Conference with Fisher", *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D. Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, Seven Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1849), II: Section 10, §iii., 32-3.

[376] Ibid., 33.

"…an explicit faith…" held by "…all the Church, (who) utter this."[377] The Scriptures, the Creed and the tradition established in the first four centuries of the Church were also the measure by which the Convocation of 1571 determined orthodoxy. Significantly it was this synod which imposed subscription to the Articles. Convocation required the clergy "…to see that they never teach aught in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments…" but also "…what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from the same doctrine."[378] From the Anglican Divines and Convocation came ample evidence to support the contention that the Creed was the 'Rule of Faith.' Despite the belief of Newman's detractors, he had extracted an interpretation from the Articles "…which contradicted their obvious literal meaning… ."[379] There was sufficient confirmation to prove that Newman's conclusions were not new.

Beyond the Tracts, the most expansive array of Tractarian literature lay in the published sermons of Newman, Keble and Pusey. Between 1825 and 1843 no less than 191 of Newman's sermons were issued in eight volumes in a series entitled *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. These consisted of sermons preached while Newman was vicar at St. Mary's in Oxford.[380] The sermons might be viewed as a companion to the *Tracts for the Times*.[381] An examination of these sermons provided evidence there was consistency between the statements they contain and those found in *Tract 90*. Moreover, the sermons contained statements which went beyond those in the Tract.

---

377 Ibid.
378 Edward Cardwell, editor, "The Canon *Concionatores*." *Synodalia. A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons, and Proceedings of Convocations in the Province of Canterbury, from the YEAR 1547 to the Year 1717*, 2 Volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842), I: 126. The original text read: *Inprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam oceant pro concione, quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinae Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina catholici patres, et veteres episcopi collegerint.*
379 Gilley, *Newman and His Age*. 205.
380 Austin Cooper, "J. H. Newman: The Parochial and Plain Sermons", *The Australasian Catholic Record* (July 1990): 273-4.
381 Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* 28.

Written at the end of 1834, and preached on Trinity Sunday of the following year, the sermon entitled *The Gospel, a Trust Committed to Us* began with a central Tractarian tenet. Newman believed all Christians "…high and low…are responsible for the safe keeping of the Faith."[382] However, though all Christians had an equal interest in safeguarding the faith "…an Order of men has been especially set apart for the duty of guarding it."[383] For, "…it might be fitting for private Christians to wait until they were informed concerning the best mode of expressing [the faith of Christ]."[384] The prospect of leaving the communication of the faith in the private hands of individuals, asserted Newman, would lead to "…rashness and fancy, to pride, debate, and strife."[385] Newman argued that the Sacrament of baptism imparted the faith. It was "…put into their hands one by one at their baptism, in a form of words called the Creed…" which has been handed on "…from the first ages."[386] Newman reasserted the Tractarian doctrine of the necessity of the ordained priesthood as the keepers of faith, a doctrine which excluded the notion that the individual alone may freely interpret Scripture or act individually to pass on the faith. Orthodoxy relied on the authority of the Church situated within the ordained clergy. Each new member of the Church received the Nicene Creed from the clergy at his or her baptism. At this time the newly-baptised infant held a nascent faith. As each child grew into adulthood it was the Athanasian Creed which directed how each might mature in faith. The Creed contained the fullness of the 'Articles' of the faith. This development in faith would allow the "…unfoldings of the Gospel Doctrine…,"[387] a faith which relied more on the doctrine contained in the Creeds rather than the words of

---

382 Newman, "The Gospel, a Trust committed to us", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. II: 255.
383 Ibid.
384 Ibid., 256.
385 Ibid.
386 Ibid.
387 Ibid.

the Scriptures. (The terms 'Gospel Faith' or 'Gospel Doctrine'[388] were used interchangeably by Newman.) Scripture was the basis for the: "Fundamental Articles of Faith which the Apostles delivered."[389] These 'Articles', found in Scripture, formed the doctrinal basis for the true confession of faith systematised in the Creed. This faith was the Gospel viewed through the temper of the Ancient Faith, the purpose of which was to prevent "…a deficient insight into the principles and ends, a narrow comprehension of the spirit of His Revelation." No faith, stated Newman, could be perceived except though the "…Articles of Faith, which the Church has ever confessed…,"[390] those which the "Apostles delivered."[391] These were not a comprehensive list of doctrines, but Newman noted they

> …are expressly introduced as portions of a Formulary or Confession, committed or accepted, whether on the part of Ministers of the Church at Ordination, or of each member of it when he was baptised.[392]

The faith contained in these Articles had been handed down from the Primitive Church. It remained unchanged, and had been entrusted to the "…Church of each place and of its Bishop… ."[393]

The 'Articles' of which Newman wrote were not the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*.[394] This record of faith was "the doctrine of Christ",[395] one which was revealed in elementary concepts in Scripture and refined and defined by the "Apostolic Rule of Faith."[396]

---

388 Ibid., 256 & *passim*.
389 Ibid., 261-4.
390 Ibid., 264.
391 Ibid.
392 Ibid., 265.
393 Ibid.
394 Seven years before he published *Tract 90* Newman presented in this sermon the same list of *Articles of Religion* that he did not dispute in 1841. See: Appendix III.
395 Newman, "The Gospel, a Trust committed to us", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. II: 262.
396 Ibid., 261.

Newman posed the rhetorical question: "What is the harm of being a Sabellian, or Arian?"[397] To be a schismatic in the early Church approximated to being estranged from the Church of England in the nineteenth century. Libertine views on Christian freedom were dismissed on the grounds they destroyed the *corpus* of doctrinal Truths handed down from the early Church[398] and led to the neglect of the ordinances and polity of the Church.[399] As a consequence the 'True Church' was marked by her adherence to the ancient doctrinal Truths which were reflected in her precepts and government. For Newman it was "…the Christian Church…" which was "…simply and literally a party or society instituted by Christ."[400] It was the Church which brought order to disharmony and was the guarantor of the true faith. The Church was the bastion against those who sought faith in different communions and meeting houses and those who synthesised doctrines to the point where they became personal, individual faiths.[401] The Church embodied the true universal faith which Christ built upon the Rock, St. Peter.[402]

The final security against faith being "…taken over by opinions of the day…"[403] was the ministerial priesthood. Newman reflected that, while there was no reference to the Sacrament of reconciliation conveyed in the Gospels, and hence it could not be called a "Gospel Sacrament," there was no antecedent to suggest that a Sacrament should not be exercised in the reconciliation of the soul to Christ. It was for this purpose:

> …that a standing Ministry has existed from the first, leads on to the inference that the Ministry was intended to take charge of the Sacraments; and thus to facts

---

[397] Ibid.
[398] Ibid., 259.
[399] Ibid., 272.
[400] Newman, "The Unity of the Church", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. VII: 241.
[401] Ibid.
[402] Ibid., 240.
[403] John Henry Newman, "The Christian Ministry", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. II: 310.

> of the case suggest…He committed to Peter "the *keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven.[404]

Thus the Scriptures were not sufficient for salvation. The Sacraments were the fulfilment of Christ's promise, which would be accomplished through the institution of the ministerial priesthood. Newman wrote about the necessity for the priesthood in a sermon, *The Unity of the Church*.[405] This sermon demonstrated understanding of the importance of Church and the role of the priesthood in maintaining it as the "visible body or society" of Christ.[406] It was Christ's design that all were brought into the one "*body*" and this was accomplished by receiving the Sacrament of baptism from those who were "…already baptised…," Christians already incorporated into the pre-existing body, the Church.[407] The grace which was received from the Sacrament could not be received by sitting "at home" but must be accessed via the "…means which God has appointed…," baptism.[408] Implicit in this argument was that a man or woman cannot be saved through or by Sacred Scripture, one must actively partake of the rites which place each "…in touch with the mystery of Christ."[409] Grace flowed from the gift of baptism and this sacred rite was transmitted through those who had a "visible association" with the "original apostolical society", the "ministerial orders."[410] The latter were members of the sacred office to which they were ordained because the generation of clergy preceding them had passed on the "Divine gift" instituted by Christ through his Apostles.[411] Such ordered transmission, wrote Newman, prevented the "evil consequences" which would

---

[404] Ibid.
[405] Frank M. Turner asserted that Newman's interpretation of the *Articles* was through his recently obtained theology. This sermon, written in Newman's Evangelical period, demonstrated a remarkable consistency in his arguments, ones held before the birth of the Oxford Movement and written forty-two years before *Tract 90*. Turner, *John Henry Newman,* 359.
[406] Newman, "The Unity of the Church", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. VII: 235.
[407] Ibid., 235.
[408] Ibid.
[409] Cooper, "The Parochial and Plain Sermons", *Australasian Catholic Record.* 278
[410] Newman, "The Unity of the Church", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. VII: 236, 238.
[411] Ibid., 239.

arise from any individual or congregation taking it upon themselves to appoint a minister outside the ordered succession ordained by Christ.[412] Hence, salvation could not be guaranteed by the Scriptures, rather it was by the Sacrament of baptism, celebrated by those who were ordained by bishops in apostolic succession. Baptism, not Scripture, was the conduit of the grace of God.[413]

In *Faith the Title for Justification*, a sermon preached on 24 January, 1841, Newman noted it was in the "…One Holy and Catholic Church…" that the presence of God abided.[414] The sermons, *The Gospel, a Trust Committed to Us* and *The Unity of the Church*, repeated this argument. Individuals could not seek and receive salvation, for each could only know "…certain texts to the exclusion of others."[415] It was both faith and Church communion which were necessary to salvation.[416] Newman wrote that in the New Testament: "We find faith was not thought through enough, but was made to lead on to other conditions."[417] The "condition" to which he referred was that of the Sacrament of baptism, for while the desire for faith was gifted from reading the Scriptures, baptism conveyed the faith.[418] Newman noted:

> And as reading does not involve faith, yet is the way to it, so faith, though it does not involve justification is a sure title to it. And thus by reading Scripture, thousands, we may trust, who are not baptized, yet are virtually catechumens, and in heart and spirit *candidates* for the cleansing Sacrament.[419]

---

[412] Ibid.
[413] To Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VII: 136.
[414] Newman, "Faith the Title for Justification", *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* VI: 172.
[415] Ibid., 155.
[416] Ibid.
[417] Ibid., 164.
[418] Ibid., 168.
[419] Ibid., 172.

Hence, Newman reflected, "…faith is disjoined from justification; Christ willed justification should come at once upon faith through the Sacrament of Baptism."[420] Prior to the publication of *Tract 90* there was considerable evidence that Newman consistently believed Scripture did not contain all that is sufficient for salvation.

Newman considered the Scriptures, as the exclusive 'Rule of Faith', were compromised because the Canon had been imposed by an authority other than the Church.[421] The greater difficulty lay in the question as to who had the authority to interpret the Scriptures, what means would be used and by what measure would the interpretation be judged true or not.[422] There was no uniformity as to what constituted the 'Rule of Faith.' In the early Church the sole source of authority lay in the apostolic succession, a tenet guaranteed by the credal statements.[423] The Divines Taylor and Field considered the Creed to be the sole Rule, while Laud and Bramhall considered both Scripture and the Creed the Rule.[424] It was never Newman's intention to disparage the Scriptures, rather he wished to emphasise the importance of the Creed.[425] In the end Newman surmised that in Anglican doctrine "…the phrase 'Rule of Faith' is no symbolical expression with us…" hence "…its use had better to be avoided altogether."[426] In this sense, he added, Scripture was plainly not the 'Rule of Faith.'[427]

---

[420] Ibid.
[421] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 1. Paragraph 7.
[422] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 11.
[423] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraph 12.
[424] Ibid., Section 1. Paragraphs 15-18.
[425] To Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 136.
[426] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 1. Paragraph 29.
[427] Ibid.

CHAPTER 5

TRACT 90 – β2

ARTICLE XI

Article XI. Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Homily of Justification.

Newman's commentary on Article XI was unique in three ways. Firstly, it was the shortest of all the eleven sections in *Tract 90* containing only 695 words. Secondly, this section could be read separately without reference to following sections on Articles XII, XIII (Works before and after justification) XXV (Sacraments) and XXXV (*Homilies*). Newman wrote that the *Homilies* affirmed the doctrine of justification through baptism "…as will be shown incidentally in a later Section."[428] He also contended faith and good works were not mutually exclusive as means of justification and this was to be "…taken up in the strongest language…in Section 11."[429] Lastly, the consistency of Tractarian argument was no more amply demonstrated than in the dissertation on Article XI in which Newman bought together three great doctrines of the Oxford Movement. The first of the doctrines concerned the Sacrament of baptism. This Sacrament was the visible means of grace, which transmitted justification to the one being baptised, who in turn must have faith to receive it. The faith indwelling each person gained virtue and

[428] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 2.
[429] Ibid., Paragraph 5.

quality by the very nature of the celebration of the Sacrament of baptism.[430] The other fundamental Tractarian doctrines, membership of the Visible Church gained through baptism, and the ordained ministry necessary to convey the sacramental graces, were also synthesised within this argument concerning the source of justification.[431]

The Tractarian view on the doctrine of justification had previously been presented in *Tracts 67*, *68* and *69* written by Pusey and *Catena Patrum No. II*, *Tract 76* written by Newman, each concerning Baptismal Regeneration. These substantial works were indicative of the centrality of the doctrines concerning the Sacrament of baptism. In the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* Newman wrote that the Sacraments imparted righteousness and divine life. These thoughts were precursors to a later time when the Tractarians made the Incarnation the important doctrine, rather than that of the Atonement.[432] The *Lectures* presented a doctrine of justification which was a combination of both the Protestant and Roman Catholic systems yet excluded the excesses of both.[433] The Lutheran system of justification by faith and the Roman Catholic teaching that justification was present in each man and woman through inherent righteousness was replaced by Newman with the concept of an adhered righteousness, which was dependent "wholly and absolutely on the Divine indwelling."[434] In the tenth lecture in the series he considered (as he did three years later in *Tract 90*) how and in what sense faith alone was the instrument and the means by which justification was gained. Both faith and baptism had a distinct and complementary role in the imparting of justification in which

---

[430] John Henry Newman, *Lectures on Justification* (London. Longmans, Green & Co. 1908), 280-1.
[431] Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 135.
[432] David Newsome, "Justification and Sanctification: Newman and the Evangelicals", *The Journal of Theological Studies*, new series XV (1964): 33. C.C.J. Webb, *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (London: S.P.C.K., 1928), 89-90. Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 138.
[433] Alister E. McGrath, *Iustutia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 296. In essence this was Newman's *Via Media*.
[434] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. Lectures v-viii. Also see: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 262.

"Baptism might be the hand of the giver and Faith the hand of the receiver."[435] The inner faith received justification through the Sacraments. Mats Selen noted, "…that although faith is a necessary pre-requisite to justification, it only gains its virtue through baptism."[436] Newman wrote that the term "…to "justify" *means* in itself "counting righteous," but includes *under* its meaning "making righteous"…"[437] its primary meaning being the former.

Newman asserted that the *Homilies* contained the same argument he offered, that Article XI must be viewed with respect to both what it does say and what it does not say. He sought to define this by reference to the *Homilies*: "They do not imply a denial of *Baptism* as a means and instrument of justification; which the Homilies elsewhere affirm… ."[438] With this statement he was preparing the ground to set up the proposition that there was a difference between the internal and external means of justification. Thereafter followed two paragraphs which were not ascribed, yet these were direct quotations taken from his works, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. In these he presented the fundamental contention that the "…instrumental power of Faith cannot interfere with the instrumental power of Baptism… ."[439] Faith cannot be viewed as the sole instrument of justification, rather as the sole means of justification over and against all other graces. Newman created a *Via Media* between the Roman Catholic and Protestant positions, one which required both God acting to justify and the preparedness of each human being to receive justification. In Newman's formula, the internal and external means of justification held elements of both theological positions. The Protestant doctrine relied solely on the internal means of justification and the Roman Catholic doctrine on the

[435] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 226. Also see: Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 142.
[436] Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 142.
[437] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 65.
[438] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 2.
[439] Ibid., Paragraph 3.

external means. Newman believed that an external action required an internal reaction, which in turn did not lie latent but was made evident in good works.[440] The gift of faith was a gift of grace and, amongst all of the graces God gave, it was this alone which could justify. It was this gift alone which could respond internally to the external means of conveying justification, the Sacrament of baptism. The Sacraments were a means of grace, which both invoked and added to the internal grace which was faith.[441]

Newman's reflection on Article XI did not contain any reference to Bishop George Bull's (1634-1710) doctrine of justification. This was particularly surprising because, not only was Bull Newman's favourite Anglican Divine, it was through Bull's doctrine of justification the Tractarians could claim any form of continuity with the High Church tradition.[442] It was even more surprising because Newman referred to Bull in the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. In Lecture Three he referred explicitly to Bull, who wrote about Protestant doctrine of an imputed righteousness.[443] Rather than cite the authority of the Caroline Divines, Newman turned to the *Homilies*. Newman's methodology in employing the *Homilies* to substantiate his contentions was made clear in Section 11 of *Tract 90* and in the *Apologia* where he reported Article XXXV as saying: "The second *Book of Homilies* doth contain a godly and holy doctrine…as doth the former *Book of Homilies.*"[444] Moreover, the principles they contained demonstrated no discrimination between Roman Catholic and Protestant doctrines.[445] Newman contended that at the time the Articles were drawn up, their authors:

> …could not have possessed that exact distinction between the Catholic and Protestant faith, or have made the clear recognition of formal Protestant

[440] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 303.
[441] Gilley, *Newman and his Age*. 172-4.
[442] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context.* 268. See also: Newman, *Apologia*. 154.
[443] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 158-9.
[444] Newman, *Apologia*. 93.
[445] Ibid., 95.

> principles and tenets, or have accepted that definition of "Roman doctrine," which is received in this day…[446]

The Articles were not only tolerant of what he called "Catholic teaching," but also "Roman teaching".[447] This argument was based on the observation that the "Godly doctrine" contained within the *Homilies* was often at variance with that contained in the Articles. Thus Newman was able to argue that those who wrote the Articles actually required subscription, by way of Article XXXV and the *Homilies*, to

> …a number of those very Papistical doctrines which they were now thought to deny, as part and parcel of that very Protestantism, which they now thought to consider divine?…[448]

The importance of Newman's argument could not be ignored. Sheridan Gilley wrote that Newman

> …demonstrated a surprisingly popish element in the Books of Homilies; and in the prescribed readings of the Homilies, he pointed to the survival of patristic Catholicism in the Church of England, which in its practical teaching, had gone some way beyond an unambiguous Protestantism.[449]

In his *Apologia*, Newman cited twenty-six instances in the *Homilies* where they were at variance with the Thirty-nine Articles. In Section 11 of *Tract 90* this was extended to sixty-seven examples. Newman realised that the contentious testimony of the Caroline Divines was inadequate to substantiate a 'Catholic' reading of the Articles.[450] Through the

---

[446] Ibid.
[447] Ibid.
[448] Ibid., 93.
[449] Gilley, *Newman and His Age*. 205
[450] Newman, *Apologia*. 95-6.

Homilies he sought to both overcome this difficulty and to provide yet another foundation for a 'Catholic' interpretation of them.

As long as the Articles remained unassailable in their decidedly Protestant position, the Tractarians faced a serious difficulty in their search for doctrinal authority. Nockles observed in respect to the doctrine of justification:

> As there had never really been an Anglican consensus on the doctrine, it was easy for the opponents of the Movement to also claim impeccable Anglican testimony for their decisive repudiation of Tractarian teaching on the subject.[451]

The Evangelicals likewise had no consistent definitive statements from the Divines to support their view. What they could turn to in other matters of faith and doctrine were the Articles. To render a "Catholic" reading of them Newman sought authority in the *Homilies*.[452] Often overlooked as a source which reflected the thinking of the age, they indicated a set of doctrines which reflected a Church in transition with no settled teaching. The transitory nature of doctrine was reflective of the political turmoil in England.

Evangelical Henry Fish (1802-79) criticised the Tractarians for their selective quotation of the Divines. He noted there was no "…greater deception than that which is to be found in the "catenae patrum"…,"[453] most particularly Pusey's support for Newman's views on justification by citing Andrewes and Hooker in *Tract 81*. The arguments between Tractarians and Evangelicals on the doctrine of justification represented the

---

[451] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 268.
[452] Newman, *Apologia*. 96. The *Homilies* Newman regarded as authoritative in the sense that they conformed to the "ancient authorities", those being the Old and New Testaments, the "Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops".
[453] Henry Fish, *Jesuitism Traced in the Movements of the Oxford Tractarians* (London: J. Mason, 1842), 61-2. Also see: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 264.

quintessential difference between the two parties in their views on the Sacraments, religious practice, theology and the role of Tradition and Scripture.[454] This difference centred around the Church's teaching in the nineteenth century that religion "…was an inward thing, outward forms did not matter."[455] The Tractarian doctrine of justification demanded the outward expression of faith. Hence, the outcome of their dispute with the Evangelicals would be pivotal in deciding which belief would prevail. Newman defended his interpretation of the Divines by noting:

> …I had as much right to do so as the Evangelical party had, and more right than the Liberal, to hold their respective doctrines. …I thought the Anglican Church had been tyrannised over by a party… I only asked to be allowed to show them the difference.[456]

Newman cited the Divines Heylin, Horne and Heber in *Catena Patrum No. II* (*Tract 76*) to support his doctrine of justification. Earlier, in *Tracts 67-69, Scriptural Views on Holy Baptism*, Pusey had rejected the Protestant notion of a righteousness which was merely imputed.[457] In the Preface to Volume VI of the *Tracts for the Times* (later to become *Tract 82*) Newman defended Pusey's views in a publication entitled *Letter Addressed to a Magazine on Behalf of Dr. Pusey's Tracts on Holy Baptism and Other Tracts for the Times*. This seminal document demonstrated that *Tract 90* contained no new arguments, rather it repeated those contained in *Tract 82*.

---

[454] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 256-269 *passim*.
[455] Alf Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells), 1965), 66*f.*, 93.
[456] Newman, *Apologia*. 102.
[457] Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 143.

The link between the two Tracts became evident when Newman reflected that writing *Tract 82* had "…been a step towards the 90th Tract."[458] This was particularly so with respect to his understanding of the relationship between the *Homilies* and the Articles. Writing in the *Christian Observer*, Samuel Charles Wilks (1789-1872) attacked Pusey for his views on baptism. Wilks asked "…how, as a conscientious man, he retains any office in a Church which requires him to subscribe to all the Thirty-nine Articles…" and to the Scriptural "…doctrines set forth in the Homilies?"[459] A further question was then posed to all Tractarians:

> Will any one of the writers, or approvers of the Oxford Tracts, venture to say that he does really believe all the doctrines of the Articles and Homilies of our Church? He may construe some of *the Offices* of the Church after his own manner; but what does he do with the Articles and Homilies?[460]

Implicit in both questions was the understanding that the *Homilies* and the Articles were of equal standing with respect to doctrinal teaching and, as a consequence, perhaps inadvertently Wilks had created a link between them which would be exploited by Newman. Despite the reality that *Tract 82* had not addressed the doctrine of justification,[461] four years before the publication of *Tract 90* Newman outlined the relationship between the *Homilies* and the Articles. That the Articles could be interpreted by the *Homilies* was, in Newman's reasoning, evident by the wording of Article XXXV.

---

[458] John Henry Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, 2 Volumes (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), II: 145.
[459] Samuel Charles Wilks, *Christian Observer* (December 1836) 788-91. Cited in: Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 153.
[460] Wilks, *Christian Observer*. 788-91. Cited in: Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II. 153-4.
[461] John Henry Newman, "Letter to a Magazine on the Subject of Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism", *Tract 82* (London: Rivingtons, 1837), Paragraphs 28 & 55.

Referring to the Thirty-nine Articles in *Tract 82* Newman wrote that his detractors exhibited confusion:

> …between two things very distinct; the holding a certain sense of a statement to be *true*, and imposing that sense upon others. Sometimes the two go together; at other times they do not.[462]

The meaning of the Creed and of the liturgy was certain, but other documents contained less certainty. He believed a Parliamentary Declaration or Petition "…is put together by persons, differing in matters of detail, though agreeing together to a certain point and for a certain end."[463]

> Now the *Thirty-nine Articles* lie between these two, between a Creed and a mere joint Declaration; to a certain point they have one meaning, beyond that they have no one meaning. They have one meaning, so far as they embody the doctrine of the Creed; they have different meanings, so far as they are drawn up by men influenced severally by the discordant opinions of the day. This is what I have expressed in the former part of my letter: "the Articles," I say, "are confessedly wide in their meaning, but still their width is within bounds: they seem to include a number of shades of opinion."[464]

This statement demonstrated the methodology by which Newman's doctrine of justification had been developed. Thus he could develop his own doctrine and believe there was consistency between his writings and what was in the *Homilies*.[465] As early as 1837, he was able to discern how the Articles, ostensibly Protestant in content, were to be read in the context of their age, and as documents which were composed by many

---

[462] Ibid., Paragraph 55.
[463] Ibid., Paragraph 55.
[464] Ibid.
[465] Ibid., Paragraph 50

writers with different meanings in mind. He also established that the Articles contained statements which could be interpreted differently by utilising the *Homilies*.

Tract 82 was an essential document in understanding *Tract 90* and the way in which Newman interpreted both the Articles and the *Homilies*. The Anglican Divines had proven to be unreliable in substantiating Tractarian arguments because the Evangelicals could equally claim authority by reference to the Divines. The brilliance in Newman's new methodology of proving the Catholicity of the Articles was that he used what had long been regarded as the joint foundation of the Protestant cause in England, the Articles and the *Homilies*, against the Evangelicals.[466]

Newman showed the *Homilies* contained a strong Catholic position.[467] They were referred to as a source of proof that "…the sole instrumentality of Faith…" does not interfere "…with the doctrine of Works as a mean(s) also (to justification)."[468] Newman presented an unattributed excerpt which, it might have appeared from the wording, came from the *Homily on Alms-deeds*. However, it was Newman quoting himself. The passage was taken from "Lecture 12. Faith viewed relatively to Rites and Works" in the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*.[469] Newman's primary contention was "…does not CHRIST only justify… ."[470] He asserted that those who condemned justification through good works were like the Arians who tried to disprove Christ was God. The implied reasoning was that as the three Persons of the Godhead were different yet the same, so faith and works were different, yet both were the means of justification.[471] The inclusion of this excerpt seemed curious in that Newman did not present the preamble which appeared before it

---

[466] Newman, *Apologia*. 102.
[467] See: Appendix XI.
[468] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 5.
[469] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 275.
[470] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 6.
[471] Ibid., Paragraph 6.

in the original work. In Lecture 12, he employed the authority of St. James who insisted on works over and against St. Paul who insisted on faith as the means of justification.[472] Newman reconciled this in the formula that Article XI does not deny works justify. It confirmed faith justifies in the sense in which it alone is (one) of the sources of justification.[473] Rune Imberg noted that this argument was "rather strained."[474]

In his reflection on the doctrine of justification nowhere did Newman refer to a key document, the *Homily on Justification*, cited by the Article as containing a more fulsome expression of the doctrine.[475] This was because only a part of the Article was cited in *Tract 90*: "That we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine."[476] However, on closer inspection, it could be seen that Newman had paraphrased the *Homily*. The original text from the *Book of Homilies*, Book I., Homily iii. read:

> IT hath been manifestly declared unto you, that no man can fulfill the Law of GOD, and therefore by the law all men are condemned: whereupon it follows necessarily, that some other thing should be required for our salvation then the law: and that is, a true and a lively faith in Christ: bringing forth good works, and a life according to GODS commandments. And also you heard the ancient authors minds of this saying, Faith in Christ only justifies man, so plainly declared, that you see, that the very true meaning of this proposition or saying, We be justified by faith in Christ only, (according to the meaning of the old ancient authors) is this: We put our faith in Christ, that we be justified by him only, that we be justified by GODS free mercy, and the merits of our Savior Christ only, and by no virtue or good works of our own, that is in us, or that we

[472] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 275.
[473] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 6.
[474] Imberg, *In Quest of Authority*. 130.
[475] See: *Article XI*. The full title of the *Homily* was: A SERMON OF THE salvation of mankind, by only Christ our Savior from sin and death everlasting.
[476] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 1.

> can be able to have or to do, for to deserve the same: Christ himself only being the cause meritorious thereof.[477]

Reading this extract and the Lectures and *Tract 90* in parallel indicates Newman had interpreted its argument to mean that humankind was justified by Christ alone. Faith was the means by which men and women believed they were justified through him.[478] The extract also stated men and women were not justified by their own virtues or good works. This permitted Newman to claim that, while all are justified by Christ only, faith and good works are the internal and external responses by each individual who is justified by Christ only. He went on to illustrate his point further by again quoting from the *Homilies*. Moses in "…lifting up his hands on the Mount…" performed an action "…which did not merit GOD'S mercy, but asked for it."[479] Also, from the *Book of Homilies*, Book II., Homily vii.:

> We reade in the booke of Exodus, that Iosua fighting against the Amalekites, did conquer & ouercome them, not so much by vertue of his owne strength, as by the earnest and continuall prayer of Moses, who, as long as hee helde vp his handes to GOD, so long did Israel preuaile…[480]

Both Newman and the *Homilies* reflected that no action, no faith of any human being, could warrant God's justification, rather it was the Lord alone who justified. Men and women may only ask for it as Moses prayed for victory over the enemies of Israel.

---

[477] A SERMON OF THE salvation of mankind, by only Christ our Savior from sin and death everlasting. *Books of Homilies*. Book I. Homily iii. Part 3. Paragraph 1. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk1hom03.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008.
[478] See: Appendix X.
[479] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 7.
[480] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning Prayer. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily vii. Paragraph 3. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008.

Newman illustrated this further by the example of the Brazen Serpent.[481] The people of Israel in their worship of the image did not warrant God's mercy, but their very action desired it. This concept was taken from the *Homilies*, Book I, Homily v.:

> …you reade of Baal, Moloch, Chamos, Melchom, Baalpeor, Astaroth, Bell, the Dragon, Priapus, the brasen Serpent, the twelue signes, and many other vnto whose images the people with great deuotion inuented Pilgrimages, precious decking and sensing them, kneeling downe, and offering to them, thinking that an high merit before God, and to bee esteemed aboue the precepts and commandements of GOD …vnto the very commandements of GOD: for the which thing (the following of the commandments) their immortall reward and glory, doeth, and shall remaine with GOD for euer.[482]

This extract also illustrated where Newman and the *Homily* parted, for the latter required the Ten Commandments be observed in order for men and women to receive their reward and glory from God. Newman, however, perceived that their justification was derived from the gift of grace through baptism. This extract from the *Homilies*, that denotes men and women received an imputed justification by following God's law, was not found in Tractarian doctrine. This was located elsewhere in the *Homilies*. From Book I, Homily iii.:

> In so much that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to GODS favor, and made his children, and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven. And they which in act or deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to GOD unfeignedly, they are likewise

---

[481] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 7. Newman also employed the example of the Brazen Serpent in: Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 174-5.
[482] A Sermon of Good Workes annexed vnto Faith. *Books of Homilies*. Book I. Homily v. Part 2, Paragraph 8. http://allsaintsgreenville.org/Faith/Homilies/Book1Homily5.dsp: retrieved 28 September, 2008.

> washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort, that there remains not any spot of sin, that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that justification or righteousness which S. Paul speaks of, when hee saith, No man is justified by the works of the Law, but freely by faith in Jesus Christ. And again he saith, We believe in Jesus Christ, that we be justified freely by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the Law, Because that no man shall be justified by the works of the Law (Galatians 2.16). And although this justification be free unto us, yet it cometh not so freely unto us, that there is no ransom paid therefore at all.[483]

It was Christ alone who justified, the faith in Christ which sought justification and baptism which "conveys it."[484] Newman completed this section of *Tract 90* by making an allusion to the parable of the labourer in the vineyard (Matt. 20:1-16). Faith, he wrote, was akin to the labourer receiving his wage before he began his work. That is, faith led to works, and it was by both each man and woman would be justified "…partly in this world, fully in the next."[485] In this formula, Newman continued the idea that the divine indwelling was informed and brought forth by the Sacrament of baptism, which in this example taken from Matthew, became work carried out in love.

This section of *Tract 90*, for all its brevity, was essential for comprehending what follows. Most especially the Tractarian doctrine of the efficacy of the Sacraments was highlighted and reinforced. In the Tract it was given a new importance. What followed was, to a large extent, dependent on the belief that it was the Sacraments which imparted divine grace. However, of equal importance was the methodology Newman employed to present his

---

[483] A SERMON OF THE salvation of mankind, by only Christ our Savior from sin and death everlasting. *Book of Homilies.* Book I. Homily iii. Paragraph 3. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk1hom03.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008.
[484] Cf. Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 7.
[485] Ibid.

arguments, for this itself became a matter of contention. He was roundly criticised for his methodology. It was necessary to consider if Newman was successful in using the *Homilies* as a means to support his arguments. Of even greater importance was the question concerning his accurate usage of them. He recorded in his *Apologia* that he could find evidence in the *Homilies* to support his claims, just as his Evangelical opponents could.[486] It he could find evidence in the Homilies to support his claims, just as his Evangelical opponents could.was evident, Newman claimed, that the *Homilies* were written in a time when the terms Protestant and Catholic were unknown. There was apparent "confusion" in the *Homilies* in that they did not present a pure Reformation theology, but exhibited some vestiges of the "old" religion on their pages.

Newman did not invent a new doctrine of justification in *Tract 90*. The doctrine he expounded was one which could be found elsewhere in Anglicanism. He also used extracts from the *Lectures on Justification* in *Tract 90*, hence any claim *Tract 90* contained new material was groundless. The Tractarian principle was to present nothing new which could not be found in the Tradition of the Church, and this was supported by an examination of Section 2. That this section contained the first excerpt from a *Homily* was significant: it was the precursor of what was to follow. That Newman employed the *Books of Homilies* with such great effectiveness was also first evidenced in this section.

[486] Newman, *Apologia*. 102. See also: Appendices IX & X.

CHAPTER 6

TRACT 90 – SECTION β3

ARTICLES XII & XIII

XII. Of Good Works.

Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

XIII. Of Works before Justification.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of the Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace also it is to be believed, that he went down into Hell.

Newman now turned his discussion to the subject of works before and after justification. He addressed further the matter of an 'adhered' justification in which internal faith was justified by the external instrument of grace: baptism. Newman posited the Articles did not recognise an intermediate stage between those who were not justified and those who were.[487] Newman's notion of internal faith being justified by external grace demanded there was 'something' in the believer to which righteousness adhered.[488] Within those who were not justified there was a disposition to seek divine grace.[489] This disposition might be made manifest by good works, which in themselves did not justify, rather it was

[487] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 7.
[488] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 132.
[489] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 9.

God's divine gift of grace, which alone justified.[490] Newman trod a very careful line here, one that could easily be taken for the Protestant position in which God justified through faith alone. His insistence that there was 'something' within each man and woman to whom righteousness adhered was the basis for his doctrine of justification, one of a *Via Media* between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

Newman's thoughts on good works were found in the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* first published in 1838. The Lectures provided the foundation for his comments in *Tract 90*. Newman studied the Protestant doctrine of justification, which he observed around him, while writing the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*.[491] Protestants believed all humankind was depraved and any endowed righteousness was lost at the time of the Fall.[492] Newman's perception of the Protestant doctrine was that God declared the sinner just and righteous, although the actions of the one justified did not necessarily reflect their state of righteousness. Justification was attained through the Atonement when Christ took on humankind's guilt and punishment. The pardon offered by God could not be attained by anything the sinner did, but rather was given as a gift.[493] On these points Newman agreed. However, the Protestant doctrine deemed each man and woman, even after justification, remained a sinner. The Tractarian doctrine of justification affirmed God's grace was freely given through the Sacraments.

> By this doctrine is meant, first, that the Sacrament of Baptism is not a mere *sign* or *promise*, but actually a *means* of grace, an *instrument*, by which, when rightly received, the soul is admitted to the benefits of CHRIST'S Atonement, such as

---

[490] Ibid.
[491] Selen noted that Newman's view of Luther's doctrine of salvation was founded in what he observed of current Protestant practices and beliefs, rather than what Luther actually wrote. See: Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-45*. 136, 139-140. See also: McGrath, *Iustutia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 296*f*.
[492] Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-45*. 137.
[493] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 7. Also see: Gilley, *Newman and His Age.* 172.

> the forgiveness of sin, original and actual, reconciliation to GOD, a new nature, adoption, citizenship in CHRIST'S kingdom, and the inheritance of heaven,—in a word, Regeneration.[494]

If the Sacraments were the means of God's sovereign grace they must have an effect on the one gifted it. The internal faith of the one who received external grace must not only be able to recognise what was of God but also benefit from the gift.

If a man or woman remained a sinner after justification, if each did nothing to be justified and was required to do nothing to remain justified, what then, asked Newman, was the difference between one justified and one unjustified? He considered Luther's doctrine to be inadequate. He perceived the Lutheran doctrine to say: "To justify is to *account* or *declare* righteous; this is God's act; this is a movement of the Divine Mind and altogether external to the *subject* of that justification."[495] If justification only existed in the Divine Mind "…then those who are justified are justified from eternity, for God sees the end from the beginning."[496] Likewise, because it was God's will a man or woman be justified "…they are in a justified state even from the hour of their birth; before their conversion, while they are wallowing in all sin and unholiness, they are justified… ."[497] Newman considered this unacceptable. He believed baptism was the external sign of God's justifying grace. Each man or woman who was justified through baptism entered the state of righteousness. If the Sacrament of baptism "…is the *instrument* of…"[498] justification then justification lies beyond the divine consciousness. It followed there was

---

[494] Newman, *Tract 76*. Paragraph 1.
[495] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 132. Also see: McGrath, *Iustutia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 212-3.
[496] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 132.
[497] Ibid.
[498] Ibid.

within the baptised "…*that* which is *named* righteousness."[499] But, Newman asked, "…what is that object or thing, what is it in a man, which God seeing there, therefore calls him righteous?"[500] Equally, all who were justified received that which is "…called righteousness, which God first clothes us with as with a robe, then looks upon and accepts…."[501] Newman reflected, "…I do not ask why God so looks upon it, but *what* it is He looks upon."[502]

Newman believed what God looks upon must be what Adam lost through his disobedience and Christ regained. It was a "supernatural gift," one into which all the other gifts given by God to Adam were subsumed, it was "…the presence of God the Holy Ghost in him, exalting him into the family and service of His Almighty Creator."[503] Before the Fall, Adam had possessed this gift of righteousness wholly. Now righteousness was possessed in an incomplete state by each baptised man and woman, it was "…the indwelling and manifestation in our hearts of the Incarnate Word…," one which would be restored completely in the hereafter.[504] Righteousness was fully restored through the action of the Holy Spirit who directed the nature of men and women. "Human nature" was distinguished from the "moral nature" which was directed by the Holy Spirit.

> Since, then, the gift of righteousness is a supernatural presence in our moral nature, distinct from it, yet dwelling in it and changing it, it is not wonderful that the change itself should sometimes be spoken of in Scripture as the gift or as included in the gift.[505]

---

[499] Ibid., 131.
[500] Ibid.
[501] Ibid., 133.
[502] Ibid.
[503] Ibid., 160.
[504] Ibid.
[505] Ibid., 170.

Adam's righteousness "…was not a mere imputed righteousness, (which) need not formally be proved; it was a something, of the loss of which he was himself at once conscious, which he could not be of acts passing in the Divine Mind."[506] Neither was it an innate righteousness, for if it was so it would not have yielded "…to external temptation… ."[507] Newman cited George Bull who had collected the testimony of the "Catholic fathers":

> …(they) teach that the principle of sanctity in Adam, to which was attached the gift of immortal life, was something distinct from and above his human nature. That nature, indeed, did look towards such a perfection, but could not in itself reach it.[508]

The sanctity in Adam was the moral nature, a "heavenly possession" without which "…man was not able to keep the Law according to the Covenant of Life, but with it he could serve God acceptably, and gain the reward set before him."[509] It was the moral nature sanctified by the Holy Spirit which impelled an individual to seek what was once lost by Adam: the gift of immortal life. But, it could not be faith alone which sought the hereafter. Newman had written in the previous section of *Tract 90* that faith alone justified in the sense in which it justified, "…so works, whether moral or ritual, may justify us in their own respective senses… ."[510] The moral works were as much an outpouring of the moral nature as was faith. Both seek the fullest expression of God, attained partially in this life, fully in the next.

---

[506] Ibid., 158.
[507] Ibid.
[508] Ibid., 159. George Bull, "Discourse V. Concerning the First Covenant, and the State of Man before the Fall, According to Scripture, and the Sense of the Primitive Doctors of the Catholic Church", *The English Theological Works of George Bull, D.D. Sometime Lord Bishop of St. David's*, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844), 92-3.
[509] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 159.
[510] Ibid., 276.

Newman's doctrine of justification could not easily be reconciled with Articles XII and XIII, yet it was essential for him to bring together the two positions. In this way he could maintain the contention that the Thirty-nine Articles were both Catholic and apostolic.[511] In *Tract 90,* eight of the nine paragraphs examined Article XIII. The two Articles were printed in reverse order and while he quoted the text of Article XII from the Thirty-nine Articles, he quoted the text of Article XIII from the Forty-two Articles.[512] Article XIII stated "…that works *before* grace and justification were worthless…" but did "…not speak at all of works *with* God's aid *before* justification."[513] In describing the nature of works done with God's aid, Newman's reason for using the text from the Forty-two Articles became evident. He considered "…to deserve *de congruo*, or of congruity, is to move the Divine regard, not from any claim upon it, but from a certain fitness or suitableness… ."[514] The desire to conform to God's will came from that within each human which was of God. The Holy Spirit compelled men and women through their moral nature to do good, and righteousness adhered to that nature. As the moral nature acted before justification, Newman asserted that faith and works were acceptable both before and after justification.[515]

The rationale behind Newman's treatment of these Articles was obvious. His doctrine of justification had established that there was within each man and woman the "supernatural gift" and the grace of the Sacraments. Latent within each man and woman was that to which God adhered the gift of sanctification, consequently each was

---

[511] Newman, *Apologia*. 133.
[512] See: Appendix XIX.
[513] Newman, *Apologia*. 97.
[514] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 4. *De congruo* means to coincide, agree or conform, in this instance with God's will. It is the moral nature which led to conformity with God's will.
[515] Ibid., Paragraph 9.

predisposed to do good.[516] It was the action of the Holy Spirit within each that drew them towards God. "He is our "seal unto the day of redemption;" for as the potter moulds the clay, so He impresses the Divine image on us members of the household of God."[517] Baptismal regeneration was the means by which the "supernatural gift" was placed in the receiver, despite which:

> …the original nature of the soul is not destroyed, yet its past transgressions are pardoned once and for ever, and its source of evil staunched and gradually dried up by the pervading health and purity which has set up its abode in it.[518]

In this state, each human being was predisposed to seek God. Those who worshipped the Brazen Serpent did not deserve God's mercy, but their action demonstrated a desire for it. So it was with those who did good works before justification.[519] In Newman's model they did not deserve mercy, but each desired it, because of that which lay within drawing them towards God. This was contrary to Article XIII which described two states of humankind: "…one of justifying grace, and one of the utter destitution of grace; and it says that those who are in utter destitution cannot do anything to gain justification."[520]

In *Tract 90*, Newman quoted two excerpts from the *Homily on Repentance*, neither of which he employed to support his claims. Rather, he used them to reflect upon the Articles. The first extract defined "The repentance of the Schoolemen." It was one "…that teach repentance without a liuely faith in our Sauiour Iesus Christ…"[521] and was described as being akin to the repentance of Judas. This type of repentance was marked by three

---

[516] Ibid., Paragraphs 7 & 9.
[517] Newman, "Sermon 19. The Indwelling Spirit", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. II: 223.
[518] Ibid.
[519] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 2. Paragraph 7.
[520] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 7.
[521] AN HOMILIE OF Repentance, and of true reconciliation vnto GOD. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xx. Part 2, Paragraph 9. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom20.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90* Section 3. Paragraph 5.

"parts." They were: "…the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction of the worke."[522] The *Homily* judged "…all these things we finde in Iudas repentance: which in outward appearance did farre exceede and passe the repentance of Peter… ."[523] Nevertheless, these actions could not save Judas. Peter was saved by an altogether different type of repentance, one which depended on the gift of God's grace:

> This was commonly the penaunce that Christ enioyned sinners: Goe thy way, and sinne no more (John 8.11). Which penance wee shall neuer be able to fulfill, without the speciall grace of him that doeth say, Without me ye can doe nothing.[524]

The second excerpt from the *Homily* confirmed that while "…we should in no wise despaire of the mercy and goodnesse of GOD…" but no one should believe "…we are able to repent aright, or to turne effectually vnto the Lord by our owne might and strength."[525] The *Homily* and "…the *Article* denie(d) that works done before the grace of CHRIST, or in a mere state of nature…dispose towards grace, or move GOD to grant grace."[526] The Articles referred to justifying grace and to a state without grace, but did not allude to a state which existed between the two where humankind lived in neither:

> ....light or in darkness, but are sometimes between the two; they are sometimes not in a state of Christian justification, yet not utterly deserted by GOD, but in a state of something like that of Jews or of Heathen, turning to the thought of religion.[527]

---

[522] Ibid.
[523] Ibid., *Homily,* Paragraph 10.
[524] Ibid., *Homily,* Paragraph 13.
[525] AN HOMILIE OF Repentance, and of true reconciliation vnto GOD. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xx. Part 1, Paragraph 19. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom20.htm: retrieved 30 December, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90* Section 3. Paragraph 6.
[526] Newman, *Tract 90.* Section 3. Paragraph 3.
[527] Ibid., Paragraph 7.

In this intermediate state the possibility of justification was offered to those who, not through their own merits or actions "…the secret aid of GOD…" which was akin to the "…grace and Spirit…" poured out on the baptised. Both were offered through the "…merits of CHRIST'S sacrifice."[528] Though nothing could be done to merit justification, there was a particular state in which men and women could exist which led to their justification. The state between not having grace and being justified was one in which a person might be visited by "Divine influences" or "…by *actual* grace, or rather *aid*…"[529] and in such circumstances "…works done *with* divine aid, and in faith, *before* justification, *do* dispose men to receive the grace of justification… ."[530] Newman wrote that the Article was silent on the subject of this intermediate state.[531]

He offered evidence for this state, referring to Cornelius (Acts 10:1-28) who was disposed to "alms, fastings and prayers"[532] yet he was not justified. Cornelius was not saved. He was not filled with the Holy Spirit. Peter pronounced that it was through the gift of the Holy Spirit, symbolised in the waters of baptism, Cornelius was subsequently saved (Acts 10:47). Newman cited this example to support his contention that the good works of Cornelius were a precursor to his redemption through baptism and it was God who gave Cornelius his Divine "*aid*" which led him to the Sacrament of salvation (cf. Acts 10:34-5). But this contention was not new. The first excerpt Newman cited from the *Homily on Repentance* contained an ellipsis, which might have led the reader to assume the words not included were at variance with Newman's argument. Such was not the case. On the contrary, the 951 words excluded contained statements in conformity with

[528] Ibid.
[529] Ibid.
[530] Ibid.
[531] Ibid., Paragraph 8.
[532] Ibid., Paragraph 7 Cf. Acts 10:2.

Newman's contentions.[533] The *Homily* presented further parallels between Judas' betrayal of Christ and Peter's denial of Christ. Of the former the *Homily* noted:

> Did not hee also afore hee hanged himselfe make an open confession of his fault, when hee sayde, I haue sinned, betraying the innocent blood? And verely this was a very bold confession, which might haue brought him to great trouble. For by it he did lay to the high Priests and Elders charge, the shedding of innocent blood, and that they were most abominable murderers. Hee did also make a certaine kinde of satisfaction, when hee did cast their money vnto them againe.[534]

These acts of contrition did not save Judas, yet in contrast Peter suffered no sanction even though he denied the Saviour. Peter had committed a "heinous sinne" yet his only act of contrition was to go out and weep bitterly.[535] The *Homily* considered the difference between the two figures was that Peter had a "…liuley Faith…" and sought out the "…mercy of GOD…" whereas Judas "…did dispayre of the goodnesse and mercie of GOD… ."[536] It was of no consequence if men and women were sorrowful for their sins, stated the *Homily*. The desire for forgiveness from God would bring all to a state of "…vtter desperation…"[537] whereby all were solely reliant on God's mercy. But what was the evidence which demonstrated the desire for mercy? The *Homily* and Newman concurred, for both spoke of a state in which human beings were not justified; they had not been given the grace which flowed from God's mercy. Both stated there must be a desire for God's mercy and this was evidenced by "good fruits."[538] (Newman used the

---

[533] See: Appendix XI.
[534] AN HOMILIE OF Repentance, and of true reconciliation vnto GOD. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xx. Part 2. Paragraph 10. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom20.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008.
[535] Ibid., Paragraph 11. Cf. Matt. 26:34 & parallels.
[536] Ibid.
[537] Ibid.
[538] Ibid., Paragraph 10.

term "first-fruits."[539]) Newman believed these "first-fruits" were evidence of the Divine "*aid*", an "*actual grace*" which led men and women to be justified.[540] Both the *Homily* and Newman placed the desire for justification in those who sought God.

> …the Nineuites for an example, which at the preaching of Ionas did not onely proclaime a generall fast, and that they should euery one put on sackecloth: but they all did turne from their euill wayes, and from the wickednesse that was in their hands (Jonas 3.5, 10).[541]

The *Homily* further illustrated the desire of men and women to seek salvation from God. It gave the examples of "Zacheus" (Luke 19:1-10)[542] and the "sinfull woman" who used her tears and hair to wash the feet of Christ.[543] In the examples cited in the *Homily*, those seeking redemption did so through an action. The Ninevites put on sackcloth and ashes, Zaccheus gave away his wealth and the sinful woman washed the feet of Jesus. These were ostensibly good works, but it was not these which saved them. The Ninevites, for example, were saved by their faith-filled actions which demonstrated their intention of repentance. These were the same "heathens" whom Newman placed in neither the dark nor the light but were amongst those "…turning to the thought of religion… ."[544] The *Homily* concurred that it was God who granted grace to those called to repentance "…either by the preaching of GODS word, or by some inward motion of his holy spirit,

---

[539] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 7.
[540] Ibid.
[541] AN HOMILIE OF Repentance, and of true reconciliation vnto GOD. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xx. Part 2. Paragraph 11. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom20.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008.
[542] Ibid., Paragraphs 11 & 12.
[543] Ibid., Paragraph 12.
[544] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 7.

or els by some other meanes… .”[545] This was a description of grace which paralleled Newman’s “*actual* grace” or Divine “*aid*.”[546]

The final paragraph of Section 3 summarised Newman’s commentary on the two Articles. This contained his only consideration of Article XII. He agreed works after justification could not save but they were “…pleasing and acceptable to God…” which were rewarded “…according to their degree of excellence.”[547] Works before justification done under “divine influence” gained grace, works after justification gained so much more. These were “…“grata,” pleasing to GOD;” and they were accepted, “accepta” which means that GOD rewards them.”[548] But good works could neither expiate sin nor release humankind from “…the severity of GOD’S judgment.”[549] Works after justification were still vulnerable “…to the infection of original sin… .”[550]

Section 3 was unique because it contained a commentary on the Articles with no corroborative evidence, not even from Newman’s own literature; but this did not indicate that the argument was innovative. Reference to the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* provided ample evidence that *Tract 90* contained little new material.

The Lectures considered why works alone did not suffice to justify. Newman wrote of figures in the Old Testament whose works were accepted by God because of the forthcoming Atonement.

---

[545] AN HOMILIE OF Repentance, and of true reconciliation vnto GOD. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xx. Part 3. Paragraph 7. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom20.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008.
[546] Ibid., Part 2. Paragraphs 9, 10 & 13. Also cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 4.
[547] Ibid.
[548] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 3. Paragraph 9. Newman’s used Latin to strengthen his argument. Both words are used correctly in context.
[549] Ibid.
[550] Ibid.

> It is true He has before now, in His great mercy, accepted such works, as the zeal of Jael, the self-abasement of Naaman, or the faith of the widow of Sarepta; but (as the last-mentioned expresses it in her own case) their "sin" was still in "remembrance;" it was not abolished, it still "stank" before God and was loathsome; and if He vouchsafed to admit them to any measure of His favour, He did so from respect to the merits of that Atonement which was to be made…[551]

God also accepted the good works "…in consideration of those good feelings…which lay in their souls…,"[552] but these "good feelings" were not generated by any human being, rather, they "…came from the grace of God, as their first source… ."[553] Even then "…they were not such as to sanctify their persons, or make their works pleasing, or good and righteous in the sight of God."[554] Simultaneously men and women were counted both as acceptable to God and yet considered to be unrighteous. This was because "…by nature sin was sovereign in us in spite of the remains of heaven… ."[555] The infection of Adam's sin remained in the nature of each man and woman and consequently they were "…unrighteous or displeasing to God…"[556] but equally "…we are actually righteous and pleasing to Him in a state of grace."[557] The effects of original sin were "staunched" through baptismal grace and the consequent regeneration. Nevertheless, good works still had a significant role to play in winning God's favour and were indeed a symbol of God's grace.

---

[551] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 90.
[552] Ibid.
[553] Ibid.
[554] Ibid.
[555] Ibid., 91.
[556] Ibid.
[557] Ibid., 90.

It was significant that in *Tract 90* Newman did not go nearly as far in defining and advocating the importance of good works as he did in the Lectures.

> …while works before justification are but conditions and preparations for that gift, works after justification are much more, and that, not only as being intrinsically good and holy, but as being fruits of *faith*. And viewed as one with faith, which is the appointed instrument of justification after Baptism, they are,—(as being connatural with faith and indivisible from it, organs through which it acts and which it hallows),—instruments with faith of the continuance of justification, or, in other words, *of the remission of sin after Baptism*.[558]

Good works after justification are "…the means of keeping and restoring (grace) not of procuring it, as fruits of faith done in the grace of Christ and by the inspiration of His Spirit, not as dead works done in the flesh, and displeasing to God."[559]

Newman referred to the *Homily of the Passion* to argue "…how our Reformers *identified* faith and works, not as an idea, but in fact."[560]

> …it remayneth that I shew vnto you, how to apply Christs death and passion to our comfort, as a medicine to our woundes… Heere is the mean whereby we must apply the fruites of Christs death vnto our deadly wound. Heere is the meane whereby we must obtaine eternall life, namely fayth.[561]

---

[558] Ibid., 304.
[559] Ibid., 306.
[560] Ibid.
[561] AN HOMILIE FOR good Friday, concerning the death and passion of our Sauiour Iesus Christ. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xiii. THE SECOND HOMILIE concerning the death and Passion of our Sauiour Christ. Paragraph 6. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom13.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 306.

Newman quoted from the *Homily on Alms Deeds*: Christ taught that in order to keep souls safe it was necessary to seek a

> …precious medicine and an inestimable iewell, that hath such strength and vertue in it, that can either procure or preserue so incomparable a treasure. For if we greatly regard that medicine or salue that is able to heale sundry and grieuous diseases of the body: much more will wee esteeme that which hath like power ouer the soule. And because wee might be better assured both to know and to haue in readines that so profitable a remedy: he, as a most faithfull & louing teacher, sheweth himselfe both what it is, and where we may finde it…[562]

Christ instructed his disciples to "…Giue almes…(and)…to bee mercifull and charitable in helping the poore, is the meanes to keepe the soule pure and cleane in the sight of GOD…that mercifull almes dealing, is profitable to purge the soule from the infection and filthie spottes or sinne."[563] Both faith and works after justification were the "medicine" "…as the means of keeping and restoring…" it.[564]

Further evidence to support this contention was taken from *Homily of Christian Love and Charity* which noted all men and women should direct their lives "…by Christian loue and charitie…" to gain salvation.[565] Finally, from the *Homily of the Resurrection for Easter Day*:

---

[562] AN HOMILIE OF Almes deedes, and mercifulnesse toward the poore and needy. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xi. Part 2. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom11.htm: retrieved 28 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 305.
[563] Ibid.
[564] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 306.
[565] A SERMON OF CHRIstian loue and charity. *Books of Homilies*. Book I. Homily vi. Part 2. Paragraph 6. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk1hom06.htm Accessed 28 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 309.

> Apply yourselves, good friends, to *live in Christ, that* Christ may *still* live in you, whose favour and assistance if ye have, then have ye everlasting life already within you, then can nothing hurt you.[566]

Newman added italics to the text to emphasise that "Godly and holy living was the *immediate tenure* of Christ's inward presence, or of justification in God's sight."[567] The *Homily* provided further evidence "…our Formularies consistently put forth the doctrine…" good works and faith were both means of remaining justified.[568]

In the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, Newman also cited *The Book of Common Prayer* to support his argument regarding the importance of works to retain and enhance justification. In *The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion* Newman found evidence for his contention in the introductory sentences prefixed to the Exhortation. Newman noted: "It is quite evident that these Sentences are intended to proclaim God's *forgiveness of sin*, as a fit introduction to the Confession."[569] He observed these sentences did not mention faith as "…*the* mean by which pardon and acceptance after sinning may be obtained…" and this was singularly noticeable because "…the Sentences are the selection of the Reformers, who, if any men, were alive to the necessity of faith in order to justification."[570] Newman went on to make the most explicit claim in any of his writings concerning faith and good works:

---

[566] AN HOMILIE OF THE Resurrection of our Sauiour Iesus Christ. For Easter Day.' *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xiv. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom14.htm Accessed 28 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 309.
[567] Ibid.
[568] Ibid.
[569] Ibid., 310.
[570] Ibid.

> Nothing can show more clearly that, while they considered it the only instrument of justification, they considered also that good works (of whatever kind) were in fact the coming to God, and the concrete presence of faith.[571]

Newman provided further examples from the Exhortation, the collect for Ash Wednesday and *The Order for the Visitation of the Sick* to support his argument. Each contained "…renewal, contrition, and confession…as the *immediate* causes or instruments, on our part, of justification…" and nowhere was there a reference to faith.[572] Lastly, in the 'Note on Lecture 12', Newman compared the "…popular Protestant faith…" of justification by faith alone with the Commination Service which demanded of each penitent he or she "…follow Him in lowliness, patience, and charity, and be ordered by the governances of His Holy Spirit."[573]

Tract 90 contained statements which were far less provocative than those found in the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, documents which were the foundation of the Tractarian doctrine of justification. There was little in else in Tractarian literature outside these documents which referred to the doctrine. In *Tract 90* Newman did not refer to the Caroline Divines. In the *Lectures* he referred to them in four instances only. However, the Divines did offer evidence to support Newman's views. In *Tract 81*, *Catena Patrum No. IV* by Pusey, the principle that good works were a means to sustain justification was maintained by J. Overall, J. Taylor, D. Brevint, W. Beveridge and G. Hickes.[574] Newman's assertion that documents from the time of the English Reformation did contain confirmation which supported Catholic doctrine. This was sustained on the evidence provided by the *Homilies*. Proof from the post-Reformation period could be

[571] Ibid.
[572] Ibid., 309-311.
[573] Ibid., 311.
[574] Pusey, *Tract 81*. §4, §27, §28, §37, §40.

located in the Divines. Everything printed in *Tract 90* on the doctrine of justification had been printed before in earlier Tractarain literature, was consistent with works from the Caroline Divines and hence was neither innovative nor radical.

CHAPTER 7

TRACT 90 – SECTION β4

ARTICLE XIX

XIX. Of the Church.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

Newman's interpretation of Article XIX complemented Section 1 which considered the nature of the Church. In both sections Newman adopted a similar methodology. Each section contained a series of short extracts from diverse authorities. In the earlier section Newman turned to the Catholic Fathers, the Creeds and the Caroline Divines (notably Richard Field) to support his arguments. Addressing Article XIX he sustained his arguments by providing evidence from sources including the early Fathers, the Popes, Catholic philosophers and theologians, Protestant Reformers and the Confession of Augsburg.[575] The Anglican Divines were notable in their absence from the list of authorities. Newman claimed that, even in their diversity, the twenty authorities cited were nevertheless in accord. All agreed in their description of the "…One Holy Catholic Church diffused throughout the world…,"[576] one which could not be mistaken in its

[575] See: Appendix XIII.
[576] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 3.

singular majesty.[577] The Visible Church was "…not an abstract idea… ."[578] It was a congregation of the faithful.[579] Consistently throughout *Tract 90* there was one enduring motif: that of the Visible Church in apostolic succession through which the Sacraments were communicated. The Sacraments were the means by which grace was dispensed. In contrast, the Protestant position held that the Invisible Church was the true Church of Christ. Membership of it came from election by God.[580] Protestant theology argued against the merit of good works and rejected the efficacy of baptism. Election was by faith alone. The opposing doctrines were examined in Newman's consideration of Article XIX.

Originally framed around the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, Newman contended that the words contained in the Article might equally be interpreted as containing Catholic ecclesiological doctrine. In Article XIX no mention was made of the role of bishops and yet the Church of England was built on the frame of the episcopacy.[581] But it was not the fundamental Tractarian doctrine of the episcopacy, important though it was, which Newman addressed in his consideration of Article XIX.[582] He examined how the Church of England was a branch of the Catholic Church.[583] The Tractarians contended the Church of England bore the two essential marks of the universal Church, the episcopacy and the Sacraments.[584] Newman believed that if the Article was read as a Protestant statement any "…Kirk, or connexion…" could be identified as a Church, but these were neither universal nor Catholic.[585]

---

[577] Ibid.
[578] Ibid., Section 4. Paragraph 7.
[579] Ibid.
[580] Herring, *What was the Oxford Movement?* 30.
[581] Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity.*) 30.
[582] Newman, *Tract 90.* Section 4. Paragraph 4.
[583] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 261.
[584] Cf. Newman, "Sermon 17. The Visible Church an Encouragement to Faith", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. III: 240-1.
[585] Newman, *Tract 90.* Section 4. Paragraph 7.

Newman asserted that the words of Article XIX found parallels in documents which contained Catholic doctrine. From such parallels a Catholic-reading Article could be made. The Visible Church was not presented by Newman by reason of a "logical definition" but in the sources he cited. The excerpts declared that the Church consisted of a universal fellowship of the faithful.[586] Newman turned again to the *Homilies* to seek evidence to prove that the Article contained Catholic doctrine. Newman quoted the *Homily for Whitsunday*: "The true Church is an vniuersall congregation or fellowshippe of GODS faithfull and elect people … ."[587] He argued that the language used in the *Homily* approximated to that used in Article XIX, which declared that the Church was a "congregation of faithful men."[588] Newman read the *Homily* and the Article as having the same meaning. This had a further consequence in that the *Homily* described the constituent properties of the Visible Church.[589] In the *Homily* the description of a true Church was one which held a "…pure and sound doctrine…" and "…the Sacraments (were) ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right vse of Ecclesiasticall discipline."[590] This formula was repeated by the Tractarians who believed the marks of the true Church were Scripture, conformity to the practice of the Primitive Church, the Sacraments and the apostolic authority of the episcopacy.[591] This extract from the *Homily* was found in all editions of *Tract 90*. Although much of the *Homily* was removed from the version of the Tract in Volume Two of *The Via Media of the Anglican*

---

[586] Ibid. Section 4. Paragraph 1.
[587] AN HOMILIE CONcerning the coming down of the Holy Ghost, and the manifold gifts of the same. For Whitsunday. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily xvi. Part 2. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom16.htm: retrieved 2 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 6.
[588] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 7.
[589] Ibid.
[590] AN HOMILIE CONcerning the coming down of the Holy Ghost, and the manifold gifts of the same. For Whitsunday. Book II. Homily xvi. Part 2. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom16.htm: retrieved 2 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 7.
[591] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 261-5.

Church, published in 1877, this excerpt remained.[592] He excluded the full text of the *Homilies* because they contained "blatterant abuse" and "boastful" remarks against the Roman Catholic Church, particularly the Pope.[593] At the same time he admitted that the omissions weakened his claim as regards the "branch" argument.[594] Nevertheless, the essence of the argument remained. It was remarkable that Newman, first as an Anglican then as a Roman Catholic, consistently held the same view on the marks of the Visible Church.

The second edition of *Tract 90* included extracts from the Confession of Augsburg and the Saxon Confession.[595] Their inclusion was of particular significance. The Confessions supported Newman's contention regarding the Visible Church. The Saxon Confession was the work of Melanchthon, a Protestant theologian whom Newman respected (at least during the period when *Tract 90* was being written).[596] Newman chose the extract from Article VII of the Confession of Augsburg carefully. The citation contained a reference to predestination, but for Newman's purpose it was far more important that it contained the words: "The one Holy Church will remain for ever."[597] An essential element of the Visible Church was that it existed everywhere throughout all time.[598] He did not cite another section in Article VII of the Confession of Augsburg which stated: "The Church is a congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the

---

[592] Significantly, the modified version of *Tract 90* published in *The Via Media of the Anglican Church, Volume II* was of the first edition, hence it included the extract from Estius.
[593] See: Appendix XIV.
[594] Ibid., 265.
[595] See: Appendices XIII & XXII.
[596] Newman, *Apologia*. 86. See also: Appendix XII.
[597] "Article VII: Of the Church." *Confession of Augsburg*. http://www.ctsfw.edu/etext/boc/ac/augustana07.as: retrieved 2 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 2.
[598] Cf. John Henry Newman, *Tract 11. The Visible Church* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 9.

sacraments rightly administered."[599] Article XIX began with these exact words. Newman's contention that the Articles were not solely based in Protestant doctrine would have been firmly undermined by their inclusion.[600]

The addition of excerpts from the Confession of Augsburg and the Saxon Confession has immense importance when considering Rune Imberg's *Tracts for the Times: A Complete Survey of All the Editions*. Imberg's study asserted that an examination of the different editions of the Tracts demonstrated a change in Newman's attitude towards the Roman Catholic Church. By studying different editions, Imberg claimed that the editing affected by Newman showed a growing pro-Roman Catholic position. Imberg noted that the second edition of *Tract 90* contained short additions to Newman's textual study of Article XIX, while the fourth edition contained both extensive and minor additions.[601] Imberg made no reference to the nature of the additions, nor to whether any text was removed. The alterations unquestionably included the excerpts from the Confession of Augsburg and the Saxon Confession. The second (dated 21 June, 1841) and third (dated 27 December, 1841) editions of *Tract 90* removed an excerpt from Estius (Latinised name of Willem Hessels van Est 1542-1613) and replaced it with the citations from the Confession of Augsburg and the Saxon Confession. In late 1841, when Newman was under considerable pressure and felt rejected by the bishops regarding the publication of

---

[599] "Article VII: Of the Church." *Confession of Augsburg*. http://www.ctsfw.edu/etext/boc/ac/augustana07.as: retrieved 2 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 2.

[600] Pusey acknowledged the source of the words contained in the Article, but noted that any Lutheran interpretations of the words should be dismissed. To do otherwise, argued Pusey, would be to give to the Lutheran documents an authority they did not hold within the Church of England. Edward Bouverie Pusey, *The Articles Treated on in Tract 90 Reconsidered and Their Interpretation Vindicated in a Letter to the Rev. R.W. Jelf D.D., Canon of Christ Church* (Oxford & London: John Henry Parker & J.G.F. & J Rivington, 1841), 19-20.

[601] Imberg, *Tracts for the Times: A Complete Survey of all the Editions*. (Lund: Lund University Press, 1987) 163-4.

Tract 90, he chose to remove the citation from a Catholic source and replace it with two Protestant authorities. This was hardly evidence of a Rome-ward movement.[602]

Tract 90 was addressed especially to those young Oxford men considering defection to Rome. It was designed for "…quieting the consciences of persons who considered…that the Articles prevented them holding views found in the Primitive Church."[603] In his *Apologia* Newman reflected his greatest concern was that his arguments were disposing them towards Rome.

> First because Rome is the only representative of the Primitive Church besides ourselves; in proportion then as they are loosened from the one, they will go to the other.[604]

Newman believed a Catholic interpretation of Article XIX was essential to countering the Rome-ward movement. "I seem to myself almost to have shot my last arrow in the Article on English Catholicity."[605] The inclusion of the excerpt from Estius was important. In *The Arians of the Fourth Century* Newman had already established the literary device of rhetoric as a means of addressing the issues of the day. He did this by describing events in the fourth century and equating these to contemporary events. To Newman the State persecution of the Church in the fourth century had an express counterpart in the nineteenth century. Those questioning the Catholicity of the English

---

[602] See: Appendix XXII. At the time of the writing and publication of the third edition of *Tract 90* Newman was also feeling disaffected over the matter of the Jerusalem Bishopric. See: To: R.W. Church, Christmas Day, 1841; to: John Keble, 26 December, 1841; to: William Dodsworth, 27 December, 1841; to: Miss M.R. Giberne, 27 December, 1841; and, to: Henry Wilberforce, 27 December, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 386-94.

[603] To: R. W. Jelf. 15 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 88. These words were appended as a Postscript to the second and third editions of the *Letter*. Pusey wrote that Article XIX was "…treated of rather for completeness and for truth's sake than for any immediate subject of controversy." Pusey, *The Articles Treated on in Tract 90 Reconsidered and Their Interpretation Vindicated in a Letter to the Rev. R.W. Jelf D.D., Canon of Christ Church.* 19.

[604] Newman, *Apologia*. 135.

[605] Ibid., 136.

Church found reassurance in Estius' words "…Catholics define it (the Church) to be the *Society of those who are joined to each other by a right faith and the Sacraments*."[606] This was a description of the Tractarian doctrine of the Church *par excellence*. The citation from Estius went further.

> There is a controversy between Catholics and heretics as to what the word 'Church' means. John Huss and the heretics of our day who follow him, define the Church to be the university of the predestinate…[607]

Through rhetoric, Newman was challenging the 'heretics' of the nineteenth century. In his *Letter to Jelf*, Newman quoted from George Bull to address those same heretics. Bull wrote that "…against the perverse interpretations of heretics…"[608] the true teaching, embodied in the Nicene Creed was "…in all ages, received by the Catholic Church."[609] Conspicuously, Newman turned to a Caroline Divine, a body of authority absent from *Tract 90*.

One textual variation did not conclusively prove the Tracts contained no evidence of Newman's progression Rome-wards. The removal of the citation from Estius and addition of the Protestant authorities demonstrated here there was not a movement towards Rome. Imberg's failure to mention this important alteration to the first edition of *Tract 90* called into question the comprehensiveness of his survey of the Tracts. Imberg wrote of difficulties in locating the different editions of the Tracts and in noting all the textual variations, not the least of these being that he did not have access to all the

---

606 Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. Paragraph 4.
607 Ibid.
608 George Bull, *The Works of George Bull, D.D. Lord Bishop of St. David's*, Edward Burton, editor, Two Volumes (Oxford: The University Press, 1846), II: 213. Cited in: To: R. W. Jelf. 15 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 85-6.
609 Bull, *Works.* II: 217. Cited in: To: R. W. Jelf. 15 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 85-6.

editions of the Tracts at the same time.[610] Much of Imberg's assertion concerning the Rome-ward movement of the Tractarians relied on his close examination of *Tract 15*. His survey of the editions was limited to those published after 1842.[611] Imberg wrote that he had chosen to give attention to the early Tracts. This meant that Imberg subjectively chose the Tracts for his study. His 'comprehensive' survey of all the textual variations amounted to a thorough inspection of *Tracts 1*, *10*, *15*, *18*, *20* and *38* which he found the "most interesting."[612] Imberg discovered that *Tract 15* was altered between the first edition (dated 13 December, 1833) and the seventh and last edition (issued September/October 1837).[613] In his *Apologia* Newman wrote that the material for what was to become *Tract 15* was supplied to him by a friend and he did not agree with some arguments in the material, particularly those concerning the Council of Trent.[614] The Tract was written by William Palmer of Worcester College (1803-85) and was later revised and completed by Newman.[615] This was not evidence of Newman's Rome-ward movement, it was evidence of a revision of the work. Of interest was that *Tract 15* made the observations that the marks of the true Church were its existence in all places at all times, faithfulness to the Primitive Church, apostolic succession, the episcopacy and the Sacraments.[616] Palmer also wrote in his *Treatise on the Church of Christ* about the "branch" theory.[617]

Tracts 11, *20* and *47*, containing four *Letters to a Friend*, addressed the topic of the Visible Church. An examination of these Tracts indicated that the thoughts Newman expressed

---

[610] Imberg, *Tracts for the Times: A Complete Survey of all the Editions*. 143-4.
[611] Ibid., 13.
[612] Ibid., 143.
[613] Ibid., 144.
[614] Newman, *Apologia*. 64.
[615] Henry Parry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, Four Volumes (London: Longman, Green, 1894), III: 473.
[616] Newman, *Tract 15*. Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 &9.
[617] William Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ: Designed Chiefly for the Use of Students in Theology*, Two Volumes (London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1838), *passim.*

in *Tract 90* had been expressed before. In *Tract 90* Newman presented three key thoughts. First, the Church "…is not an abstract idea…," second, the Church "…is a certain society of the faithful…" which (thirdly) exists in the "…One Holy Catholic Church diffused throughout the world…."[618] This reflected what Newman wrote in *Tract 11*(Letter I).

> Now look at the fact. The body then begun has continued; and has always claimed and exercised the power of a corporation or society. Consider merely the article in the Creed, "The Holy Catholic Church;" which embodies this notion. Do not Scripture and History illustrate each other?[619]

Newman wrote in *Tract 90* another note of the true Church was the "…ministration of the Word and Sacraments…" by the Visible Church found throughout the world.[620] This emulated *Tract 11*(Letter I): "…the *Sacraments* are evidently in the hands of the Church Visible and these…are generally necessary to salvation…(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."[621] This was repeated in Letter II of *Tract 11*: "…the Sacraments, which are the ordinary means of grace, are clearly in possession of the Church."[622] The "…Sacraments are committed, not into the hands of the Church Visible assembled together…but into certain definite persons, who are selected from their brethren for that trust."[623] The importance of the ordained ministry, particularly the bishops, was reinforced by bringing together again the three great tenets of the Oxford Movement: the episcopacy; the Sacraments; and the Anglican Church as the Catholic Church in England. Newman's

---

[618] Newman, *Tract 90.* Section 4. Paragraph 2.
[619] John Henry Newman, "Letter I, The Visible Church", *Tract 11* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 9.
[620] Newman, *Tract 90.* Section 4. Paragraph 3.
[621] Newman, "Letter I", *Tract 11.*Paragraph 6.
[622] John Henry Newman, "Letter II, The Visible Church", *Tract 11.* Paragraph 4.
[623] Ibid.

comments in Letters I and II of *Tract 11* were largely repeated in *Tract 90*, but *Tract 20* (Letter III) and *Tract 47* (Letter IV) provided a greater insight into Tractarian thought on the Visible Church.

Tracts 20 and *47* contained polemic against the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches respectively. Both Tracts maintained the Tractarian argument that the true Church in England was the Church of England. Both the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches had erred. They no longer replicated the exemplar, the Primitive Church. The Roman Catholic Church contained an "…element of truth…" in it.[624] It was a "…Visible Church…to (be) a witness for Him, to be a matter of fact, as undeniable as the shining of the sun… ."[625] Despite its claim to historicity and its evident grandeur, Newman considered the Church of Rome to have been infected with heretical doctrine:

> The vaunted antiquity, the universality, the unanimity of their Church puts them above the varying fashions of the world, and the religious novelties of the day. 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 sis, utinam noster esses!—But, alas, AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it, as a pestilence.[626]

The Protestant doctrine was also inadequate. Newman thought the title *coetus fidelium* could not be given to a loose grouping of believers. In *Tract 20* he considered to ignore that Christ instituted the Visible Church would lead men and women:

---

[624] John Henry Newman, "Letter III. The Visible Church", *Tract 20* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 2.
[625] Ibid., Paragraph 4.
[626] Ibid., Paragraph 5. Since if you wish only that were true, our hearts would beat as one.

> …to attempt unions with those who have separated from the Church, to break down the partition walls, and to argue as if religion were altogether and only a matter of each man's private concern.[627]

This argument was repeated in *Tract 47*. Whilst Newman considered he had known some good Presbyterians[628], they were not members of the Visible Church and lacked all the benefits accorded by membership of it. They were perilously closer to non-believers than they were to the Church.

> So far from its being a strange thing that Protestant sects are not "in Christ," in the same fulness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world that they should lie between us and heathenism.[629]

Tracts 11, *20* and *47* were composed in a confrontational style to address what was perceived by the Oxford Movement to be a crisis facing the Church. They present a consistent, unvarying argument which appears in all of Newman's literature about the Visible Church. Whilst *Tract 90* broadly repeated the contentions of the three early Tracts, its style and content were far more measured. Nowhere in Section 4 was the "branch" theory mentioned, yet this was a core Tractarian principle.[630]

The Church Visible and Invisible, an 1834 sermon by Newman, stated the case for the "branch" theory. Contentiously, the Church of Rome, which was perceived as corrupt, for all its unfaithfulness also remained a branch of the same Visible Church instituted by Christ.

---

[627] Ibid., Paragraph 7.
[628] John Henry Newman, "Letter IV. The Visible Church", *Tract 47* (London: Rivingtons, 1834), Paragraph 2.
[629] Ibid., Paragraph 5.
[630] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 4. *Passim.*

> Properly speaking, the One Church is the whole body gathered together from all ages; so that the Church of this very age is but part of it, and this in the same sense in which the Church in England, again, in this day, is but part of the present Church Catholic. In the next world this whole Church will be brought together in one, whenever its separate members lived, and then, too, all its unsound and unfruitful members will be dropped, so that nothing but holiness will remain in it.[631]

This was the same argument which had been presented the previous year in *Tract 20*, Letter III.[632] This evidence shows there was no change in Newman's view.

To counter the Roman Catholic argument that there was only one true and infallible Church and to support the "branch" theory, Newman contended that there was not just one Visible Church. There were now many Churches, consequently the Church of Rome had lost any claim to infallibility.[633] Whilst infallibility existed in the "Ancient Church," the "…model in all matters of doctrine…,"[634] it no longer existed because of the fracturing of the Church. Some sense of visible unity was conveyed through "Ministerial Succession."[635] The Visible Church was present in the notes of the ordained ministry and the Sacraments. These notes signified that the Church of England remained part of the wider Church Catholic. In the *Via Media*, the Church of England remained a Catholic Church through its devotion to the "higher measure of truth" and it was a reformed

---

[631] Newman, "Sermon 16. The Church Visible and Invisible", *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* III. 222-3.
[632] Newman, "Letter III. The Visible Church", *Tract 20.* Paragraph 2.
[633] John Henry Newman, "Lecture VIII. The Indefectibility of the Church Catholic", *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism* (Oxford & London: J.H. Parker & J.G. & F. Rivington, 1837), 239.
[634] Ibid., 241.
[635] Ibid., 240.

Church because it had grown in its conformity to the Primitive Church.[636] The "higher measure of truth" was the apostolic succession through which the "…sacred mysteries of the faith are continued… ."[637]

These contentions, that the English Church was the Church of the *Via Media* and that it was the Catholic Church in Britain, were seemingly in conflict with each other. Whilst the Church Catholic, apostolic succession, the Creeds, the Sacraments, Holy Orders *et al* were visibly present in the external form of the Church of England, the *Via Media* was "…nothing better than an assemblage of words… ."[638] Even as Newman was writing the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, he formed the belief that the *Via Media* would not stand. In the summer of 1839, his study of the Monophysite controversy led Newman to the conclusion that "…the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverised."[639] Yet those commentators[640] who highlight the death of the *Via Media* in Newman's reasoning fail to note that he put any doubts about it aside.[641] In his "Introduction to the Third Edition" in Volume I of *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* (written in 1877) he reasserted that the doctrine of the *Via Media* did have credibility. Newman argued that Popery and Protestantism did not exist in the early Church but were realised much later in the Church's history. The *Via Media* had "innate persuasiveness" but "…scarcely has existence, except on paper."[642] He contended that the *Via Media*, although not found in the literature of the Patristic Period, nor throughout history, could not be dismissed, for neither could Protestantism nor Popery

---

[636] Ibid., 241-2.
[637] Ibid., 240.
[638] Newman, "Lecture V. On the Use of Private Judgment", *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*. 154.
[639] Newman, *Apologia*. 121.
[640] Imberg, *In Quest of Authority The Tracts for the Times and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-1841*. 139-40.
[641] Newman, *Apologia*. 121.
[642] John Henry Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican* Church, Two Volumes (London: Longmans, Greene & Co., 1901), I: xxiv.

be found. The *Via Media* was an argument advanced for and on behalf of Anglicanism. It was a "broad, intellectual and intelligible theory" which was both reasonable and consistent. Newman averred this in itself was the ground on which the truth of the doctrine was proven. The historical foundation of the theory was taken for granted.[643]

It was striking that this was written long after Newman had become a Roman Catholic. It indicated his ability to intellectualise and maintain concepts for their truth, rather than being reliant on his particular religious affiliation. Owen Chadwick thought: "Of no one is it truer than of Newman that a man's thought is himself."[644] Newman's 1877 reflection on the *Via Media* suggests his 1839 conclusion that the theory was "pulverised" was a momentary reaction. More significantly, any observation that Newman wrote *Tract 90* in order to replace the theory of the *Via Media* must be questioned. That he wrote Tract *90* to provide himself with a *raison d'être* for remaining an Anglican might also be dismissed. There was no evidence to suggest that Newman's concerns over the *Via Media* were anything more than momentary and they were not a sign or a means by which he would begin his translation to the Roman Catholic Church. That Newman considered the *Via Media* difficult to maintain in 1840-1 was true, that he had dismissed it was not.[645] This defence of the *Via Media* parallels the maintenance of his thoughts on the Visible Church. Without the *Via Media* his contention that the Church of England was the Visible Church would have been impossible. It was the *Via Media* upon which Newman built his claim for the Catholicity of the Anglican Church which carried with it all its attendant "notes" of validity.

---

[643] Ibid., xxiii.
[644] Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 127.
[645] Cf. Ibid.

There was considerable further evidence to support the contention that Newman wrote nothing new in *Tract 90* on the subject of the Visible Church. The 1835 sermons "The Visible Church an Encouragement to Faith" and "The Church Visible and Invisible" used Scripture to contend that the Anglican Church was the Visible Church in England.[646] These contained the same formula, which would be repeated in *Tract 90*, with one important difference. In "The Visible Church an Encouragement to Faith" Newman went beyond the authority of Scripture. He considered how St. Chrysostom (354-407), St. Athanasius (*c.*295-373), St. Augustine (354-430) and St. Jerome (*c.*347-*c.*420) had endowed the Church of England confirmation it was the Visible Church.[647]

> A prayer we read daily is called the prayer of St. Chrysostom; a creed is called the creed of St. Athanasius; another creed is called the Nicene Creed; in the Articles we read of St. Augustine and St. Jerome; in the Homilies of many other such besides.[648]

Through these means *The Book of Common Prayer* made it evident that the Church of England conformed to the doctrines of the early Church. The inclusion in the sermon that *The Book of Common Prayer* was a means of confirming the marks of the Visible Church was new. But the sermon also unswervingly repeated Tractarian doctrine. It was through the bishops that Christ "…has continued the line of His Apostles onwards through every age and all troubles and perils of the world."[649] The Church of England manifestly partook of "…the same spiritual food… and the same spiritual drink, used the same prayers, and confessed the same creed…"[650] as had the Catholic Church

---

[646] In the sermons, as in all of Newman's works written before 1840 on the Visible Church, no reference was made to the Anglican authorities.
[647] Newman, "Sermon 17. The Visible Church an Encouragement to Faith", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. III: 249.
[648] Ibid., 249.
[649] Ibid., 248.
[650] Ibid., 248-9.

throughout every age. The Visible Church was made present through the bishops, Sacraments and *The Book of Common Prayer*. [651]

An article written for the *British Critic* provided considerable insight into Newman's thoughts. The "Catholicity of the Anglican Church" was published in January 1840 and written at the same time Newman was researching and preparing to write *Tract 90*. The similarities between this article and his reflections on the Visible Church in *Tract 90* were conspicuous. The "Catholicity of the Anglican Church" included authorities from the early Church that Newman referred to in *Tract 90*,[652] but it also included excerpts from the Anglican Divines, Thomas Cranmer, William Laud and Edward Stillingfleet. Stillingfleet wrote: "We have not separated from the whole Christian world in anything wherein the whole Christian world is agreed… ."[653] This was a familiar statement, but the article contained something new: a Platonic argument. There was "…one Bishop invisible in heaven…"[654] and every bishop on earth shared in the episcopacy of Christ. Even though each was separated from another, every bishop was united through the invisible episcopacy.[655] But the one invisible episcopacy of Christ was not complemented by the papacy as a symbol of unity.

> Bishop is superior to bishop only in rank, not in real power; and the Bishop of Rome, the head of the Catholic world, is not the centre of unity, except as having a primacy of order.[656]

---

[651] Ibid., 250-1. See also: Newman, *Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 261-5.
[652] See: Appendix XV,
[653] Edward Stillingfleet, *Origins Sacrée: or a Rational Account of the Grounds of Natural and Revealed Religion*, Two Volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1817), II. 4, § 2. Cited in: John Henry Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic* (January 1840). In: John Henry Newman, *Essays Historical and Critical*, Two Volumes (London: Longmans Greene & Company, 1871), II: 23.
[654] Newman. "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *Essays Historical and Critical*. II: 20.
[655] Ibid., 23.
[656] Ibid., 24.

The English Church had been independent of Rome for some time before the Reformation. Before and after the Reformation, the Anglican Church maintained the visible form of the Church Catholic.

> Accordingly, even granting for argument's sake that the English Church violated a duty in the sixteenth century, in releasing itself from the Roman Supremacy, still it did not thereby commit that special sin which cuts off from it the fountains of grace, and is called schism. It was essentially complete without Rome, and naturally independent of it; it had in the course of years, whether by usurpation or not, come under the supremacy of Rome, and now, whether by rebellion or not, it is free from it; and as it did not enter into the Church Invisible by joining Rome, so it was not cast out of it by breaking from Rome. These were accidents in its history, involving, indeed, sin in individuals, but not affecting the Church as a Church.[657]

The visible signs of the Church reflected the invisible unity of the Catholic Church. The Catholicity of the English Church was derived from what had been handed down from the Apostles; it was not dependent on the papacy as a mark of unity.

> Each diocese is a perfect independent Church, sufficient for itself; and the communion of Christians one with another, and the unity of them all together, lie, not in a mutual understanding, intercourse, and combination, not in what they do in common, but in what they are and what they have in common, in their possession of the Succession, their Episcopal form, their Apostolic faith, and the use of the Sacraments.[658]

---

[657] Ibid.
[658] Ibid., 20.

Written just prior to *Tract 90*, these statements did not show evidence of any pro-Roman attitude.

An examination of earlier Tracts, Newman's sermons and the seminal article in the *British Critic* demonstrated this section of *Tract 90* contained little new material. Its arguments were less contentious than those presented in earlier literature. Evidence of this conclusion might be found by way of additional examination of the *British Critic* article. Newman alluded to the wording of Article XIX (quoted in Latin) and noted how it reflected Gallican thinking. The Gallican Divines argued that Catholicity, and not the papacy, was the essence of the Church.[659]

> If these words (*Article* XIX) are to be strictly construed by the light of such passages as Launoy brings from a multitude of antecedent writers (the Gallican divines) against Bellarmine, our Reformers held but *one* Church in the world, and entertained the idea of intercommunion, reciprocity, and mutual understanding, in short, political union, as the *perfection* of ecclesiastical unity.[660]

Section 4 was important for two reasons which lay outside the consideration of its uniformity with other Tractarian material. Firstly, it contained a crucial textual variation which was central in questioning the validity of Imberg's claims. Lastly, it was significant because Newman's image of the Visible Church was one which reflected the doctrine of the *Via Media*, which did not expire after he became a Roman Catholic.

---

[659] Ibid., 36.
[660] Ibid., 38. Jean de Launoy (1603-78) and Robert Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621 - Ultramontanist).

CHAPTER 8

TRACT 90 – SECTION β5

ARTICLE XXI

XXI. Of the Authority of General Councils.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

In Section 5 Newman considered the Church's source of its authority. Article XXI manifested the political and ecclesiological milieu of its time and made a claim, which of necessity, had to be challenged by the Tractarians. Moves by the government to reform the Church were discernible in Newman's mind when he wrote *Tract 90*.[661] He considered it essential to address the matter of State intervention in Church affairs. Such interference placed the authority of the State over that of the Church in ecclesiastical matters. The Tractarians strongly opposed this. They believed authority over the Church must lie within the Church. Article XXI arguably stated otherwise. Countering this interpretation Newman observed that Article XXI stated "…that Councils called by *princes* may err; they do not determine whether Councils called in the name of Christ may err."[662] Ostensibly, this contention would appear at first to be the focus of this section. Closer examination revealed that this was not so. Newman referred to only one

[661] Newman, *Tract 90*. *Introduction*. Paragraph 2.
[662] Ibid., Conclusion. §5.

authority, Gregory Nazianzen (*c.*330-*c.*390). The two citations from Nazianzen both supported and contradicted the Article. Newman considered councils both General and Catholic when "…their decrees (are) authoritative…" so determined because the councils "…are a thing of heaven… ."[663] These measures of authenticity also defined the number of councils determined Catholic.

> In such cases they are Catholic councils; and it would seem, from passages which will be quotes in Section 11, that the Homilies recognize four, or even six, as bearing this character.[664]

This section was significant because it anticipated what was to come, particularly in Section 11. Without having argued successfully that councils were authoritative, even though they lacked the imprimatur of princes, much of what Newman proffered in the next sections lacked authenticity.

Section 5 did not draw on any of Newman's earlier works. The contentions Newman advanced were straightforward and demonstrated none of the complexity found elsewhere in the Tract. Newman argued that councils gathered "…in the Name of CHRIST, according to our LORD'S promise…"[665] could not err. Surprisingly he added:

> What those conditions are, which fulfil the notion of a gather "in the Name of CHRIST," in the case of a particular council, it is not necessary here to determine. Some have included among these conditions, the subsequent reception of its decrees by the universal Church; others a ratification by the pope.[666]

---

[663] Ibid., Section 5. Paragraph 4.
[664] Ibid.
[665] Ibid., Section 5. Paragraph 4.
[666] Ibid., Section 5. Paragraph 6.

This was not a contentious statement. If anything it was one of Newman's more open statements, one receptive to a range of determinants to measure authenticity. Newman wrote in *Tract 85*:

> St. Paul happens in one place of his Epistle to the Hebrews, to warn us against forgetting to assemble together for prayer. Our Saviour says that where two or three are gathered together, He is in the midst of them; yet this alludes in the first instance not to public worship, but to Church Councils and censures, quite a distinct subject.[667]

This assertion was far more controversial than anything which appeared in *Tract 90*.

The weakness in Newman's argument extended to his failure to address the fundamental claim of Article XXI that General Councils cannot be called without the authorisation of princes. This contrasted to his earlier consistent claim for the Church having her own authority in all ecclesiastical matters. Newman's first book, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, signalled the beginning of his campaign to claim for the Church authority of her own. The book was a "…rhetorical thrust against his ecclesiastical and political opponents…"[668] in the Church of England and in the government.[669] Newman drew a parallel between the persecution of the Church by the State in the fourth century and its equivalent in the nineteenth century.

> 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. Then as now, there was the prospect, and partly the presence in the Church, of an Heretical Power enthralling it, exerting a varied

---

[667] John Henry Newman, "Lecture 1: Difficulties in the Scripture Proof of the Catholic Creed", *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London: Longmans Greene & Co., 1907), 121. Also published as *Tract 85*.

> influence and a usurped claim in the appointment of her functionaries, and interfering with the management of her internal affairs.[670]

Nothing approaching the strength of these opinions appeared in Section 5. It was surprising that Newman, having expended so much effort in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* defining what was a Catholic Council and what was a General Council, should comment so little on it in *Tract 90*. Furthermore, that he offered few remarks on how a Council could be determined to have pronounced authoritatively and infallibly was at variance with the considerable body of work he had previously offered on the topic. A survey of Section 5 (part 2) of *The Arians of the Fourth Century* gives an insight into Newman's thoughts. Firstly, he used the terms General Council and Œcumenical Council interchangeably. Secondly, he defined the Catholicity of the Church by its theological orthodoxy.[671] Thirdly, a General Council in the Patristic Period must include members of the Churches of the East and the West.[672] The Second Council of Nicaea did not meet this test. It

> …independent of doctrinal considerations…has no pretensions to authority, is plain, from the fact, that it was the meeting, not of the whole Church, but of a mere party in it, which in no sense really represented the Catholic world.[673]

---

[668] Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 34.
[669] Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* 32.
[670] John Henry Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (London: Longmans Greene & Co., 1908), 393.
[671] Ibid., 378.
[672] Ibid., 391.
[673] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. I: 207-8. See also: Newman, "Appendix: Note 5. The Orthodoxy of the Body of the Faithful During the Supremacy of Arianism", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. I: 468.

This contention, which appeared throughout Newman's writings on General Councils, found no place in *Tract 90*.

In Section 5 he agreed with the Article that "…great bodies of men…may not meet together without the sanction of their rulers, is plain from…primitive practice."[674] This appeared at odds with the Tractarian premise that the State had no authority over the Church, yet Newman's commitment to the legitimacy of history would not permit him to disallow this statement. Newman affirmed in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* that it was Constantine (*d.* 337AD) who referred the cause of schismatics "…to the arbitration of successive Councils…"[675] and it was Theodosius I (*d.* 395) from whom the bishops of the (Latin) Church sought permission to convoke a council at Alexandria in 381AD-382AD.[676] His commentary on the Article made no reference to the point of doctrine "…that in points necessary to salvation, a council should prove its decrees by Scripture… ."[677] This again was surprising, for *Tract 85* concluded "…that it does not follow that a doctrine or rite is not divine, because it is not directly stated in Scripture…there are some wise and unknown reasons for doctrines being…not clearly stated… ."[678]

Newman also considered the inability of Scripture to legitimise doctrine and offered that when councils made decrees that were "a thing of Heaven"[679] they were authoritative, but how and why this was so "…it is not necessary here to determine."[680] This was in contrast to what he had written earlier. Newman considered that the Lord's statement

---

[674] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 5. Paragraph 5.
[675] Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. 245.
[676] Ibid., 391.
[677] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 5. Paragraph 7.
[678] Newman, "Lecture 1: Difficulties in the Scripture Proof of the Catholic Creed", *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects*. 125.
[679] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 5. Paragraph 4.
[680] Ibid., Section 5. Paragraph 6.

"when two or three are gathered…" (Matt 18:20) referred to the gathering of bishops in Council. However, this gathering had limitations:

> 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…[681]

What constituted divine inspiration was left open with respect to the determinations made by councils. However, infallible statements could be judged against the prescription that they were to be made in the spirit of "Unanimity, uniformity, mutual intercourse, strict discipline, the freshness of Tradition, and the reminiscences of the Apostles… ."[682] Such a state once existed for the whole Church, but now only existed when the Church conformed to the teachings, doctrines and practices of the early Church. Newman reflected: "Our reception of the Athanasian Creed is another proof of our holding the infallibility of the Church, as some of our Divines express it, in matters of saving faith."[683] He explained the essence of his argument in 'Geraldine – A Tale of Conscience':

> …the Church of England is, in essentials, exactly the same with the early Catholic Church of the first five centuries, inasmuch as that Church was infallible, because still pure from its apostolic founders, so also is the Church of England; but she cannot *enforce* any thing that is not proved to have been held by that early Church, and, of course, must not deny any thing, clearly flowing from that apostolic source.[684]

---

[681] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. I: 201.
[682] Ibid., 126-7.
[683] Ibid., 193.
[684] John Henry Newman, 'ART. II. Geraldine—a Tale of conscience. By E. C. A. In 2 vols. London: Booker and Dolman. 1837.' *British Critic* Vol. 24 (July 1838) 65. This was Newman's review of a work by a Roman Catholic, Emily Agnew. Emily C. Agnew, *Geraldine-a Tale of Conscience*, Two Volumes (London: Booker & Dolman, 1837), I: 136.

Infallibility was ascribed to the Church of England because she was in conformity with the early Church and she subscribed to the Athanasian Creed. *Tract 90* contained nothing of these earlier arguments. His reason for addressing the validity of councils lay within the Tract itself.

In his commentary on Articles VI and XX Newman quoted from Richard Field to contend the *Regula Fidei* could not be the Scriptures.

> We also [after Scripture] do believe the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, with the additions of Constantinople, and that which is commonly called the symbol of St. Athanasius; and the four first General Councils are so entirely admitted by us, that they, together with the plain words of Scripture, are made the Rule and Measure of judging heresies among us.[685]

In the conclusion to *Tract 90* Newman stated that councils "…called in the name of CHRIST…" taught with authority.[686] The parallel between his contention contained in Section 5 and that in the conclusion was evident. The teaching of the councils, whether or not they were called by the authority of princes, might be taken as the Rule of Faith provided that it met the measure of Catholicity.[687] The *Homilies* recognised that either the first four[688] or six[689] of the General Councils were marked by universal acceptance and therefore carried the mark of Catholicity. Newman noted that the *Homilies* also accepted that some local councils taught with authority. He cited the Council of Eliberis[690] and Council of Bishops assembled in the West by "Constantine, Bishop of Rome."[691] (This "Council" was a synod assembled in Rome in either late 711AD or early 712AD.)

---

[685] Richard Field. *Dissuasive*. Part 1, i. 131 Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Chapter 1. Paragraph 9.

Referring to these citations taken from the *Homilies,* Newman noted "…the authority of…the first councils…are taught in the *Homilies*."[692]

The authorities on councils were quoted only to demonstrate that the *Homilies* which contained "…godly and wholesome doctrine…" (Article XXXV) were, on a range of doctrinal matters, at variance with the Articles.[693] This left those who insisted on adherence to the Articles in a quandary, for in doing so they committed themselves to Roman Catholic doctrine.[694] A cornerstone of Newman's arguments throughout *Tract 90* hinged on the premise that "Romish doctrine" condemned in the Articles could not refer to the Council of Trent because they were drawn up before the decrees of the Council of Trent were promulgated.[695] The Articles, Newman wrote, were not aimed at Roman dogmas but at "…the dominant errors, the popular corruptions, authorised or suffered by the high name of Rome."[696] Not only were the Articles open to interpretation, Newman argued, but they were not directed against the Council of Trent. In this context, it was clear why Newman chose to address the Article on General Councils. He wrote in Section 5 and elsewhere throughout *Tract 90* that the legitimacy of General Councils could not be easily proven. Moreover, what constituted a Catholic (or Œcumenical) Council was not simply determined. The Council of Trent, therefore, had legitimacy when it showed that it conformed to the teachings of the early Church. In addition, it

---

[686] Ibid., Conclusion. §5.
[687] Ibid., Section 5. Paragraph 5.
[688] Ibid., Section 11. §38.
[689] Ibid., Section 11. §20.
[690] Ibid., Section 11. §18.
[691] Ibid., Section 11. §19.
[692] Ibid., Section 11. Concluding paragraph.
[693] Ibid.
[694] Newman, *Apologia*.. 95-6.
[695] Ibid., 95. Also see: Newman, *Tract 90*. Chapter 6. Paragraph 9.
[696] Newman, *Apologia*. 96.

took on the title of Catholic Council because many of its doctrines could be found contained in the *Homilies*.[697]

In the *Homilies* there were elements of inconsistency and Newman exploited these to further his assertion that Article XXI should not be read as a closed definition on the teaching authority of councils.

Newman's claims regarding the authority of councils were based on three assertions. First, he contended that councils called by princes could not claim sole authority or legitimacy. Second, neither could those which claimed validity on the authority of Scripture. Third, the number and nature of councils could be disputed. Evidence to support each of these arguments could be found in the Anglican Divines.

Thomas Jackson (1579-1640) stated that Scripture "…is a rule of Faith, perfect for quantity, and sufficient for quality…"[698] but "…when we reject Ecclesiastical tradition from being any part of the rule of Faith, we do not altogether deny the authority or use of it."[699] John Bramhall went further. It was a "…General or Oecumenical Council, which we make the highest Judge of controversies on earth."[700] The General Council interprets, defines and applies the Rule of Faith. (Newman's later literature reflected this interpretation of the Rule of Faith.) Bramhall further wrote a "lawful Synod" acted with authority when it was "…established with Universality of Jurisdiction, by the Institution of CHRIST, and superiority above Oecumenical Councils, and Infallibility of Judgment,

---

[697] Ibid., 96. Also see: Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. I: 261-5.
[698] Thomas Jackson. *The Works of Thomas Jackson, D.D. Sometime President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Dean of Peterborough,* 12 Volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1844), XII: 168.
[699] Ibid., XII. 168.
[700] John Bramhall, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall D.D., Sometime Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of All Ireland*, edited by A. W. Haddan, 5 Volumes, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845), V: 270.

was the constant tradition of the Primitive Church."[701] Thus local councils or synods also taught with authority. This statement undermined the Anglican doctrine which accepted the authority of the first four or six councils. William Beveridge submitted himself to a "National English Synod" until such time as there was a "free general council." This further weakened the argument that only Œcumenical councils could teach with authority. He also considered that Scripture was not the sole Rule of Faith.

> …there are many things which we see have been defined by the Universal Church in councils truly oecumenical, many things which have been approved by the consent of several, many things again by the consent of all the writers of the Church; many things, finally, concerning which there was in ancient times no controversy moved, some of this class have been mentioned by us above, to which very many others may be added. Those especially which, although not definitively prescribed in holy Scripture, have yet been retained by our very pious and prudent reformers of the English Church.[702]

Beveridge believed that while Scripture was divinely inspired and contains precepts "…which are absolutely necessary for every man's salvation…"[703] there remained a difficulty. Scripture was "…by one man interpreted in one way, and by another in another…so that it would…seem to admit almost as many meanings as there are men…."[704]

---

[701] John Bramhall, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall D.D., Sometime Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of All Ireland*, edited by A. W. Haddan, 5 Volumes, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), I: 53.
[702] William Beveridge. *Codex Canonum Ecclesle Primitivae Vindicatus ac Illustratus*. Preface. §5. Cited in: Charles Marriot & H. E. Manning, *Tract 78. Catena Patrum III. Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Duty of Maintaining Quod Semper, Quod Ubique, Quod ab omnibus Traditum Est* (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1838), §30, Paragraph 5.
[703] Ibid., Paragraph 2.
[704] Ibid.

The nonjuring Divine, Charles Leslie (1650-1722), provided further support for Newman's contention. Leslie argued that a council was convened "…to judge of doctrines, and to know what the Catholic Church had believed and taught, as received from the Apostles."[705] The council to which he referred was that of Alexandria, a local council summoned in 321AD by St. Alexander (*d.* 326 or 328AD). Hence Leslie credited to a local council the authority normally given to an Œcumenical council. Noteworthy was the role of the local council as the guardian of doctrine taught by the Apostles and received by the whole Church. The council in this instance acted on behalf of the universal Church because it predated the first Council of Nicaea (325AD). Recognition of this council, one beyond the "four or six" acknowledged councils, was verification that Newman's argument could be found in earlier Anglican documents. Additionally, Alexandria was not summoned by a prince but a bishop. The responsibility of princes in maintaining orthodoxy was defined by John Potter (*c.* 1674-1747). He limited their role to that of maintaining "…GOD'S true Religion and virtue…"[706] free from superstition and false Gods and conforming to teaching contained in the Creed.

For Newman to present cogent arguments that demonstrated a sympathetic "Catholic" reading of the Articles was not only possible but desirable. He had first to challenge and then deconstruct the assertion that no councils had any authority in the Church of England unless they had received the royal warrant. Newman's arguments in the sections addressing both *Article XXII – Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, Invocation of Saints* and *Article XXXI – The Sacrifices of Masses* were to rely substantially on his assertion that the Council of Trent and the Articles could be reconciled on matters of doctrine. He argued

[705] Charles Leslie, "Letter to a Gentleman converted from Deism", *Theological Works*, 2 Volumes (London: W. Boyer, 1721), I: 70.
[706] John Potter, "Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford", *Theological Works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Potter Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, 3 Volumes (Oxford: Published by Printed at the Theatre, 1753), I. 283, 296.

the Articles could not possibly refer to the Council of Trent because the decrees of the latter had not been proclaimed at the time of the writing of the former.[707] This argument, along with those presented in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* successfully supported his contention that not all councils accepted as authoritative had been convened by princes. Newman had to establish both contentions to prove Trent's legitimacy as a General Council. In Section 5 he also indirectly challenged Article XXI by questioning the number of councils which should be accepted as authoritative. He also queried the authority Scripture as the sole arbiter by which truth was measured.[708] Newman cited inconsistent statements from the *Homilies* and from this used the excerpts to strengthen his own case. The Anglican Divines provided further evidence of a lack of uniformity in Anglican thought. The Creed and the precept of the Vincentian Canon were two measures of orthodoxy which had general acceptance.[709] Using these different sources Newman was able to demonstrate the inadequacy of a narrow interpretation of Article XXI. Finally, *Tract 90* contained less contentious statements on General Councils than in Newman's earlier writings. Equally, there was nothing in the Tract that could not be found in Newman's other works.

[707] To: R. W. Jelf. 15 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 78.
[708] Cf. Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 8.
[709] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II: 262.

CHAPTER 9

TRACT 90 – SECTION β6

ARTICLE XXII

XXII. Of Purgatory.

The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Relics, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

Newman expended 9848 words in ninety-three paragraphs to maintain his primary contention that Article XXII did not condemn the doctrine of purgatory, pardons and image-worship, but rather censured the "*Romish* doctrine."[710] In this section, he cited an array of authorities to support his assertions. He cited an impressive array of Anglican authorities, from the *Homilies* and Caroline Divines through to the latitudinarian Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715). He quoted excerpts from four *Homilies*: *On the Peril of Idolatry*; *Concerning Prayer*; *On Good Works*; and *On the Place and Time of Prayer*. The Divines quoted included Richard Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Samuel Johnson (*d.*1700), Thomas Ken and Lancelot Andrewes. He used both the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent as authorities. He deemed the Council of Trent authoritative because its teaching conformed to both "Primitive doctrine" and "Catholic doctrine."[711] The Catholic doctrine contained in the *Homilies*, Divines and councils was quite different to the populist practices of the Roman Catholic Church. Newman referred to the populist

[710] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 1.
[711] Ibid., Paragraph 10.

practices as the "*doctrina Romanensium*"[712] or 'Romish' doctrine. He cited Trent, which condemned them to be of the "uneducated and vulgar."[713]

Section 6 of *Tract 90* contained an introduction and conclusion and four sub-sections. Each sub-section addressed the foci of the Article: Purgatory; Pardons and Indulgences; Veneration and Worshipping of Images and Relics; and Invocation of Saints. In more than any other section, Newman allowed the sources to speak. For example, in the section on Purgatory, Newman contributed only 644 words to the total of 1774, while in the section on Pardons and Indulgences he contributed only 109 words to 1678. Newman included a short conclusion to each substantial section. The introduction in this section contained a defining statement that could equally apply to all the observations made by Newman in *Tract 90*. This was that Article XXII could not refer to "…the Tridentine [statement], because this Article was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent."[714] It was this contention upon which Newman's entire argument hung.

This section (along with Newman's comments on Article XXXI concerning the Sacrifice of Masses) raised the most serious objections amongst the heads of Oxford University. Eight days after the publication of *Tract 90*, a letter was sent to the (anonymous) "Editor of the Tracts for the Times" from four senior college tutors: Thomas Townson Churton (*b.*1799) Vice-Principal and Tutor of Brasen-Nose College; Henry Bristow Wilson (1803-1888) Senior Tutor of St. John's College; John Griffiths (1806-85) Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham College; and Archibald C. Tait (1811-82) Fellow and Senior Tutor of Balliol College.

---

[712] Ibid.
[713] Council of Trent. Session 25. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 9.
[714] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 9.

> The Tract has in our apprehension a highly dangerous tendency from its suggesting that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England; for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines, 1, of Purgatory; 2, of Pardons; 3, of the worship and adoration of Images and Relics; 4, of the Invocation of Saints; 5, of the Mass, as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do.[715]

The tutors ignored all other contentions in *Tract 90*. They reflected: "We readily admit the necessity of allowing that liberty in interpreting the formularies of our Church…," a position advocated by the "…most learned Bishops and other eminent divines…," however, *Tract 90* "…puts forward new and startling views as to the extent to which that liberty may be carried."[716] Evidence the tutors' reaction carried significant importance might be gauged by the considerable effort Newman made in the letter he wrote to Richard W. Jelf (1798-1871) to explain further his main contentions regarding Articles XXII and XXXI. In it, Newman used the same authorities, the Council of Trent, the *Homilies* and Anglican Divines, to support his statements.[717] He largely repeated these same arguments in his letter to Richard Bagot, the Bishop of Oxford.[718]

Newman began Section 6 by defining unacceptable doctrine. He also provided methodology that identified which practices and what measures could be used to determine the validity of doctrine. Newman's opening remarks could be regarded in the

---

[715] From: T. T. Churton and Others to The Editor of the Tracts for the Times, Oxford, 8 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 59-60.
[716] Ibid., 60.
[717] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Ibid. VIII: 78*f*.
[718] To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Ibid. VIII: 128*f*.

light of what he had written in his previous section concerning General Councils. Having established that the Articles did not address the Canons of Trent, he set out to determine how and why Anglican doctrine and practices differed from those of the Roman Catholic Church, yet they were not in conflict with the teaching of the universal Church. (This was a Church that conformed to the Early Church, a contemporary Church untainted by 'Roman errors.') However, in a dramatic change from his previous stance, Newman stated "…that there are portions in the Tridentine [statements] on these subjects, which the Article, far from condemning, by anticipation approves, as far as they go."[719] This marked a paradigm shift in the arguments advanced thus far, so much so that the four tutors made specific reference to this statement.

> The Tract would thus appear to us to have a tendency to mitigate, beyond what charity requires, and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own…[720]

Newman's letter to Jelf gave a greater insight into his thoughts:

> …distinction between the words of the Tridentine divines and the authoritative teaching of the present Church, is made in the Tract itself, and would have been made in far stronger terms, had I not often before spoken against the actual state of the Church of Rome, or could I have anticipated the sensation which the appearance of the Tract has excited.[721]

This excerpt showed that Newman presupposed his readers already had knowledge of his earlier writings on the Church of Rome. Newman also reiterated his earlier statement in *Tract 90*, that the teaching of the Council of Trent differed significantly from the current

---

[719] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 9. Also cf. Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and His Age*. 205.
[720] From: T. T. Churton and Others to The Editor of the Tracts for the Times, Oxford, 8 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 60.
[721] To R. W. Jelf, 13 March, 1841. Ibid. VIII: 80.

Roman Catholic statements and practices. In the letter, he commented that the Roman Catholic Church, as proven by Trent, was capable of reformation, and many of the practices condemned by the Articles and *Homilies* were also condemned by Trent.[722] Newman considered it was no "…great excess of charity towards the largest portion of Christendom, to rejoice to detect such a point of agreement between them and us, as a joint protest against some of their greatest corruptions… ."[723] He conceded he had deviated in his arguments over time, but these deviations had been minor.[724]

Developing his principal contention that Article XXII referred to the abuses of 'Romish' practices alone, Newman again turned to the *Homilies*. He set out to demonstrate that while there was no overt evidence in the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry* to suggest that the worship of relics was endorsed, "…a certain veneration is sanctioned by its tone in speaking of them, though not of course the Romish veneration."[725] What followed were two excerpts taken from the *Homily*, neither apparently supporting Newman's statement. The first extract referred to the iconoclast, St. Epiphanius (*c.*315-403):

> …that 'Epiphanius, being yet alive, did work miracles: and after his death, devils, being expelled at his grave or tomb, did roar.' Thus you see what authority St. Jerome (who has just been mentioned) and that most ancient history give unto the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius.[726]

For the first time in this Tract, Newman did not quote the citation fully or accurately. The *Homily* continued, "…whose iudgement of images in Churches and Temples, then

---

[722] Ibid., 83.
[723] Ibid., 84.
[724] Ibid.
[725] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 4.
[726] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 2. Paragraph 8. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 29 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 5.

beginning by stealth to creepe in, is worthy to be noted."[727] What the *Homily* described were Epiphanius' actions to keep all images out of "Christ's Church" whether they "…be carued, grauen, and moulten images, (or) paynted images…" and these included images of the Saviour.[728] The *Homily* reports that Epiphanius' "hatred" of images stemmed from the fact that he:

> … was a Iew, and being conuerted to the Christian faith, and made a Bishop, reteined the hatred which Iewes haue to images still in his minde, and so did and wrote against them…[729]

Newman made no comments on Epiphanius' actions to remove graven images from places of worship. He used the example of Epiphanius because the iconoclast himself became venerated from the grave.[730] The irony could not be lost on anyone familiar with the particular *Homily* and the life of the Saint. The second excerpt referred to the finding of the true Cross by St. Helena (*c.*255-*c.*330).

> Shee worshipped the King, and not the wood surely (for that is an heathenish errour, and the vanitie of the wicked) but shee worshipped him that hanged on the Crosse, and whose name was written in the title, and so foorth.[731]

Again, Newman did not cite the whole passage from the *Homily*. John Jewel derisorily commented about the actions, which he observed about him: "And wee fall downe

---

[727] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 2. Paragraph 8. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 29 September, 2008.
[728] Ibid., Paragraph 9.
[729] Ibid., Paragraph 11.
[730] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 7.
[731] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 2. Paragraph 12. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 29 September, 2008.

before euery Crosse peece of timber, which is but an Image of that Crosse."[732] This passage once more expressed the confusion surrounding the practice of religion right throughout the period of the English Reformation and suggested that popular common practices did not necessarily follow Church doctrine. Newman's argument would have been strengthened if he had cited this passage from the *Homily*, but surprisingly he did not so.

The key to Newman's argument concerning the veneration of relics again relied on the contention that the *Homilies* provided a deeper understanding of the doctrines contained in the Articles. He saw in the judgement of the *Homilies* "…not all doctrine concerning veneration of relics is condemned in the Article before us, but a certain toleration of them is compatible with its wording…" and only the "Romish" doctrine is condemned:[733]

> In these passages (in the *Homily on Idolatry*) the writer (Jewel) does not positively commit himself to the miracles at Epiphanius's tomb, or the discovery of the true Cross, but he evidently wishes the hearer to think he believes in both. This he would not do, if he thought all honour paid to relics wrong.[734]

This would appear to be one of Newman's weakest arguments in that he made a value judgement on what Jewel would wish the reader of the *Homily* to think. There was no evidence to suggest that that the meaning of what Jewel wrote was other than what it appeared. Jewel wrote of images that "…all these things bee vaine and abominable, and most damnable before GOD…And GODS owne mouth in the holy Scriptures calleth them vanities, lies, deceites, vncleannesse, filthinesse, dung, mischiefe, and abomination

---

[732] Ibid., Paragraph 12. Also see: John Jewel, *The Apology of the Church of England*, Henry Morley, editor (London: Cassell, 1888), Part II, 47.
[733] Newman, *Tract 90*, Section 6. Paragraph 8.
[734] Ibid., Paragraph 7.

before the Lord."[735] Such was the tenor throughout the *Homily* and it was irreconcilable with Newman's assertion. Newman's choice of Epiphanius would appear fraught. Jewel wrote of the Saint that "…hee iudged it contrary to Christian religion and the authoritie of the Scriptures, to haue any images in Christs Church."[736]

In Jewel's *Apology*, the words were equally damning. In this work, he contrasted a Church stained with the sin of idolatry over and against a Church, "…as Tertullian (*c.*160-*c.*225) termeth it, a pure virgin…."[737] The measure of such a Church was one that conformed to a model Newman himself could have written. Jewel wrote of the Church of England "…that we have swerved either from the Word of God, or from the Apostles of Christ, or from the primitive Church."[738] Jewel noted that the Catholic Church was one that conformed to "…the primitive Church of Christ's time, of the Apostles and of the holy fathers… ."[739] As Newman did, so Jewel had also distinguished between the Catholic Church and the contemporary "Romish" Church that "…hath shamefully and most wickedly erred…" from the example of the Primitive Church.[740]

Newman chose his material for inclusion in *Tract 90* carefully. He had previously employed Jewel as an authority in *Tract 76, Catena Patrum No. II, Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration*, citing his *Apology*.[741] Newman's knowledge of Jewel gave him insight into a man divided in his loyalties. The public John Jewel was the Erastian *par excellence*, the private man longed for the Protestantism of

---

[735] Ibid., Paragraph 97.
[736] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 2. Paragraph 9. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 29 September, 2008.
[737] Jewel, *The Apology of the Church of England*. Part VI, 166.
[738] Ibid., Part IV, 88.
[739] Ibid.
[740] Ibid., Part V, 132.
[741] Newman, *Tract 76, Catena Patrum No. II, Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration*. Paragraphs 3-10.

Zurich. Jewel was a paradox who, as the first apologist for the Church of England, perceived the 'Elizabethan Settlement' as the golden mean between the extremes of Roman Catholicism and Puritanism. He also saw that the Church's lack of reforming zeal resulted in a leaden mediocrity.[742] As an Erastian, Jewel proclaimed, "Let us, & your children with us pray, God saue Queene Elizabeth, and confound all those which rise up against hir."[743] He proclaimed Elizabeth to be "…our noble and renowned Queene, whom God hath mercifully apointed to rule ouer us in place of her noble Progenitours."[744] Yet, at the same time, Jewel complained of royal indecisiveness in a letter to Peter Martyr (1500-62) in Zurich (dated 2 April 1559). "If the Queen would but banish it [a crucifix] from her private chapel, the whole thing might easily be got rid of. Of such importance among us are examples of princes."[745] Choosing the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry* as the basis for his introductory contentions regarding Article XXII, Newman did so having a thorough grounding in the life and works of John Jewel. It was no mere coincidence that both perceived the Church of England to be at one with the Primitive Church. The 'Romish' Church was not the true Church. Only when Rome returned to practices of the Primitive Church could she again claim to be the 'true Church'. Moreover, both Jewel and Newman came to recognise that the English Reformation was not sufficient and while the former would long for Zurich, the latter would turn towards Rome.

Internal evidence from *Tract 90* would suggest one other reason for Newman's choice of extracts in the preamble. Each extract was linked to what was to follow, particularly with

---

[742] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England. Volume 1: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534 - 1603*. 221.
[743] John Jewel, *A VIEWE OF A SEDITIOVS Bul sent into Englande, from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome, ANNO. 1569. Taken by the reuerende Father in God, IOHN IEWEL, late Bishop of SALISBVRIE* (AT LONDON: Printed by R. Newberie, & H. Bynneman, ANNO. 1582), Paragraph 120.
[744] Ibid., Paragraph 3.
[745] H. Robinson, editor, *The Zurich Letters or Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others With Some of the Helvetian Reformers During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846), 29.

respect to that material he chose from the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry* and the *Homily on Good Works* to argue his case regarding the "Veneration and worshipping of images and relics." Newman proffered that 'Romish' doctrine was not Tridentine doctrine. To this end, Newman was able quote from the *Homilies* and Trent language common to both. Newman's use of the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry* as an authority was designed to draw the distinction between 'Romish' doctrine and the canons of the Council of Trent. But was his use of Jewel accurate? There was unambiguous evidence that Jewel perceived 'Romish' practices and doctrine to be not in keeping with that of the Primitive Church. Jewel's opinion of Trent was a negative one, although he recognised that the Fathers sat in council to address the errors of the Church. He described the utterances from the council as containing "marvellous expectation" but despite its welcome determinations on "Godly things," it had no success in removing idolatrous practices from common custom.[746] Newman located the distinction between doctrine and practice in Jewel's writings. Newman did not put forward any new argument concerning the difference between 'Romish' practices and Tridentine doctrine. He demonstrated an immense astuteness of unrivalled depth in choosing both the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry* and the *Homily on Good Works* to prove his contention. Not only was the author, John Jewel, a theologian with Genevan Protestant beliefs, he was also a compromised Erastian. In a delicious act of irony, Newman has used one of the greatest Protestant thinkers of the sixteenth century against the Evangelical party of his own century. Newman's immense intellect almost invited his detractors into a place where each displayed their lack of scholarship.[747]

---

[746] Jewel, *The Apology of the Church of England*. Part VI, 150.

[747] See: Richard W. Church, *The Oxford Movement Twelve Years 1833 – 1845* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1894), Chapter XIV, Paragraphs 24 - 30 *passim* & Chapter XV, Paragraphs 3 - 5 *passim* for an opinion on the lack of scholarship amongst Newman's critics of *Tract 90*.

Newman cited the decree of the Council of Trent (Session 25) concerning Purgatory and images.

> Among the uneducated and vulgar *let difficult and subtle questions*, which make not for edification, and seldom contribute aught towards piety, be kept back from popular discourses. Neither let them suffer the public mention and treatment of uncertain points, or such as *look like falsehood.*[748]

While the Council noted that in respect to the worship of images:

> Due honour and veneration is to be paid unto them, *not that we believe that any divinity or virtue is in them*, for which they should be worshipped (colendÊ) or that *we should ask any thing* of them, or that trust should be reposed in images, as formerly was done by the Gentiles, which used to place their hope on idols.[749]

Reference to Trent in the context of drawing a parallel between the statements of the council and Article XXII[750] caused the greatest outcry amongst Newman's opponents. Richard Church wrote, "Nothing could exceed the scorn poured on the interpretation of the Twenty-second Article…."[751] That such a reaction should occur again revealed that the detractors of *Tract 90* had little or no knowledge of what Newman had written previously. In *Tract 79* (*On Purgatory*), Newman not only quoted at greater length from the Council of Trent (Session 25) but he also made the unequivocal comment: "Such is the Roman doctrine; and taken in the mere letter there is little in it against which we shall be able to sustain formal objections."[752] In this earlier Tract, Newman also drew out the

---

[748] The Council of Trent. Session 25. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 9.
[749] Ibid.
[750] Church, *The Oxford Movement Twelve Years 1833 – 1845*. Chapter XIV, Paragraph 24.
[751] Ibid., Chapter XIV, Paragraph 22.
[752] John Henry Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*) (London, Rivingtons, 1837), Part ß 1. *STATEMENT OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY*. Paragraph 3.

differences between what was the official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and common practices.

> …as regards the doctrine of Purgatorial suffering, there have been for many ages in the Roman Church gross corruptions of its own doctrine, untenable as that doctrine is even by itself. The decree of the Council of Trent…acknowledges the fact.[753]

Here again was incontrovertible evidence that Newman not only made the same statements in *Tract 90* that he made in much earlier documents, the earlier assertions were made in more explicit, controversial language. As early as 1836 Newman was beginning to draw out this distinction, although his earlier comments in *Tract 71* (*On the Controversy with the Romanists*) were not as developed as his later works.[754]

Concerning Purgatory, Newman again distinguished between the 'Romish' doctrine and that which Article XXII did not reject. He presented three particular examples of Purgatorial doctrines, which were quite distinct. The first was a doctrine that included the cleansing flames.[755] Another vision of Purgatory, Newman described, was one "…maintained by the Greeks at (the Council of) Florence (1431)… ."[756] This was not one of "…a torment of fire, but the absence of GOD'S presence."[757] Yet another was one "…in which the cleansing is but a progressive sanctification, and has no pain at all."[758] All three doctrines Newman stated were "…adduced as an illustration of what the Article does not mean, and to vindicate our Christian liberty in a matter where the

[753] Ibid., Paragraph 4.
[754] John Henry Newman, *Tract 71. On the Controversy with the Romanists.* (*Against Romanism, - No.1*) (London: Rivingtons, 1836), Paragraph 42.
[755] Newman, *Tract 90.* Section 6. Paragraph 11.
[756] Ibid., Section 6. Paragraph 12.
[757] Ibid., Unlike *Tract 79* Newman did not observe that the Greeks were to submit to a compromised doctrine of Purgatory at Florence. See: Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*) Part ß4. *THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE. Passim.*
[758] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 12.

Church has not confined it."[759] In advancing the definition of Purgatory from the Council of Florence, Newman was drawing on his contention from the previous section where he argued for a broader definition of a General Council. Using this argument, he could contend that doctrinal statements of the Council of Florence[760] could be accepted, even within the Church of England. On this basis, Newman claimed that: "None of these doctrines does the Article condemn; any of them may be held by the Anglo-Catholic as a matter of private belief… ."[761]

Newman began his extensive discussion on the topic of Purgatory by again referring to the *Homilies*. He presented a long extract from *AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning Prayer* written by Jewel. The *Homily* primarily asserted:

> ….the sentence of GOD is vnchangeable, and cannot be reuoked againe. Therefore let vs not deceiue our selues, thinking that either we may helpe other, or other may helpe vs by their good and charitable prayers in time to come.[762]

The extract disallowed any notion of a 'third place' by quoting St. Augustine who "…doth onely acknowledge two places after this life, heauen & hell."[763] Contained in the same excerpt were the words of St. Cyprian: "…after death, repentance and sorrow of paine shall bee without fruit, weeping also shalbe in vaine, and prayer shall be to no

---

[759] Ibid., Section 6. Paragraph 13.
[760] Newman did note in *Tract 79* that because of its lack of representation from the whole Church Florence was only barely recognizable as an Œcumenical Council, nevertheless he accepted it as one. See: Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*) Part ß4. *THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE*. Paragraph 3.
[761] Newman, *Tract 90*, Section 6. Paragraph 13.
[762] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning Prayer. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 10. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 29 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 15.
[763] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning Prayer. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 11. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 29 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 15.

purpose (Cyprian, 'Homil. 5' in *'Contra Demetrianum'*)."[764] A reading of the passage would apparently disallow any attempt by Newman to prove that there was an acceptable doctrine of Purgatory. However, close examination of the excerpt showed that Newman had made an astute choice. Nowhere did the *Homily* describe the primitive doctrine of Purgatory only that of the 'Romish' doctrine. The three examples Newman gave of Purgatory were ones that did not refer to punishment or to those who were damned. The *Homily*, Newman argued, does not reject anything *per sé* other than the doctrine that stated Purgatory is a place of cleansing fire for the damned. The *Homily* made no allusion to the fate of those already pardoned by God before they die.

> …the Council of Trent, and Augustin and Cyprian, so far as they express or imply an opinion approximating to that of the Council, held Purgatory to be a place for believers, not unbelievers, not where men who have lived and *died in* GOD'S *wrath*, may gain pardon, but where those who have *already* been pardoned in this life, may be cleansed and purified for beholding the face of GOD.[765]

Thus, the differentiation between the doctrine condemned by the *Homily on Prayer* and the doctrine Newman argued was acceptable rested on the definition of Purgatory as a place not for punishment (*poena*), but rather a place of cleansing or sanctification. There was little doubt that Newman had drawn a very fine line indeed and this might be adjudged an example of sophistry. However, could Jewel equally be accused of sophistry? While the understanding of Purgatory in Augustine's time was somewhat confused,[766] it was nevertheless clear that in the *City of God* he had a perception of a doctrine that included a cleansing punishment to redeem those who died in a state of sin. Moreover,

---

[764] Ibid.
[765] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 16.
[766] J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1977), 484

Augustine perceived that it was the duty of the Church to pray for the souls of those who died in a state of such wickedness that redemption was not possible.

> For some of the dead, indeed, the prayer of the Church or of pious individuals is heard; but it is for those who, having been regenerated in Christ, did not spend their life so wickedly that they can be judged unworthy of such compassion, nor so well that they can be considered to have no need of it.[767]

The other authorities cited in the extract from Jewel's *Homily* were St. Cyprian and St. Chrysostom (*c.*347-407). The writings of both saints contained imagery of Purgatory that Jewel chose not to include in the *Homily*. Cyprian believed all sins might be "…cleansed and long purged by fire…" and those waiting to be cleansed did so in "…suspense till the sentence of God at the day of judgment… ."[768] Likewise, St. Chrysostom made reference to Purgatory and wrote it was essential to "…not be weary in giving aid to the departed and of offering prayers for them."[769] On the basis that Jewel was subjective in quoting from the Fathers, he could be charged with citing them imaginatively.[770]

Juxtaposed against the quotation from Jewel was an excerpt from Richard Hooker. Newman employed Hooker to provide a precise definition of the 'Romish' doctrine of

---

[767] St. Augustine, "The City of God", *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series. The City of God and Christian Doctrine*, Philip Schaff, editor (New York: The Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1890), 470. Also see pp. 445-6.

[768] St. Cyprian, "The Epistles of S. Cyprian with the Council of Carthage on the Baptism of Heretics: With the Council of Carthage, on the Baptism of Heretics; to which are Added the Extant Works of S. Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona", *A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West*, translated by Members of the English Church (Oxford & London: John Henry Parker & J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1844), 128.

[769] St. Chrysostom, "Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople", *A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West*, translated by Members of the English Church, John Keble, editor (Oxford & London: John Henry Parker & J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1845), 593.

[770] Gary W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (London/Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2006.) 1. This view is rejected by Paul Avis who states that Jewel and the Reformers believed in all the teachings of the Fathers and Councils, but that such teaching had to be substantiated from Scripture. See: Paul Avis, "John Jewel: Anglicanism's Bane or Blessing?", *Ecclesiology 4.3* (2008): 348.

Purgatory. Hooker wrote Purgatory was a punishment "…which hath in it not only loss of joy, but also sense of grief, vexation, and woe…,"[771] one which "…the souls of castaways, together with damned spirits, do endure… ."[772] Newman followed by quoting from Jeremy Taylor on the 'Romish' doctrine. He noted, "The passage to be quoted has already appeared in these Tracts."[773] Again, here was evidence that the material contained in *Tract 90* was indeed nothing new. Newman concluded his evidence concerning a view of Purgatory, which was not 'Romish,' by including a long excerpt from the work of the Whig controversialist Samuel Johnson titled *Purgatory Proved by Miracle*. Newman noted that this was: "Another specimen of doctrine, which no one will attempt to prove from Scripture… ."[774] To describe the piece by Johnson as an example of doctrine was, to say the least, imaginative. Samuel Johnson had written an inventive piece using many literary constructs. It contained no evidence of scholarship, only that of imagination. The inclusion of Johnson's writing is questionable. Its content is irrelevant and the purpose of its insertion unclear.

The section on Purgatory ended with the observation that the 'Romish doctrine of Purgatory' "…be not the doctrine, that the punishment of unrighteous Christians was temporary, not eternal, and that the purification of the righteous is a portion of the same punishment… ."[775] It was not the acceptable primitive doctrine. Newman's brief concluding remarks contained the essence of his argument and in a few words summarised the considerable evidence he had advanced to support his contentions. Ultimately, there could be little doubt that Newman argued the case for a doctrine of

---

[771] Hooker, *Works,* arranged by Keble. II: 738. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 17.
[772]Ibid.
[773] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 18. The material was also found in: Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory*. (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*) Part ß3. *THE HISTORY OF THE RISE OF THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY, AND OPINIONS IN THE EARLY CHURCH CONCERNING IT*. Paragraphs 58-9.
[774] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 21.
[775] Ibid., Paragraph 27.

Purgatory that could be believed by a member of the Church of England who, at the same time, could subscribe to the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*. He did so by writing a piece which exhibited immense academic depth, one which defied his detractors to look beyond the mere words and perceive that even those arguments which seemed to diminish his were indeed flawed themselves. This was no more so than in the evidence he provided from John Jewel. Section 6 also contained an extract from Jeremy Taylor, which had been used in *Tract 79*, again supporting the contention that there was no new material in *Tract 90*.

In part two of his examination of Article XXII, Newman reflected on what was arguably the touchstone of the Reformation, the question of pardons and indulgences. That Newman perceived the question of indulgences to be inexorably linked to the Reformation was indicated by his citing of two extracts from Gilbert Burnet's (1643-1715) *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England*. Newman quoted from Burnet to give a brief historical overview of the (necessary) implementation of indulgences through to the growth in their abuse. Regarding the origin of indulgences, Burnet recorded: "In the primitive church there were very severe rules made, obliging all that had sinned publicly…to continue for many years in a state of separation from the Sacrament, and of penance and discipline."[776] This practice was later regarded as being both too general and too severe because it was imposed without regard to "…the great variety of circumstances, taken from men's sins, their persons, and their repentance…"[777] so the Council of Nicaea granted bishops the right to relax the severity of the penance. The penalties imposed through the Sacrament of Penance, more in keeping with the sin

[776] Ibid., Paragraph 29. Gilbert Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England* (Philadelphia: D. Appleton & Co., 1850), 182. In this instance Newman was citing Burnet on Article XIV, upon which he made no comment in *Tract 90*. The Article referred to works of supererogation.
[777] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 182. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 29.

committed, were titled indulgences. These were "…just and necessary, and …a provision without which no constitution or society can be well governed."[778] By the beginning of the eleventh century, the Popes used indulgences for feeding their own "power" and "great designs." From this grew an age that:

> …was so gross, even in an ignorant age, and among the ruder sort, that it gave the first rise to the Reformation: and as the progress of it was a very signal work of GOD, so it was in a great measure owing to the scandals that this shameless practice had given the world.[779]

This historical overview presented reasons for the "Romish doctrine concerning pardons" to be condemned. It followed that Newman, in quoting Burnet, demonstrated indulgences *per se* were not necessarily an evil. Newman employed Burnet to demonstrate the abuse and misuse of dispensing indulgences was what was immoral.

To support this claim Newman again utilised Burnet to cite a long list of Papal abuses concerning granting indulgences. Burnet had written that these practices were acknowledged by the Council of Trent, which "…did, *in very general words*, approve of the practice of the Church in this matter, and decreed that indulgences should be continued… ."[780] The council conversely "…*restrained some abuses*, in particular that of *selling* them."[781] Burnet went on to say that the ancient Church correctly addressed the needs of the day and instituted a set of good practices, ones based around sound theological reasoning and fine pastoral praxis. However, over time abuses set in and

---

[778] Ibid.
[779] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 183. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 31.
[780] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 299. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 33.
[781] Ibid. (The italics are Newman's.)

these were partially addressed at Trent.[782] Newman conspicuously did not cite the full text from Burnet about Trent's attempted correction of the abuse of the sale of indulgences.[783] Burnet wrote: "…the correction of which (indulgences), however, was left to the discretion of them, who had been the authors of, and were the gainers by them."[784] It was unusual that Newman used his own words to state it was abuse of Papal power, regarding indulgences, which Article XXII criticised.[785] This argument could easily, and possibly less controversially, have been cited from Burnet. Perhaps Newman presumed his readers had a broad knowledge of the earlier document. He accurately employed Burnet to argue that the Roman Catholic Church had from antiquity used indulgences, but the distorted form of the doctrine only took hold "…after the tenth century… ."[786] The Council of Nicaea perceived that the word 'indulgence' pertained to granting bishops the authority to lessen the severity of temporal penance. Consequently, the use of the word in antiquity could not be equated with that of the later use of the word, which referred to the lessening of time in purgatory.[787] Burnet believed Article XXII contained an implied assertion which criticised practices which were "…contrary to the sense of antiquity… ."[788] It was again unusual that Newman did not make more of this since Burnet's Exposition on the Thirty-nine Articles was regarded as a respected theological work in the nineteenth century.[789] By citing Burnet, Newman could claim that the words of Article XXII did not annul the efficacy of the practice of granting indulgences, if they conformed to the practice of the ancient Church. Newman introduced Burnet to support his contention that the Articles did not condemn Catholic

---

[782] John Henry Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 34.
[783] Ibid., Paragraph 33.
[784] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 299.
[785] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 40.
[786] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 182. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 29
[787] Ibid.
[788] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 318.
[789] Hugh James Rose, *A New General Biographical Dictionary*, Twelve Volumes (London: T. Fellowes, 1857), V: 297.

practices but did condemn "Romish" malpractices. Newman would surely have left himself less open to criticism if he had quoted more extensively from Burnet.[790]

Newman failed to acknowledge that Burnet recognised the Article did address the excesses of Roman Catholic practices and doctrine regarding indulgences. Burnet considered "…before the publication of the present Articles, the decree and canons concerning the *mass* had passed in Trent, in which most of the heads of this Article are either affirmed or implied."[791] Newman did present Burnet's primary argument that indulgences were of two types, those he denoted as "penances" which were "…instituted for the outward discipline of the Church…" and those which were "…for the internal quiet of the consciences, and regard the future state."[792] The former conformed to the "primitive" practices of the Church while the latter were those instituted over time and abused by the Popes since the tenth century.[793] This was the crux of Newman's argument. It was the misuse of Papal power through the selling of indulgences that Article XXII criticised, not the practices of the Church over the first eleven centuries.[794] Newman further supported this assertion with a substantial extract from the *Works* of Jeremy Taylor. Taylor contended the Popes had abused the use of indulgences as a means of pardoning sin. He thought that the (ridiculous) number of years given in pardon through the practice of obtaining indulgences was "fantastical."[795] Like Burnet, Taylor believed that the abuse of obtaining and granting indulgences would lead "…to

---

[790] It must be noted, however, at the time of the publication of Burnet's *Exposition* in 1699 he was condemned by the Lower House of Convocation for writing material contrary to the Articles and received doctrines of the Church of England. See: B. W. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 30.
[791] Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*. 284.
[792] Ibid., 300.
[793] Ibid., 182.
[794] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 40.
[795] Taylor, "Of Indulgences", *Works*, 10 Volumes. XI: 55. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 38.

make religion to be ridiculous, and to expose it to a contempt and scorn."[796] Moreover, the ridiculous length of years given in indulgences, wrote Taylor, would lead man and women to "…sin more freely…" to such an extent that so "…great a gift become useless."[797] Thus, as with Burnet, the doctrine of indulgences as such was not condemned, only the more recent abuse of their use.[798]

Surprisingly little reference was made to the doctrine of indulgences in Tractarian literature prior to the publication of *Tract 90*.[799] When reference was made, it was inevitably linked to the doctrine of Purgatory. The nexus between the two was viewed as essential, for one doctrine could not stand without the other. The *Via Media* (Volume 1) cited (St.) John Cardinal Fisher (1469-1535) who wrote: "…If you take away Purgatory, what is the use of Indulgences?"[800] Fisher reflected: "…faith, whether in Purgatory or in Indulgences, was not so necessary in the Primitive Church…"[801] for the Church conformed more closely to the teaching of Christ. As with Burnet, Fisher saw the growth of indulgences came about as a means to forgive sins. This practice replaced the rigorous penance imposed in the early Church and its usage grew incrementally. The doctrine was initially "…believed by certain persons…" and then this belief grew "…*by degrees*, partly from revelations, partly from the Scriptures, and so at length, that faith in it became firmly and generally received by the orthodox Church… ."[802] This view reflected that of both Burnet and Newman, who contended the system of indulgences in the early Church

---

[796] Taylor, "Of Indulgences", *Works*, 10 Volumes. XI: 54. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 35.
[797] Taylor, "Of Indulgences", *Works*, 10 Volumes. XI. 55. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 38.
[798] Taylor, "Of Indulgences", *Works*, 10 Volumes. I: ccv.
[799] See: Joseph Rickaby, *Index to the Works of John Henry Newman* (London: Longmans, Greene & Co., 1914), 76*f*.
[800] Newman, "Lecture 2. On Roman Teaching as Neglectful of Antiquity", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 72. Newman was citing from John Cardinal Fisher's work *Assertio Lutherum Confutatio*. (No. 18.)
[801] Ibid.
[802] Ibid.

was concerned with the forgiveness of temporal sin, not that of the future "…alleviation of sufferings in Purgatory."[803] Newman had earlier expressed the same understanding in *Tract 79*: "…the doctrine of Indulgences is, in the theory, entirely connected with the doctrine of Penance; that is, it has relation solely to *this world*…"[804] and on this the English and Roman Churches agreed. The Roman Catholic Church later added another power to indulgences: a reduction of time spent in Purgatory. The Anglican Church did not accept this doctrine, Newman articulated, nor was it found in antiquity.[805] In *Tract 79* he cited Fisher (among others) to support the contention. Reflecting on the sixteenth-century practice of granting indulgences Fisher considered it was "…apparently of but recent usage in the Church, not being found among Christians till a very late date. I answer, that it is not clear from whom the tradition of them originated…(it)…was gradually introduced, that at length it became universal."[806]

Newman's fundamental assertion was that Article XXI did not refer to the Catholic doctrine on indulgences, but the "Romish" doctrine, which defined that the Pope had the sole authority to administer indulgences. Citing Burnet and Taylor, Newman established the Anglican Church had consistently accepted the primitive doctrine, one that excluded papal authority. Newman's literature written prior to *Tract 90* demonstrated the consistency of his contentions. Newman's substantive argument was presented in the *Via Media* (Volume I):

> That our Lord has left to His Church the power of relaxing the temporal punishments due to sin, is a doctrine plain from Scripture, from the continual

[803] Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*)Part ß 1. Paragraph 3.
[804] Ibid.
[805] Ibid., Paragraphs 63-6.
[806] Ibid., Paragraph 64. Newman was citing Fisher's work *Assertio Lutherum Confutatio*. (No. 18.)

practice of the Church, and from the Fathers, and it is enjoined on Catholics as *de fide*, as being the decision of the infallible Church.[807]

The same argument was also found in *Tract 71*, where Newman notes that while there was to all intents and purposes no outward difference between the Anglican and Roman doctrine of indulgences, the former referred to temporal penance alone.[808] This assertion was repeated verbatim in *Tract 79*.[809] The repetitiveness of the argument revealed Newman's resolute insistence that the *Via Media* must be both consistent and reasonable.[810]

Despite the substantial number of words he expended on Article XXII, there was an economy in Newman's argument. In his letter to Jelf, Newman offered a large body of evidence to support his claim that the doctrine concerning indulgences in the Article was not the Tridentine doctrine. Newman argued that the *Catechism of Trent* supported the popular piety practised at the time, but Trent did not sanction this.[811] To further support this assertion he cited Charles Lloyd (1784-1829), John Bramhall (1594-1663), William Wake (1657-1737) and George Bull (1634-1710) who contended that the teaching of Trent and the popular practice concerning indulgences were inconsistent.[812] Newman summarised his argument concerning indulgences by referring to the letter written by the four tutors.

I have now said enough on the point of distinction between the existing creed, or what the Gentlemen who signed the protest call the "authoritative teaching" of

[807] John Henry Newman, "Lecture 5. On the Use of Private Judgment", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 115. n. 4.
[808] Newman, "On the Controversy With the Romanists. (Against Romanism – No. 1.) Tract 71", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II: 118.
[809] Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*)Paragraph 3.
[810] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: xxiii.
[811] Ibid., 78.
[812] Ibid., 80.

> the Church of Rome, and its decrees on the matters in question. And while this distinction seems acknowledged by our controversialists, it is a *fact* ever to be insisted on, that our Articles were written *before* those decrees, and therefore are levelled not against them, but against the authoritative teaching.[813]

In *Tract 90* Newman did not used any new arguments concerning indulgences. The arguments he advanced were contiguous with those he previously asserted. This was in contrast to his reflections on the subjects of other Articles in his writings pre *Tract 90*, which were far more contentious.

Newman began his reflection on the worship of relics and images by noting that he had previously proven that "…the Homilies do not altogether discard reverence towards relics… ."[814] He was referring here to his argument concerning Epiphanius presented in the preamble to his consideration of Article XXII.[815] He went on to use a favourite literary device for the sake of argument, that is, having established what the *Homilies* acknowledge as an acceptable veneration of images, his undertaking was to now "…see what they do discard."[816] Newman presented five considerable extracts from the *Homilies*. He (as he had done with the example of Epiphanius) turned to the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry* to support his argument. He also used the *Homily on Good Works* to illustrate what was an unacceptable veneration of relics and images.

> …the veneration and worship condemned in these and other passages are such as these: kneeling before images, lighting candles to them, offering them incense, going on pilgrimage to them, hanging up crutches, &c. before them, lying tales about them, belief in miracles as if wrought by them through illusion of the devil,

[813] Ibid., 82-3.
[814] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 43.
[815] Ibid., Paragraphs 4-7.
[816] Ibid., Paragraph 43.

> decking them up immodestly, and providing incentives by them to bad passions; and, in like manner, merry music and minstrelsy, and licentious practices in honour of relics, counterfeit relics, multiplication of them, absurd pretences about them.[817]

These, according to Newman, were the absurd practices criticised by the Article, the evidence of "Romish doctrine." They were also practices criticised by the Council of Trent.[818] Newman went to considerable length to describe what the doctrine of the veneration of images "is not." His argument rested on the premise that the popular practices of the "Romish Church" were not those officially sanctioned by the Council of Trent. There were three points of note in this lengthy subsection of *Tract 90*. First, Newman used a lengthy quotation from the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry*. In itself this was not significant, for the extract adequately described the excesses of the "monstrous decking" of church buildings with "great puppets."[819] What was not emphasised nor explained by Newman, however, was why the author of the *Homily* (Jewel) wrote in the present tense.

> Our Churches stand full of such great puppets, wonderously decked and adorned…(and) because the whole pageant must throughly bee playd, it is not enough thus to decke idoles, but at the last come in the Priests themselues, likewise decked with gold and pearle…fit worshippers of such gods and goddesses.[820]

---

[817] Ibid., Paragraph 51.
[818] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 79.
[819] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 98. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 47.
[820] Ibid.

This was undoubtedly a description of church buildings and ceremonies as Jewel observed them in his day. However, Newman again did not exploit this apparent admission by Jewel of a Church that was anything other than pure in its Protestant doctrine and practices. This was ostensibly an oversight by him. The anomalous practices of the Elizabethan Church could have given fertile ground to Newman with respect to the claim he made earlier in *Tract 71* concerning the veneration of idols, a claim which went beyond anything he wrote in *Tract 90*. He reflected on the English Church's reliance on Scripture as the sole determinant concerning the practice of the veneration of images:

> Once more, we have argued the *unscripturalness* of image worship as its only condemnation; a mode of argument, which I am very far indeed from pronouncing untenable, but which opens the door to a multitude of refined distinctions and pleas; whereas the way lay clear before us to appeal to *history*, to appeal to the usage of the early Church Catholic, to review the circumstances of the introduction of image worship, the Iconoclast controversy, the Council of Frankfort, and the late reception of the corruption in the West.[821]

The Anglican Church had "…argued for the sole Canonicity of the Bible to the exclusion of tradition, not on the ground that the Fathers so held it…but on some supposed internal witness of Scripture to the fact, or some abstract and antecedent reasons against the Canonicity of unwritten teaching."[822] *Tract 71* contained a range of arguments against the purely scriptural grounds on which the Catholic system was rejected, but Newman went further in arguing that the Articles themselves were so vehemently anti-Catholic that they denied the Church of England its "rightful (Catholic) inheritance" as a branch of the universal Church.[823] Expanding on what he had written in *Tract 90* Newman

---

[821] Newman, *Tract 71, The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II: 139-140.
[822] Ibid., 139.
[823] Ibid.

judged that the English Church was not Protestant but Reformed[824] and because the "Anglican system" was a modification of the (Roman) Catholic system it could "…be mistaken for the system corrected."[825] Newman quoted Andrewes who entreated that God "…look down upon His holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, *in her captivity*; to visit her once more with His salvation, and to bring her out to serve Him in the beauty of holiness."[826] The context of these arguments was that the English Church was both deficient and imperfect.[827] As such, the Church "…is *incomplete*, even in its formal doctrine and discipline."[828] In comparing the English and Roman systems Newman concluded that both were imperfect, but the former was more "complete" than the latter. He also recognised that there was a perfection to be desired. This remained in the abstract and humanly unattainable.[829]

In developing his argument that both systems were imperfect, Newman argued that the Roman Catholic system should not be dismissed completely merely because it was not a Protestant system nor on the grounds of what it appeared to be.[830] In this context the reason for his reference to the works of the French preacher, Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704), was evident in that Bossuet provided an understanding of images which was not one in keeping with popular practice. Bossuet wrote that the veneration of images was "…to honour the apostle or martyr in the presence of the image …" and not to "…attribute to them any other virtue but that of *exciting in us the remembrance* of those they represent."[831] Images were "…*representatives*, or memorative signs, which call the originals

[824] Ibid., 137-8.
[825] Ibid.,136.
[826] Ibid.
[827] Ibid., 140-1.
[828] Ibid., 131.
[829] Ibid., 141.
[830] Ibid., 139.
[831] Jacques Bénigne Bossuet. *Exposition*. 8. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 71, The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II; 126.

to our remembrance… .”[832] Bossuet, Newman wrote, is the better interpreter of Tridentine doctrine, for not only had he helped shape it, but also he based his doctrine on that of the practices of the early Church.[833] In *Tract 71*, Newman made the overt observation that such practices were acceptable in the English Church if they were in conformity with the practices of the early Church. In *Tract 90*, deeming which practices were acceptable relied on deciding which practices were unacceptable.

Noteworthy in this section of the Tract was Newman’s dissertation on an extract from the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry*, which contained a reference to the Antichrist. According to the *Homily*, this reference was made by Daniel the Prophet to the one who does not worship the one true God:

> He shall worship God whom his fathers knew not, with golde, siluer, and with precious stone, and other things of pleasure in which place the Latine worde is *Colet*.[834]

This particular extract would appear to add nothing to his argument; it leaves open the possible interpretation that the Pope was the Antichrist. In the extract the Antichrist was portrayed as the principal idolater, “…dame Fortune fledde to Rome.”[835] Newman reflected: “…it is implied that the Bishop or the Church of Rome is Antichrist… .”[836] But he believed this implicit reference was a

---

[832] Bossuet. *Exposition*. 35. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 71, The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II: 126.
[833] Newman, *Tract 71, The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II: 123. See also: Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman.* 53, 68, 87, 141. Both Newman and Bossuet supported the immutability of the fathers and the Vincentian Canon as a measure of orthodoxy.
[834] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 76. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 46.
[835] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 78. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 46.
[836] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 46.

> …statement bearing on prophetical interpretation, not on doctrine; and one besides which cannot be reasonably brought to illustrate or explain any of the positions of the Articles: and therefore it may be suitably passed over.[837]

Despite this avowal, he did not "pass over" this topic but returned to it and discussed it in detail in Section 11. In earlier literature, Newman had offered a more spirited argument against the idea that the Pope was the Antichrist.

Writing a defence of Froude's *Remains* addressed to Godfrey Faussett (1780/1-1853), The Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Newman noted that there were Divines who maintained that the Pope was the Antichrist, yet those Divines remained in apostolic succession:

> How those divines who hold the Apostolical Succession can maintain the affirmative, passes my comprehension; for in holding the one and other point at once, they are in fact proclaiming to the world that they come from "the synagogue of Satan," and (if I may so speak) have the devil's orders. I know that highly revered persons have so thought; perhaps they considered that the fatal apostasy took place at Trent, that is, *since* the date of our derivation from Rome; yet if in "the seven hills," in certain doctrines "about the souls of men," in what you consider "blasphemous titles," and in "lying wonders," lies, as you maintain, the proper evidence that the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist, then the great Gregory, to whom we Saxons owe our conversion, was Antichrist, for in him and

[837] Ibid.

> in his times were those tokens of apostasy fulfilled, and our Church and its Sees are in no small measure the very work of the "Man of Sin."[838]

Newman had previously advanced other arguments against any notion that the Church of Rome was the Antichrist. In *Tract 82*, he proffered an answer to the question as to how "…I and others "reconcile such things in the *Homilies* with the Oxford Tracts.""[839] He did so by noting the inconsistencies in the *Homilies*, which variously stated Baruch was both "holy" and a "prophet," Tobit was a "holy Father" and the Son of Sirach was a "wise man."[840] On this basis, Newman asked:

> You ask how I reconcile my conscience to the Homilies calling Rome Antichrist, I holding the doctrines of the Tracts. To this I answer by asking, if I may do so without offence, how *you* reconcile to your conscience the Homilies saying that "the Holy Ghost doth teach" in the book of Tobit?[841]

Despite the Apocrypha not being part of Holy Writ, it "…is referred to as many as fifty-three times…"[842] in the *Homilies*. Newman's claim, dependent on the inconsistent teaching of the *Homilies,* was that the Scriptures alone did not contain all that was sacred teaching, but that the teaching of the Church was also assured through apostolic succession.[843] Moreover, each one in the Church had a particular gift through which the "…operations of the Blessed Spirit are manifold."[844] Without overtly stating the contention, Newman was arguing that to give Rome the name

---

[838] John Henry Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. The Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical (1838)", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II: 219.
[839] John Henry Newman, "Letter to a Magazine on the Subject of Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism", *Tract 82* (London, Rivingtons, 1837), Part II, Paragraph 14.
[840] Ibid., Paragraph 15.
[841] Ibid.
[842] Ibid.
[843] Ibid.
[844] Ibid.

Antichrist was to give the name to an entity which was not only the holder of sacred truth, but was also its guarantor who conveyed it through apostolic succession. Newman considered "…our Apostolical communion inherits, as the promises, so the faith, enjoyed by the Saints in every age; the faith which Ignatius, Cyprian, and Gregory received from the Apostles."[845] He questioned: "Why must Zuinglius be admitted, and the school of Gregory and Augustine excluded?"[846] Newman concluded that the Church of England taught doctrine derived from both Gregory and Augustine, yet these men were of the 'Roman school', which was condemned in the *Homilies* as the "Antichrist." It was on these inconsistencies that Newman began to build his case against the notion that the Church of Rome or the Pope was the Antichrist.[847] He added a note to his defence of Froude's *Remains* that by 1838 he had abandoned any notion that the Pope was Antichrist. Although he added this observation after his conversion to Roman Catholicism, it was a reasonable one. It was also evident that Froude's *Remains* had a significant part to play in his abandonment of his "extreme Protestant" views held when the first Tract was published.[848]

Of final note, in this part of *Tract 90*, was the substantial excerpt quoted from the Council of Trent, Session 25. This was not only remarkable for the interpretation Newman placed upon it, but also for the length of the extract exceeded only by one in Section 9 concerning the Sacrifice of Masses. That Newman used substantial excerpts from the Canons of Trent was not new. In *Tract 79*, he had quoted an extensive passage

[845] Ibid., Paragraph 39.
[846] Ibid., PART I. Paragraph 8.
[847] Newman wrote in the *Apologia* that it was in the summer of 1839 that he had a "growing dislike" of speaking against the Church of Rome and its formal doctrines, because the latter "…might possibly turn out to be true…. " Newman, *Apologia*. 126.
[848] Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. The Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical (1838)", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* II. n. 5. See also Newman's comments on Hurrell Froude's influence on his changing opinions towards Rome in: Newman, *Apologia*. 70-1.

from Session 25 in relation to the doctrine of Purgatory.[849] However, that Newman had now begun to use the Canons of Trent as the primary source to sustain his contentions was new. Previously he had used the Canons as one of a range of sources and they had not been the primary authority. That he was prepared to do so with little interpretation of the source was also important. Was it a sign of his "Rome-ward movement"? (See in Chapter 4 of this thesis the arguments advanced by Selen, Imberg, Nockles, Herring *et al.*) The first of the Tracts to cite Trent as an authority, *Tract 79*, was dated 25 March 1837. This date was well before that accepted by writers on Newman and the Oxford Movement as the point in time when his inextricable movement towards Rome began. That 'point in time' was recognised as the publication of the article in late 1839 written by Nicholas Wiseman (1802-65) which approximated the Anglican Church to Monophysite schism.[850] Without incontrovertible evidence to the contrary, Newman's recollections of the development of his religious opinions should be accepted as a truthful account. There was strong evidence that he was also truthful in stating that after his initial doubts "My old convictions remained as before."[851]

Newman's arguments concerning all matters theological demonstrated a logical progression. Frank Turner's claim that he placed a gloss over their development was not sustainable against the evidence.[852] Despite Newman's own claims that in 1839 he anathematised "…a whole tribe of Cranmers, Ridleys, Latimers and Jewels…," the evidence demonstrated that he continued to employ the Divines to support his assertions. No stronger evidence could be found of this than in his reflections on the worship of idols and the ways in which he utilised Jewel's *Homilies* to support his case.

---

[849] Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*)Part ß 1. *STATEMENT OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY*. Paragraph 3.
[850] Newman, *Apologia*. 120-1. See also: Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 166-7.
[851] Newman, *Apologia*. 121.
[852] Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*. 1-11 *passim*.

Newman's reflections on the point in time in 1839, when he perceived difficulties with structuring a systematic theological and ecclesiastical construct around the writings of the Divines was also the occasion on which Newman claimed:

> It was difficult…to find arguments against the Tridentine Fathers, which did not tell against the Fathers of Chalcedon; difficult to condemn the Popes of the sixteenth century without condemning the Popes of the fifth. The drama of religion, and the combat of truth and error, were ever one and the same.[853]

All doctrine, whether Anglican or Roman Catholic, was measured by the Tractarians against that of the early Church.[854] The Tractarians developed a systematic *Via Media* based on the Caroline Divines' attempts to construct an earlier *Via Media*, one that was also measured against the theology and ecclesiology of the early Church. The arguments Newman advanced in this section of *Tract 90* were not new in either substance or methodology. Both Trent and Jewel were measured against the Primitive Church.[855] The four great *Catenae Patrum*[856] demonstrated Newman and other Tractarian writers used a range of Anglican Divines from the whole theological spectrum to support the *Via Media.* Peter Nockles claimed that Newman cited the Caroline Divines selectively to support his contentions, but this must be questioned.[857] The sources could have been manipulated to present a conclusion that was not in keeping with the intention of the original writers.[858] Equally, this claim could be made against Newman with *Tract 90*. This was not the case. However, in this section of the Tract concerning the worship of idols, the indication was that he employed his resources accurately. Any apparent manipulation of the *Homilies* written by Jewel was not so much a selective use of them by Newman but,

---

[853]Newman, *Apologia*. 119.
[854] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 9-12.
[855] Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 162.
[856] See: Appendix IV.
[857] Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 169-82.
[858] Ibid., 165, 180-1.

rather, as he so often demonstrated, the Divines themselves developed doctrines in a confused ecclesiastical milieu. The hallmark of the English Reformation was its lack of uniformity, a fact acknowledged by Newman.[859] He sought not so much to manipulate the information but to highlight the consistency in all sources, whether they were Roman Catholic or Anglican. Any attempt to set *Tract 90* as the point of departure for Newman from the Anglican Church could be questioned on the basis that he was continuing to construct the *Via Media*.

In the final part of Section 6 Newman addressed the "Romish" doctrine of the invocation of saints. He drew particular attention to three concepts within Article XXII and then expounded each. The first of these concepts concerned the invocation of unseen beings, yet these beings truly existed. The second concerned the notion of what was a "fond" idea, or an idea which could not be proven but which existed in the realm of (spurious) belief. Lastly, Newman reflected on the "…honour that is due and proper unto GOD."[860] The Article maintained that the warrant of Scripture did not contain support for the invocation of saints. Newman again turned to the *Homilies* and the Council of Trent for evidence to support his contentions. In addition, he cited *Bishop Andrews's Answer to Chapter XX. of Cardinal Perron's Reply*[861] and St. Robert Bellarmine's (1542-1621) *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, written between 1586 and 1593.[862] This was the first time he quoted these Roman controversialists from the period of the Counter-Reformation. He quoted from Andrewes' reply to Jacques Cardinal du Perron (1556-1618) to reject Roman Catholic teaching. Contentiously, however, he cited Bellarmine, particularly to support his arguments that it was God alone to whom all prayers are

[859] Newman, *Apologia*. 102.
[860] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 64.
[861] Ibid., Paragraphs 65 - 70.
[862] Ibid., Paragraph 71. Newman referred to a particular section of the work: *De Sanctitas Beatitas*, Book I, 17.

offered and it was he alone who heard and answered those prayers.[863] Both Bellarmine and du Perron were theologians who were deeply immersed in both the scholastic and the patristic traditions. As controversialists, they each appealed to the Fathers to counter Protestant theology and each sought scholastic principles within antiquity.[864] This paralleled the Tractarian methodology of appealing to the first four centuries of the Church. Bellarmine, du Perron, Bossuet and Newman scrutinised the patristic Church to find support for their contentions on matters of doctrine. Newman and Bossuet considered that such investigation provided impetus for the development of Christian teaching and doctrine. Such development needed to be tested against an authentic measure of Christianity. For both Newman and Bossuet this was the Vincentian Canon, for Bellarmine and du Perron it was the teaching of the schoolmen.[865] Newman's utilisation of these three Roman Catholic theologians was important. It illustrated that, in seeking to locate Tractarian doctrine within the early Church, he was prepared to do so even if it meant seeking collaborators from within the Church of Rome.[866]

Newman began his reflection on the invocation of the saints by referring to the *Evening Hymn* written by the great nonjuring bishop, Thomas Ken (1637-1711):

> O may my Guardian, while I sleep,
>
> Close to my bed his vigils keep,
>
> His love angelical *instil*,
>
> Stop all the avenues of ill, &c.[867]

---

[863] Ibid.
[864] Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman,* 13.
[865] Ibid., 141.
[866] Newman, *Tract 71*. Paragraph 44. Also see: Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", B*ritish Critic*. 36. In this article he cited the Gallican Divine, Jean de Launoy (1603-1678), to support the same contention that all doctrine must be measured against the teaching and practices of the early Church.
[867] Thomas Ken, *Evening Hymn*. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 54.

Newman contended that "…here is not meant the mere circumstance of addressing beings out of sight…" for in the daily liturgies "…we use the Psalms…(in) which are frequent invocations of Angels to praise and bless GOD."[868] He observed that in the *Benedicite* "the spirits and souls of the righteous" were also addressed.[869] The *Homilies* argued "…invocations are not censurable, and certainly not 'fond,' if we mean nothing definite by them, addressing them to beings which we *know* cannot hear, and using them as interjections."[870] Article XXII was directed against "…the *superstitious* use of invocations."[871] Both the Article and the *Homilies* were directed against improper invocatory prayers, not the practice itself. To provide further evidence of this argument Newman turned to the *Homily on Peril of Idolatry*. In the first of two extracts, believers sought the help of God through an unseen intercessor because they doubted God's will to help those seeking his grace and supplication.

> What dishonour doe the creatures to their Creator and maker? And if we remember GOD sometime, yet because wee doubt of his abilitie or will to helpe, wee ioyne to him another helper, as hee were a nowne adiectiue, vsing these sayings: such as learne, GOD and Saint Nicholas be my speede: such as neese, GOD helpe and Saint Iohn: to the horse, GOD and Saint Loy saue thee. Thus are wee become like horses and Mules, which haue no vnderstanding.[872]

---

[868] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 53.
[869] Ibid.
[870] Ibid., Paragraph 55.
[871] Ibid.
[872] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 59. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 56.

They were acting in "…the (same) manner of the Gentile idolaters… ."[873] For Christians, noted the *Homily*, access to God the Father was through Christ alone. This theme was reiterated in the second extract*:*

> …they haue not onely spoyled the true liuing GOD of his due honour, in Temples, Cities, Countreys, and lands, by such deuises and inuentions as the Gentiles idolaters haue done before them: but the Sea and waters haue aswell speciall Saints with them, as they had gods with the Gentiles, Neptune, Triton, Nereus, Castor, and Pollux, Venus, and such other. In whose places bee come Saint Christopher, Saint Clement, and diuers other, and specially our Lady, to whom shipmen sing *Aue maris stella*. Neither hath the fire scaped the idolatrous inuentions. For in stead of Vulcan and Vesta, the Gentiles gods of the fire, our men haue placed Saint Agatha, and make letters on her day for to quench fire with. Euery Artificer and profession hath his special Saint, as a peculiar god.[874]

Completing a trilogy of excerpts from the *Homilies*, Newman made the observation that the "…same subject is introduced in connexion with a lament over the falling off of attendance on religious worship consequent upon the Reformation."[875]

> Finally GODS vengeance hath beene, and is dayly prouoked, because much wicked people passe nothing to resort to the Church, either for that they are so sore blinded that they vnderstand nothing of GOD and godlinesse, and care not with diuilish example to offend their neighbours, or else for that they see the Church altogether scoured of such gay gazing sights, as their grosse phantasie

---

[873] Ibid.

[874] Ibid. Here Newman was taking up an earlier argument in this section regarding the "Romish doctrine" and the condemnation of the practice of worshipping idols by the Council of Trent. See: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 6. Interestingly, Newman did not repeat Trent's claim that the worship of idols was a practice carried over from the gentiles, the exact argument which appeared here in the *Homily on the Peril of Idolatry.*

[875] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 57.

> was greatly delighted with, because they see the false religion abandoned, and the true restored, which seemeth an vnsauory thing to their vnsauory taste, as may appeare by this that a woman said to her neighbour: Alas gossip, what shall wee now doe at Church, since all the Saints are taken away, since all the goodly sights wee were wont to haue, are gone, since wee cannot heare the like piping, singing, chaunting, and playing vpon the organes that we could before.[876]

The *Homily on the Place and Time of Prayer* continued that the faithful should "…greatly to reioyce and giue GOD thankes…that our Churches are deliuered out of all those things which displeased GOD so sore, and filthily defiled his holy house and his place of prayer… ."[877]

The three extracts taken from the two *Homilies* serve to illustrate what was not acceptable as a form of veneration of the saints. In each of the extracts, Newman presented an image of superstitious practices, which Jewel proceeded to ridicule. Newman's line of argumentation was that which he had offered earlier in *Tract 90*. He was presenting these excerpts as evidence of what was the unacceptable practice of worship of inanimate objects that cannot answer the entreaties of the faithful. This was the 'fond' notion condemned in the Article. Yet, Newman did not cite what was an apparent contradictory statement by Jewel in the *Homily on Peril of Idolatry* when he wrote of the worship of relics:

> Is this agreeable to Saint Chrysostome, who writeth thus of reliques (Chrysostome, Homily of the Seven Machabees)? Doe not regard the ashes of the Saintes bodies, nor the reliques of their flesh and bones, consumed with time: but open the eyes of thy faith, and behold them clothed with heauenly vertue,

---

[876] AN HOMILIE OF THE place and time of prayer. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 2. Paragraph 6. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom08.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 58.
[877] Ibid.

> and the grace of the holy Ghost, and shining with the brightnesse of the heauenly light.[878]

This illustrated an acceptance of the practice of veneration of the saints, albeit not their earthly relics. (For this assertion, Jewel indirectly relied on the apocryphal book Maccabees to sustain his argument. This again demonstrated the inconsistency of the argument that the Apocrypha was not to be regarded as canonical.)

Further extracts taken from the *Homily on Prayer* contained the essence of Newman's doctrine on the veneration of saints. This was that all adoration was directed to God alone. These excerpts contained no statements in any way contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. The central argument offered in the *Homily* was that God alone could hear and answer the petitioner. It made four statements to support this contention:

> The first is this, that he to whom wee make our prayers, bee able to helpe vs. The second is, that hee will helpe vs. The third is, that hee bee such a one as may heare our prayers. The fourth is, that he vnderstand better then wee our selues what we lacke, and how farre we haue neede of helpe.[879]

Jewel went on: "(Only) If these things bee to be found in any other sauing onely GOD, then may wee lawfully call vpon some other besides GOD,"[880] but the nature and being of God was "…proper to him which is omnipotent…" therefore "…it followeth, that we

---

[878] AN HOMILIE AGAINST perill of Idolatrie, and superfluous decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Part 3. Paragraph 67. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008.
[879] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning prayer. *Books of Homilies.* Book II. THE SECOND PART OF THE HOMILIE CONCERNING PRAYER. Paragraph 3. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 60.
[880] Ibid.

must call neither vpon Angel, nor yet vpon Saint… .”[881] All other beings are unable to see into the hearts of men and women, listen to and attend to the prayers offered. Jewel made one exception, that it “…is written in the Apocalyps, namely that the Angel did offer vp the prayers of the Saints vpon the golden Altar… .”[882] He made no attempt to elucidate on the actions of the angels who, according to him, had a role in placing prayers before God. Jewel apparently contradicted the Article, because he accepted the role of angels who acted in answer to prayers. Hence, angels were not included, it would seem, as part of the ‘fond’ notion condemned by the Article. This supported his remarks on Ken’s *Evening Hymn*. It was not evident why Newman did not highlight this inconsistency. Here was another instance of Newman not using evidence from the *Homilies* to support his assertion. The evidence would carry considerable weight. If nothing else, the statements would once again highlight the inconsistent nature of the English Reformation with respect to a lack of standardised set of doctrines held by the Divines. Also evident were the tensions in the beliefs held by Jewel.

Newman’s acceptance of the Anglican doctrine of the veneration of saints was evident. He presented no *Via Media* position. At different points in this section of *Tract 90*, he supported the contention that the saints in heaven had no role in offering prayers to God on behalf of those on earth. He cited Jewel who writes of St Augustine that:

> …as hee witnesseth in anotherplace, the Martyrs and holy men in times past, were wont after their death to bee remembred, and named of the Priest at diuine

[881] Ibid.
[882] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning prayer. *Books of Homilies.* Book II. THE SECOND PART OF THE HOMILIE CONCERNING PRAYER. Paragraph 6. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 60.

> seruice: but neuer to bee inuocated or called vpon (Augustinem *'De Civit. Dei,'* chap. 10).[883]

From Bishop Andrewes' *Reply to Cardinal Perron* Newman quoted that it was proper to make "…no prayers to the saints, but only to pray for them."[884] Finally, from Cardinal Bellarmine he took the observation that it "…is not lawful to ask of the saints to grant to us, as if they were the *authors* of divine benefits, glory or grace, or the other means of blessedness."[885] Further, "…benefits may be granted to us by GOD (alone)… ."[886] Bellarmine also thought that what was asked of the saints surpassed their power and that the saints were not to be treated like gods.[887] An excerpt from the Council of Trent supported these authorities:

> …the Church has been accustomed sometimes to celebrate a few masses to the honour and remembrance of saints, yet she *doth not teach that sacrifice is offered to them*, but to GOD alone, who crowned them; wherefore neither is the priest wont to say, *I offer sacrifice to thee, O Peter, or O Paul*, but to GOD.[888]

In *Tract 71,* Newman wrote it was Bossuet "…who seems to have been nearly the first who put on the Tridentine decrees a meaning more consonant with Primitive Christianity… ."[889] Hence Bousset presented an authoritative interpretation of the council, one consonant with "…the received version of…(the)…creed" common to

---

[883] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon concerning prayer. *Books of Homilies.* Book II. THE SECOND PART OF THE HOMILIE CONCERNING PRAYER. Paragraph 5. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 30 September, 2008. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 61.
[884] Lancelot Andrews, *Bishop Andrews's Answer to Chapter XX. of Cardinal Perron's Reply*. 57 - 62. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 69.
[885] Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, *De Sanctitas Beatitas*, Book I, 17. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 71.
[886] Ibid.
[887] Ibid.
[888] Council of Trent. Session 22. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 65.
[889] Newman, *Tract 71*. Paragraph 44.

both Anglicans and Roman Catholics.[890] Newman observed that Bossuet wrote in his *Exposition*:

> Furthermore, there is nothing so unjust as to accuse the Church of placing all her piety in these devotions to the Saints; *since on the contrary she lays no obligation at all on particular persons to join in this practice* .....By which it appears clearly that the Church condemns only those, who refuse it *out of contempt, or by a spirit of dissension and revolt*.[891]

Newman quoted Bossuet in *Tract 71* to support a more measured understanding of the invocation of saints, one he claimed was in keeping with the Canons of the Council of Trent. In *Tract 90*, his final statement on the invocation of saints concluded that with respect to "…the doctrine of the invocation of saints…the Article means all maintenance of addresses to them which intrench upon the incommunicable honour due to GOD alone…"[892] Of all the statements made by Newman with respect to Article XXII this was the least controversial.

Leaving aside Newman's willingness to utilise Trent again to support his contentions, there was nothing controversial in this portion of Section 6. What was evident, however, was that he had access to material written by Dr. Charles Lloyd (1784-1829) in the *British Critic* in 1825. Had he used it this would have presented a far more controversial view on the invocation of saints. It was obvious that Newman knew of this material, for he cited it in his letter to Jelf. Lloyd wrote that with respect to

> …the question whether the Invocation of Saints, professed and practised by the Church of Rome, is idolatrous or not, our opinion is this; that in *the public*

[890] Ibid. Also see: Newman, *Apologia*. 111-12.
[891] Bossuet, *Exposition*. 8. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 71*. Paragraph 48.
[892] Newman, *Tract 90*. Paragraph 70.

> *formularies* of their Church, and even in the belief and practice of the best informed among them, there is *nothing of idolatry*…[893]

This statement provided further evidence that material pre-existing *Tract 90* was far more controversial than that presented in the document itself. The most serious matter not addressed by Newman in his exposition of the Article was that of *ora pro nobis*, petitioning Mary, the angels or saints to 'pray for us.' Writing to Jelf, Newman observed:

> As to Invocation, that the Article opposes, not every sort of calling on beings short of God, (for certain passages in the Psalms do this) but all that *trenches on worship*, (as the Homily puts it,) the question whether *ora pro nobis* be such, being open—open, not indifferent, but a most grave and serious one for any individual who feels drawn to it, but still undecided by the Article.[894]

This was his position, which he further explained to Bishop Bagot. In this he reiterated that all prayer be directed to God and that every "…feeling which interferes with God's sovereignty in our hearts, is of an idolatrous nature… ."[895] Nevertheless, prayers to the saints were permissible, these were "…less likely…to be injurious to…(the holy man)…but it is another matter entirely when ordinary persons do the same."[896] With respect to the contentious question of *ora pro nobis* he noted:

> …friends and opponents discovered that my premisses required, what I was very unwilling to state categorically, for various reasons, that the *ora pro nobis* was not

[893] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 81. The excerpt came from an article written by Charles Lloyd for the *British Critic* in 1825.
[894] Ibid., 87.
[895] To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 137.
[896] Ibid.

> on my showing necessarily included in the Invocation of Saints which the Article condemns.[897]

In answer to a letter from Pusey (dated either 13 or 14 March 1841)[898] seeking clarification of Newman's interpretation of Article XXII, Newman replied on 14 March that the matter of *ora pro nobis* was "…undetermined by the article."[899] He also reported to Pusey[900] that all prayer and worship was "…*due to God alone*… ."[901] These letters, *Tract 90* and *Tract 71* demonstrated a consistency of argument. This leaves open a question. Given the thoroughly (Anglican) orthodox nature of his writing on the invocation of saints, why was this particular section of the Tract not excluded from specific criticism of Newman's exposition of Article XXII by the four tutors?

Other documents also support the contention that Newman sustained a consistency in his argument concerning the invocation of saints. In the *British Critic* (January 1840) Newman wrote that in:

> …the Roman schools we find St. Mary and the Saints the prominent objects of regard and dispensers of mercy, purgatory or else indulgences the means of obtaining it… .(but the)…doctrines of Christ's merits and eternal life and death…(were)…not denied (God forbid!) but taken for granted, and passed by in order to make way for others of more present, pressing, and lively interest.[902]

---

[897] Ibid.
[898] From: E. B. Pusey. 13 or 14 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 75.
[899] To: E. B. Pusey. 14 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 76.
[900] Rather than perceiving Newman's unwillingness to commit to a definite statement on *ora pro nobis* as an action to ameliorate Pusey's concerns, Richard Church considered this was a matter of difficulty between the two. R. W. Church to Frederick Rogers, 21 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 111.
[901] To: E. B. Pusey. 14 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 76.
[902] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", B*ritish Critic*. 8.

With respect to the Roman Breviary and the antiphons contained in it to the Blessed Virgin Mary, he considered these "…portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian… ."[903] The tenor of the article in the *British Critic*, *of Tract 75* and of *Tract 90* was the same. Indeed, it was the same argument presented repeatedly with respect to Newman's reflection on Article XXII. That was, common practices of the 'Romanists'[904] were not to be taken as a reflection of the authoritative teaching of the Church Catholic, one which censured errors concerning the pardons and indulgences, veneration of images, Purgatory and invocation of saints.

Despite the length of Section 6, the argument posited by Newman was really quite straightforward.

> By the doctrine of the invocation of saints…the Article means all maintenance of addresses to them which intrench upon the incommunicable honour due to GOD alone, such as have been, and are in the Church of Rome, and such as, equally with the peculiar doctrine of purgatory, pardons, and worshipping and adoration of images and relics, as actually taught in that Church, are unknown to the Catholic Church.[905]

Popular piety within the Church of Rome notwithstanding, primitive practice reflected in the doctrines of the Church of England and the Canons of the Council of Trent was to be held as acceptable in the universal Church Catholic.[906] These practices included a

---

[903] Newman, *Tract 75*. Paragraph 25.
[904] Ibid., Paragraph 32. Also see: Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", B*ritish Critic*. January. 8*f*. Also See: Newman, *Apologia*. 111.
[905] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 70.
[906] Also see: Newman, "Lecture 2: On Roman Teaching as Neglectful of Antiquity", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 50. n. 4. Newman observed

temporary (Purgatorial) punishment of the unrighteous, a system of temporal penance, the use of religious images to evince a memory of the reality lying beyond them and prayer to beings (notably angels) provided that the practice did not detract from the pre-eminence of God.[907] Notably, while Newman's comments in *Tract 90* concerning pardon, Purgatory and images might be read as confronting, his comments concerning veneration of saints were thoroughly orthodox with respect to Anglican teaching. Throughout this section the evidence Newman presented to support his contentions was consistent. He used his sources accurately and, with respect to many of his arguments, the statements he made in *Tract 90* were not as contentious as those he made in earlier documents.

---

that a "modern consent" concerning the invocation of saints must be firmly based in primitive practice mirrored in contemporary practice.

[907] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 70. Also see: To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 135. Also see: To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841 Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 87.

CHAPTER 10

TRACT 90 – SECTION β7

ARTICLE XXV

XXV. Of the Sacraments.

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments are not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them.

And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.

Unlike his considerable critique of Article XXII, Newman expended relatively little effort to justify his contention that there were seven and not two Sacraments. Newman wrote

that Article XXV "…does not deny the five rites in question to be sacraments… ."[908] This appeared to be a complete contradiction of the Article. He offered two central arguments to support this statement. First, the Church had the authority to dispense "…grace through rites of its own appointing… ."[909] This authority was acknowledged in Article XX.[910] Second, he reflected on the larger question of the nature and purpose of a Sacrament. He considered in detail both these theological points. However, he only cited paragraph three of Article XXV in the body of the Tract, yet the material upon which he reflected was contained in every paragraph of the Article. From this it would appear that he was writing for an audience well versed in the material. As he had done in previous sections, Newman did not call on the considerable resources at his disposal to confute the statements contained in the Article. He did not seek any support from within the Caroline Divines to give authority to his statements. Both John Cosin and Jeremy Taylor had presented a perception of the Sacraments very close to that offered by Newman. Cosin[911] and Taylor[912] agreed that, whereas there were "two blessed Sacraments of our Saviour," the other five rites of the Anglican Church had substantially the same effect as the Sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. Ironically, while Newman rejected the evidence of two of the more 'Catholic' Divines,[913] he continued to use material from the second *Book of Homilies*, written largely by the most Calvinist Divine, John Jewel. Newman cited two excerpts from the *Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments*, although the balance of the section consisted of his own critique. While this analysis contained original material, a long unascribed extract came from *Lectures on the Doctrine of*

[908] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 2.
[909] Ibid., Paragraph 3.
[910] Article XX stated that the Church had the power to decree rites and ceremonies provided it acted in accordance, and not contrary to what was in the Scriptures. See: Chapter 4 of this thesis.
[911] Cosin, "A Paper Concerning the Chief Points of Differences in Religion Betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England, Written to the Late Countess of Peterborough, By Dr. John Cosin, Afterwards Lord Bishop of Durham." "Our Agreements." *Works*. IV: §6. 335-6.
[912] Taylor, "Letter 1. To a Gentleman Seduced to the Church of Rome", *Works*. XI: 185.
[913] Newman, *Apologia*. 120.

Justification.[914] Uniquely Newman also cited the Catechism, something he did not do in any other section of the Tract.

Newman believed two definitions existed in the Anglican Church on the nature and purpose of a Sacrament. The first stated that "…a sacrament be merely *an outward sign of an invisible grace under it*… ."[915] The second declared that a Sacrament "…must be an outward sign *ordained by* GOD or CHRIST… ."[916] He deemed the latter the "stricter" of the two definitions and it

> …is a characteristic of our formularies in various places, not to deny the *truth* or *obligation* of certain doctrines or ordinances, but simply to deny, (what no Roman opponent now can successfully maintain,) that CHRIST for certain directly ordained them.[917]

This definition was given in the Catechism from *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662).[918] Despite the statements made in both the Article and the Catechism, Newman maintained there was no evidence Christ ordained any of the Sacraments to be an outward sign of an invisible grace. He also questioned the necessity for a Sacrament to be ordained by God

---

[914] Newman, "Lecture 6: The Gift of Righteousness", *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 152*f*.
[915] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 4. This doctrine was formulated by St. Augustine (354-430). Latterly taken up by Calvin and Hooker. Also see: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 10 Volumes (Online: Forgotten Books, 2007), IX: 270. http://www.forgottenbooks.org/info/St_Thomas_Aquinas_Summa_Theologica_Vol_9_of_10: retrieved 8 January, 2008.
[916] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 4. Also see: Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*. IX. 28. http://www.forgottenbooks.org/info/St_Thomas_Aquinas_Summa_Theologica_Vol_9_of_10: retrieved 8 January, 2008.
[917] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 5.
[918] *A Catechism: That is to Say An Instruction to be Learned of Every Person Before he be Brought to be Confirmed by the Bishop*. In: *The Book of Common Prayer* (Glasgow: Wm. Collins Sons & Co. Ltd, no date given), 198. (Or any other edition of the 1662 BCP.) The Hampton Court Conference of 1604 added the rejoinder to the section in the Catechism on Sacraments that two Sacraments only were necessary for salvation. The Catechism described the efficacious action of the Sacraments which engendered an inward and spiritual grace in the receiver. The rejoinder was suggested by the moderate Puritan John Reynolds (1549-1607), but questioned by the extreme Puritan Stephen Egerton (!555?-1621?) because it smacked of Popish doctrine. British Library Harley MS 828. In: Roland G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, 2 Volumes (London: D. Appleton, 1910), I: 345.

and cited evidence from the Articles to demonstrate that approval by Christ was not necessary. He observed that the compilers of the Articles used a range of terminology for the institution of the Sacraments. Citing Article XIX he wrote "…that the ministration of the sacraments should be '*according to* CHRIST'S *ordinance*'."[919] With respect to the baptism of infants Article XXVII stated it was "…to be retained, as most agreeable to *the institution of* CHRIST."[920] He used these examples, among others, to demonstrate an inconsistency in the Articles as to whether the Sacraments were ordained, instituted or ordinanced by Christ. In doing so he established that the doctrine of "ordination" contained in Article XXV was not a stated requirement in other Articles. On this basis Newman made the observation that the Church of England allowed for both the broader and the stricter definitions as to what constituted a Sacrament. The essence of Newman's argument was that the Church had not used the term 'ordained by Christ' consistently; hence the five rites could act efficaciously in the same manner as a Sacrament. A Sacrament was not a Sacrament because the Articles had declared that it was ordained by Christ, it was "…justifiable on (no) grounds short of His appointment."[921] Newman claimed the Anglican formularies rejected any idea of ordination, "…not to deny the *truth* or *obligation* of certain doctrines or ordinances, but simply to deny…that CHRIST for certain directly ordained them."[922] This paragraph on the ordination of the Sacraments contained Newman's possibly most persuasive argument in Section 7. Concerning the foundation of the Sacraments he asked: "Who will maintain the paradox that what the Apostles "…set in order when they came" had been already done by CHRIST?"[923] Newman implied that the Apostles instituted rites and practices and by implication Sacraments not been ordained by Christ.

---

[919] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 5.
[920] Ibid.
[921] Ibid.
[922] Ibid.
[923] Ibid.

Once again he located evidence in the *Homilies*. In the first excerpt from the *Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments* he quoted from a section which took "…the wider sense of the meaning of the word sacrament… ."[924] In this *Homily* Jewel wrote of St. Augustine that "…hee calleth Sacraments, holy signes."[925] Accordingly:

> By these wordes of Saint Augustine it appeareth, that hee alloweth the common description of a Sacrament, which is, that it is a visible signe of an inuisible grace, that is to say, that setteth out to the eyes and other outward senses, the inward working of GODS free mercy, and doeth (as it were) seale in our hearts the promises of GOD.[926]

This, the broader definition of a Sacrament, was complemented by a more specific description from the same source. Two Sacraments, Jewel wrote, "…were instituted by our Sauiour Christ…" and these "…are to bee continued… for such purpose as our Sauiour Christ willed them to be receiued."[927] The number of Sacraments

> …should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for the visible signes, expresly commanded in the new Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiuenesse of our sinne, and of our holinesse and ioyning in Christ, there bee but two: namely Baptisme, and the Supper of the Lord.[928]

---

[924] Ibid., Paragraph 7.
[925] St. Augustine, *Contra Adversarios et Prophets.* Book. II. Cited in: AN HOMILIE WHERE-in it is declared that common prayer and sacraments ought to be ministred in a tongue that is vnderstood of the hearers. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. ix. Paragraph 1. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom09.htm: retrieved 8 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 5.
[926] St. Augustine, *Ad Boniface.* Cited in: Ibid.
[927] AN HOMILIE WHERE-in it is declared that common prayer and sacraments ought to be ministred in a tongue that is vnderstood of the hearers. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. ix. Paragraph 4. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom09.htm: retrieved 8 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 5.
[928] Ibid.

The five rites were deficient because they lacked the visible signs or were not expressly commanded in the New Testament.[929]

Newman quoted from his *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* concerning the number of Sacraments. He agreed that a Sacrament was an "outward sign of an inward grace" and noted the Church of England made no determination as "…to how many ordinances this applies… ."[930] The Sacraments of the Eucharist and baptism ordained by Christ were "…*generally necessary to salvation*."[931]

> This, then is the characteristic mark of those two, separating them from all other whatever; and this is nothing else but saying in other words that they are the only *justifying* rites, or instruments of communicating the Atonement, which is the one thing necessary to us.[932]

The other five rites had their own functions which complemented the Sacraments of the Eucharist and baptism.

> Ordination…gives power, yet without making the soul acceptable to God; Confirmation gives *light and strength*, yet is the mere *completion* of Baptism; and

---

[929] Ibid.
[930] Newman, "Lecture 6: The Gift of Righteousness", *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 153. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 9. Cf. Edward Bouverie Pusey, "Tract 77, On the Danger of Ridicule in Religion", *Tracts for the Times*, by Members of the University of Oxford, 4 Volumes (New York: Charles Henry, 1840), III: 398-400.
[931] Ibid., Cf .*Catenae Patrum Nos. II* & *IV* provided evidence that the two Sacraments were ordained by Christ. See: Newman, *Tract 76. Catena Patrum No. II. Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. passim.* Also see: Pusey, *Tract 81. Catena Patrum No. IV. Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. passim.*
[932] Newman, "Lecture 6: The Gift of Righteousness", *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 153. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 9.

> Absolution may be viewed as a negative ordinance removing the *barrier* which sin has raised between us and that grace, which by inheritance is ours.[933]

Adopting the broader definition of what constituted a Sacrament, Newman considered the five rites were Sacraments because: "…if justification be the inward application of the Atonement, we are furnished at once with a sufficient definition of a Sacrament for the use of our Church."[934] The rites were instruments for conveying the Atonement: "But, the two sacraments 'of the Gospel,' as they may be emphatically styled, are the instruments of inward life, according to our LORD'S declaration, that Baptism is a new *birth*, and that in the Eucharist we eat the living *bread*."[935]

Section 11 of *Tract 90* provided the clearest evidence concerning the number of Sacraments. Newman used evidence from the *Homilies* which reflected a confused theological and doctrinal position written at a time the milieu of the Anglican Church was changing dramatically. From the *Homily on Swearing and Perjury* he cited the words that "…the Sacrament of Matrimonie knitteth man and wife in perpetuall loue… ."[936] Other statements in the *Homilies* implied that there were other Sacraments. Jewel wrote that, while baptism and Eucharist were necessary for salvation, "…all other sacraments besides the two…named…" were not essential for the transmission of saving grace.[937] With respect to the forgiveness of sin Jewel noted that "…neither it, nor any other

---

[933] Ibid. Cf. Newman, "Sermon 1. A Preparation for Christ's Coming", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. V: 10.
[934] Newman, "Lecture 6: The Gift of Righteousness", *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 153.
[935] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 9.
[936] A HOMILY AGAINST Swearing and Perjury. *Books of Homilies.* Book I. vii. Paragraph 9. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk1hom07.htm: retrieved 8 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. §4.
[937] AN HOMILIE WHERE-in it is declared that common prayer and sacraments ought to be ministred in a tongue that is vnderstood of the hearers. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. ix. Paragraph 4. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom09.htm: retrieved 8 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. §49

sacrament else, bee such Sacraments as Baptisme and the Communion are."[938] Interestingly, this passage also appeared in Section 7, but Newman chose to make nothing of it, although in both instances he italicised the word "other" to signify its importance.[939] Newman did not use all the evidence available. In the *Homily on Matrimony* the writer used the words "ordained" and "instituted" interchangeably,[940] further verification of his claim in the Tract.[941]

The five rites that conveyed the Atonement were Sacraments. They were not "Sacraments of the Gospel" nor were they ordained by God, but they were outward signs of an invisible grace. Newman rejected the stricter definition of what constituted a Sacrament and in its place put the grace of the Atonement as the pre-eminent measure of the efficacy of a Sacrament or rite. This formula repeated what he had previously written in his only previous statement regarding the number of Sacraments in the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*; consequently he wrote nothing new in this Section 7. The extracts from the *Homilies* were used to illustrate the wider and stricter definitions of a Sacrament. Ironically, it was only in the last section of the Tract that Newman seized on the inconsistencies in the *Homilies*, a fact which lessened the strength of his argument in Section 7. In a further irony, despite his contentious opening statement regarding the number of Sacraments, there was little evidence that it elicited any major response or reaction.[942]

---

[938] Ibid. For the text of the *Homily* see: Appendix IX.
[939] AN HOMILIE WHERE-in it is declared that common prayer and sacraments ought to be ministred in a tongue that is vnderstood of the hearers. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. ix. Paragraph 4. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom09.htm: retrieved 8 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 5.
[940] AN HOMILIE OF the state of Matrimonie. Books of Homilies. Book II. xviii. Paragraph 1. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom18.htm: retrieved 8 January, 2009.
[941] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 5. Cf. Newman, "Sermon 7. Ceremonies of the Church", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. II: 76-8.
[942] Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: *passim*.

CHAPTER 11

TRACT 90 – SECTION β8

ARTICLE XXVIII

XXVIII. Of the Lord's Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Section 8 of *Tract 90* contained an eclectic collection of authorities assembled by Newman to support his assertion that Article XXVIII condemned the doctrine of the schoolmen, one popularly held by the faithful, but not taught formally by the Roman Catholic Church. It was a doctrine "…not of this or that council, but one generally received or taught both in the schools and in the multitude, that the material elements are changed into an earthly, fleshly, and organized body, extended in size, distinct in its parts… ."[943] Many of those authorities whom Newman had cited previously appeared again to support his argument concerning transubstantiation, notably St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, Robert Bellarmine, Jeremy Taylor and James Ussher. New authorities cited included The Black Rubric and an excerpt from *Johnson's Miracles of Saints*, which contained accounts of events in the lives of St. Odo and St. Wittekundus. The most significant commentary came from Newman's earlier open letter written on 22 June 1838 to Godfrey Faussett (1781-1853), the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity. The open letter, published in the form of a pamphlet, was described by Newman as the "…zenith of the Tract movement."[944] It was this pamphlet which featured heavily in this section of the Tract. Newman did not name either the author or the title of the document. He presented it as a text without provenance, only hinting at himself as being the author by noting that it was offered here with "…one or two verbal corrections…" and that this reflected the practice "…as in the case of other similar quotations above… ."[945] Minor alterations notwithstanding, the letter to Faussett argued that there was "…no "*corporal* presence" [*i. e.* carnal] of "CHRIST'S natural flesh and blood…"[946] in the Sacrament of

[943] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph. 15.
[944] To: J. W. Bowden. 22 May, 1838. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VI: 248.
[945] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 24. Such an admission by Newman would appear to justify the claims of Rune Imberg that there had been a development of Tractarian doctrine demonstrating a progression towards a pro-Roman Catholic stance. See: Imberg, *In Quest of Authority: The Tracts for the Times and the Development of the Tractarian Leaders 1833-1841*. 17. This is discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis. There is no significant change, however, to support this contention when the original document and the passages reproduced in *Tract 90* are compared. See also: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 159.
[946] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 21.

Bread and Wine, rather "…the Body of Christ is in some unknown way, though not *locally* yet *really* present… ."[947]

Taking excerpts from the Anglican authorities and Roman Catholic writers, Newman laid out in considerable detail the specific doctrine of transubstantiation denied by Article XXVII. Newman noted that the "…Article does not confine itself to any abstract theory, nor aim at any definition of the word substance, nor in rejecting it, rejects a word, nor in denying a "mutatio panis et vini," (change in the bread and wine) is denying *every kind* of change… ."[948] Any perception that the Eucharist was the visible, living, bodily flesh and blood of Jesus Christ was rejected both by the Article and by Newman. To refute this "shocking doctrine" Newman quoted from several works by Jeremy Taylor.

> Sometimes CHRIST hath appeared in His own shape, and blood and flesh hath been pulled out of the mouths of the communicants: and Plegilus, the priest, saw an angel, showing CHRIST to him in form of a child upon the altar, whom first he took in his arms and kissed, but did eat him up presently in his other shape, in the shape of a wafer.[949]

This lurid vision of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament was repeated ten times. The most appalling of all the illustrations which demonstrated the excesses of the doctrine of transubstantiation was taken from *Johnson's Miracles of Saints* which described

> St. Wittekundus, (who) in the administration of the Eucharist saw a child enter into every one's mouth, playing and smiling when some received him, and with an abhorring countenance when he went into the mouths of others; CHRIST

---

[947] John Henry Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 233.
[948] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 15.
[949] Taylor, *Works*. 10 Volumes. V: 93. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 5.

> thus showing this saint in His countenance, who were worthy and who unworthy receivers.[950]

Such an extreme portrayal of the 'carnal' substance of the bread and wine was not cited in earlier Tractarian literature.

Before the publication of *Tract 90*, only Pusey's substantial work, *Tract 81*, concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Cosin's *History of Popish Transubstantiation* (*Tracts 27* and *28*) had dealt at any length with the nature of the Real Presence within the Sacrament.[951] It was from the latter document that Newman apparently acquired the account of Berengarius (Berengar of Tours *c.*1010-88) who denied that the "…sensual manner of presence…(of)…the Body of CHRIST was not present… ."[952] Berengarius had been made to recant this by Pope Nicholas II (*d.*1061) on pain of excommunication. He assented:

> I Berengarius…with my heart and mouth do profess, that I hold that faith concerning the Sacrament of the LORD'S Table…to wit, that the Bread and Wine which are set on the Altar, are not after the consecration only a sacrament, sign, and figure, but also the very Body and Blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; (thus far it is well enough, but what follows is too horrid, and is disowned by the Papists themselves;) and that they (the Body and Blood) are touched and broken with the hands of the Priests, and ground with the teeth of the faithful, not sacramentally only, but in truth and sensibly.[953]

---

[950] *Johnson's Miracles of Saints*. 27-8. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 11.
[951] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 14.
[952] Cosin, *The Popish History of Transubstantiation; Which is Opposed to the Catholic Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, The Ancient Fathers and the Reformed Churches. Tract 28.* Chapter VII. Paragraph 9.
[953] Ibid., Chapter VII. Paragraph 9. See also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 12. Note: The glosses were inserted by Cosin. For an unedited version see: Bramhall, *Works*. I: 12.

The account of the noble Berengarius was notable not so much for the story itself, but for the admission by Cosin that the most extreme understanding of the doctrine of transubstantiation was so "horrid" that it was "…disowned by the Papists themselves." No such commentary was appended to the account presented in *Tract 90*, rather there followed yet another example of the particular doctrine condemned by the Article in an excerpt taken from *De Eucharista* by Cardinal Bellarmine:

> …in the Eucharist whole CHRIST exists *with magnitude* and *all accidents*…and that the parts and members of CHRIST'S body do not penetrate each other, but are so distinct and arranged one with another, as to have a *figure and order* suitable to a human body.[954]

Newman interpreted this to mean that the material elements of the bread and wine were changed into an "earthly, fleshly, and organized body." Only the outward appearances of bread and wine met the senses, but, as Newman noted, in Bellarmine's doctrine "nor even that always" [955] was the case. In this, as elsewhere in *Tract 90*, Newman presented the extreme understanding of the doctrine of transubstantiation, one not tempered overtly with anything akin to the statement by Cosin. However, Newman misrepresented Bellarmine's stance. Dr. Charles Russell[956] (1812-80) of Maynooth corresponded with Newman on the occasion of the publication of *Tract 90*. Russell wrote that Bellarmine taught that Christ's body in the Eucharist was "…seen, touched, broken and bruised through the medium of the species which alone are formally touched, seen, broken and bruised."[957] Replying to Russell, Newman conceded that he considered "well informed" Roman Catholics to hold a view of Christ being spiritually present in the Eucharist, and

---

[954] Roberto Bellarmine, *De Eucharista.* iii. 5. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 14.
[955] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 15. John Henry Newman, *Correspondence*. 118-129. Cited in: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 192.
[956] Newman considered that Charles Russell had "…more to do with my conversion than any one else." Newman, *Apologia*. 182.
[957] From: Charles Russell. 8 April, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 173.

that the Article was not directed against "…such a belief when it spoke of Transubstantiation."[958]

Newman adopted a relatively orthodox Anglican position regarding the doctrine of transubstantiation; rather less radical than that of Keble or Froude, yet his letter to Faussett was largely a defence of Froude's *Remains*. Froude had opposed the publication of Cosin's *History of Popish Transubstantiation*; he considered it to be representative of unacceptable Protestantism. He wrote to Newman: "Surely no member of the Church of England is in any danger of overrating the miracle of the Eucharist."[959] Alf Härdelin noted that Newman regarded the publication of Cosin's work as the "…first move to bring people from Zwinglianism of the day to higher notions."[960] Newman planned to write a Tract on the rationalist latitudinarian Benjamin Hoadley (1676-1761) who held that the Lord's Supper was a commemorative ceremony.[961] This was never written and a Tract completed by John Keble on the Eucharist was not published. Keble's work, in part, was directed against the rationalism of Hoadley, but most particularly against the contemporary sacramental theology of memorialism.[962] Written in 1835, one year after Keble's unpublished Tract, Froude's *Essay on Rationalism* was also directed against Hoadley. Both Keble and Froude believed the doctrine of transubstantiation was preferable to the "…cold unscriptural notion of a mere commemorative rite."[963] Froude believed the Protestants had "…not been content with arguments against it (transubstantiation) from Scripture…but in appeals to the Senses and the supposed

---

[958] To: Charles W. Russell. 13 April, 1841. Ibid. 174.
[959] From: Richard Hurrell Froude. January, 1835. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* V: 18.
[960] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 14.
[961] Benjamin Hoadley, *A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament in the Lord's Supper.* 1735. Cited in: Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Watts and Wesley to Martineau, 1690-1900*. II: Part 2. 59.
[962] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 15.
[963] John Keble, *Tract on the Eucharist*. 34*f*. Cited in: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 184.

suggestions of Reason,"[964] but, as much as this attack was directed against transubstantiation, Froude also contended that Protestant arguments "…interfere(d) with the Scriptural Miracle of the Eucharist… ."[965] These scriptural accounts contained a truth that contradicted the Protestant arguments concerning the Senses and Reason.[966] Christ was not "*spiritually* Present" in the Eucharist, Froude affirmed that a 'spiritual Body' was present. This, he argued was not a point of difference between himself and the Church, but a different way of emphasising that Christ was not carnally present.[967] Froude claimed that his argument concerning the presence of a spiritual Body overcame any objection that Christ could not be both in Heaven and in the Eucharist.[968] To deny otherwise would be to deny the veracity of Scripture wherein at the Last Supper Christ was physically present, yet also truly present in (what were to the senses) the bread and wine.[969] In essence, this, for Froude, was the "double miracle," a miracle attested to in Scripture, but one that defied both the Senses and Reason.[970] Unlike the Protestant doctrine, wrote Froude, transubstantiation "…does not attempt to explain away everything miraculous in the history of the Last Supper…,"[971] although it remained a "contrivance of human skepticism."[972]

The posthumous publication of the first two volumes of the *Remains* in 1838 brought considerable reaction from those opposed to the Tractarians.[973] Alongside Froude's (seemingly) greater acceptance of transubstantiation, the publication also contained open

---

[964] Richard Hurrell Froude, "Essay on Rationalism", *Remains of the Late Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude*, John Henry Newman and John Keble, editors, 2 Volumes (Derby: Richard Mozley & Sons, 1839) I: Part 2. 61.
[965] Ibid.
[966] Ibid., 61-7 *passim*.
[967] Ibid., 62. n. 1.
[968] Ibid., 62-3.
[969] Ibid., 65-6.
[970] Ibid.
[971] Ibid., 146.
[972] Ibid.
[973] Ker, *John Henry Newman*. 158.

criticism of the English Reformers, especially Jewel. Froude found not "…much to like in the Reformers…"[974] for whom he also lacked "admiration."[975] "The Reformation was a limb badly set…it must be broken again in order to be righted."[976] In a sermon preached at St. Mary's Oxford on 20 May 1838, Godfrey Faussett launched an attack on the *Remains* and the whole Tract-writing party. Faussett directed his comments against any notion of a Real Presence within the Eucharist, spiritual or otherwise:

> The early Fathers constantly designate the bread and wine as "signs," "symbols," "figures," "sacraments," not indeed as empty signs, but as attended by the blessing of Christ who instituted them, and as efficacious to the worthy receiver.[977]

Faussett noted that the notion of a spiritual Presence was a "…distinction required (which) clearly lies between the body and blood of Christ being spiritually included in the elements, and spiritually received by the faithful… ."[978] Those who held a view that Christ was spiritually present in the Eucharist were condemned as having a tendency towards "Popery itself," they were men who Faussett regarded as unsafe and inconsistent members of the Church of England.[979] He also objected to the Popish notion "…that the power of making the body and blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles…,"[980] consequently also denying the central Tractarian tenet of the apostolic succession.

---

[974] Richard Hurrell Froude, *Remains of the Late Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude*, John Henry Newman and John Keble, editors, 2 Volumes (London: J.G & F Rivington, 1838), II: 253.
[975] Ibid., 251.
[976] Ibid., 433.
[977] Godfrey Faussett, *The Revival of Popery: A Sermon Preached Before the University of Oxford, at St. Mary's, On Sunday, May 20, 1838*, Second Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1838), 18.
[978] Ibid., 22.
[979] Ibid., 24.
[980] Ibid., 23.

Newman's letter to Faussett was written to defend Froude's comments on the Eucharist[981] and it was his first and only considerable work on Eucharistic theology.[982] It was Newman's "…attempt at placing the doctrine of the Real Presence on an intellectual basis."[983] The philosophical principle which lay behind the doctrine was "…the denial of the existence of space except as a subjective idea of our minds."[984] An intellectual argument for the Real Presence in the Eucharist was only one element of Newman's defence of Froude. He cited the Anglican Divines to counter the charge of 'Popery.' Newman asked:

> Does any one doubt that…the…statements (of the Tract writers) are borne out in the main by Hooker, Andrewes, Laud, Montague, Hammond, Bramhall, Taylor, Thorndike, Bull, Beveridge, Ken, and Wilson, not to mention others? how many are there of the doctrines you object to, which one or other or all of these great pastors and teachers do not maintain?[985]

Fourteen extracts from Bramhall's *Works* were cited by Newman. They were intended to show "…how far (the) divines may diverge from the views now popular, and yet be held in reverence both in their own day and since."[986] Bramhall wrote on the Real Presence:

> Abate us Transubstantiation, and those things which are consequent of their determination of the *manner* of Presence, and we have no difference with them [the Romanists] to this particular.[987]

---

[981] Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 197 & *passim*. Also see: Ker, *John Henry Newman*. 163.
[982] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 18.
[983] Newman, *Apologia*. 86.
[984] Ibid.
[985] Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 210.
[986] Ibid., 211. The 'popular' views to which Newman referred were those of rationalism and Latitudinarianism.

Iin his *Works* in two volumes, Bramhall referred to the efficacy of the "Sacrifice of the Eucharist" through the licit ordination of priests in the Church of England, and the use of the form of words prayed at the Last Supper.

> They who are ordained Priests ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, *to make Them present* after such manner as they were present at the first institution… .[988]

Bramhall concluded that as to the manner of the Presence, spiritual or corporeal "…we determine not."[989]

The accuracy of Newman's citations from Bramhall was evident when read in context. In both the letter to Faussett and in *Tract 90*, Newman did not take the opportunity to use the most compelling evidence found elsewhere within the authority to support his claims. This was no less obvious than in respect to the citations regarding the Real Presence and the efficacy of the Eucharist.

> For all the essentials of their Sacrifice are contained in our celebration of the Holy eucharist; that is, according to their schools, the consecration, and consumption of the whole or part. Both these we have as well as they: the former

---

[987] John Bramhall, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D. D*., 5 Volumes. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844), III: 165. And: Bramhall, *Works.* V: 217. Cited in: Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 211. The quotation, as noted by Bramhall (Vol. V) was taken from: Lancelot Andrewes. *Ad Bellarmine Aplogia Responsorio* (London: 1610), 184.

[988] Bramhall, *Works*. III: 165. Cited in: John Henry Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 211.

[989] John Bramhall, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D. D*., 5 Volumes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), I: 22. Cited in: John Henry Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 211.

> more purely than they, the latter more eminently than they; inasmuch as with us both Priest and people do receive, with them the Priest only.[990]

Bramhall wrote that, no "…genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny…,"[991] the Real Presence within the Eucharist. Bramhall argued that the Fathers of the Church never determined the manner of the Real Presence[992] and that transubstantiation was a doctrine of late development.[993] Furthermore, there was necessarily a mean between "…naked figure or empty sign of Christ's Presence and a corporeal or local Presence…."[994] Christ was truly present in the Eucharist, a mystery imperceptible to human reason, imagination or sense, yet guaranteed through the words of consecration instituted by Christ and now celebrated by an ordained priest.[995] This doctrine of the Eucharist, an efficacious Sacrament instituted by Christ, administered through the authority of the Rite of Ordination, was a model which resonated well with Tractarian principles. Bramhall only stated the reality of the Real Presence. In the face of Hoadley's rationalist onslaught it was necessary for the Tractarians not only to reiterate that Christ was present in the Eucharist, but also to establish how Christ was present in the Eucharist.

Newman asked rhetorically, "…how can there be any *presence* at all of His body and blood, yet a presence such, as not to be *here?*"[996] In essence this was the heart of the Tractarian doctrinal difficulty, for, as the Article stated, Christ was present in the Sacrament "…only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." If, indeed, Christ was locally

---

[990] Bramhall, *Works.* V: 217.
[991] Bramhall, "The Bishop of Derby's Answer to The Epistle of M. De La Milletiere, &c.", *Works*. I: 8.
[992] Ibid., 13.
[993] Ibid., 9.
[994] Ibid., 11.
[995] Ibid., 22.
[996] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 21.

in heaven, Newman further enquired: "How can there be any presence, yet not *local*?"[997] The Eucharist was more than a mere memorial meal, yet transubstantiation was also rejected by the Tractarians because the doctrine could nowhere be located in Antiquity.[998] The Tractarians believed that the doctrine of transubstantiation, coming as it did from the schools, relied far too heavily upon mere words, those of "…"substance," "nature," "change," "accidents," and the like…,"[999] which were inadequate to explain the "sacred doctrine" of the Real Presence. Moreover, objections against a doctrine founded on the technical use and expression of such terminology were inadequate for they dealt with "…more or less questions of words… ."[1000]

> We, instead of denying…(the Antiquity of the doctrine of)…Transubstantiation have acted as if it mattered very little whether it were true or not, (whereas the principle is most true and valuable,) and have proceeded to oppose Transubstantiation on supposed grounds of reason.[1001]

Reason and mere words could not explain the ineffable mystery of the Real Presence. How then could it be explained? Newman elucidated how Christ was really present by examining the text of the Black Rubric, the content of which he summarised as:

> 1. That "no adoration ought to be done unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received." 2. Nor "unto any *corporal* (*i. e.* carnal) presence of CHRIST'S natural flesh and blood." 3. That "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances." 4. That to adore them "were idolatry

---

[997] Ibid.
[998] Newman, *On the Controversy with the Romanists. (Against Romanism - No. 1.) Tract 71*. Paragraphs 14 & 100. Also see: Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Testimony of the Later Writers of the English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, With an Historical Account of the Changes made in the Liturgy as to the Expression of that Doctrine. Tract 81. Catena Patrum No. IV.* Paragraph 5.
[999] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 16.
[1000] Ibid. Also see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 193.
[1001] Newman, *On the Controversy with the Romanists. (Against Romanism - No. 1.) Tract 71. Tract 71*. §23.

to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;" and 5. That "the natural body and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST are in heaven."[1002]

These statements he admitted "without difficulty." However, if Christ's "natural body" was in heaven it followed that it could not be in two places at once and hence "…there is no local presence in the Sacrament."[1003] If this were so, wrote Newman, the Rubric was at variance with Scripture, the *Homilies*, Catechism and Communion Service.[1004] Thus, it was "…the truth of a certain philosophical deduction, not of a certain doctrine of Scripture."[1005] The scriptural doctrines were reflected in *The Book of Common Prayer* which "…containeth in it *nothing contrary to the Word of God*."[1006]

Newman argued that the Black Rubric, although it was not necessarily contrary to Scripture, nevertheless, may not necessarily be true. Scripture contained events which were scientifically untrue, these included "…the sun's standing still, or the earth being fixed, or the firmament being above."[1007] Yet, it was still possible for those who attested to scientific truth to also subscribe to the truth of Scripture, for a distinction was made between what was theological and what was not. It was also possible to subscribe, wrote Newman, to a passage of Scripture, yet not to the philosophical interpretation of that paragraph.[1008] Newman contested the 'liberal' view of Scripture which held that it was true and yet it contained events which were scientifically disprovable. He also questioned the liberal or latitudinarian view that there could be no Real Presence. Newman argued

---

[1002] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraphs 19 & 20. The *Rubric* was inserted into the *Prayer Book* of 1552 to guard against the medieval and popular practices concerning adoration of the Sacrament. In the 1662 book, the words "real and essential" were replaced with "carnal", therefore indicating that the rubric's intention was to not deny Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. See: Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 178.
[1003] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 22.
[1004] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraphs 22 & 23.
[1005] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraph 23.
[1006] Ibid. Newman has taken this from the *Preface* to *The Book of Common Prayer*.
[1007] Ibid.
[1008] Ibid.

that the philosophy which underpinned this view was equally questionable. He contended that both science and philosophy interpreted Scripture and yet neither could claim authority to do so. Nor could the Church claim authority in matters philosophical, indeed it had never claimed authority in this respect.[1009] The Black Rubric, Newman contended, had decided against a local Presence in the Eucharist by using philosophical deduction. He argued "…that he had…a lawful liberty…to put forth a philosophy of space different…to the framers of the rubric."[1010]

On this premise Newman reproduced a long extract from his letter to Faussett written some three years earlier. He ignored the first half of the letter which considered the different authorities of the Anglican Church, through whom he sought evidence to support the contention of a Real Presence in the Eucharist. The excerpt only considered the philosophical question as to how Christ could both be in Heaven and yet be locally present in the Eucharistic species. Newman asserted that while one material object or being could not be in two places at once, "…very different from this is the conception we form of the presence of spirit with spirit…,"[1011] moreover, that Christ "…has a *body*, and that *spiritual*."[1012] Newman also noted that:

> In the case of things material, a transit through space is the necessary condition of approach and presence; but in things spiritual, (whatever be the condition,) such a transit seems not to be a condition.[1013]

Material objects, in order to be physically present, were required to move from one place to another, but, "…the approach and presence of a spiritual body may be in some other

[1009] Ibid. Also, see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 159.
[1010] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 159-160.
[1011] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 26.
[1012] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraph 27.
[1013] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraph 26.

way,—probably is in some other way, since in some other way, (as it would appear) not gradual, progressive, approximating, that is, locomotive, but at once, spirits become present… ."[1014]

> In answer, then, to the problem, *how* CHRIST comes to us while remaining on high, I answer just as much as this,—that He comes by the agency of the HOLY GHOST, and *by the Sacrament*. Locomotion is the means of a material Presence; the Sacrament is the means of His spiritual presence. As faith is the means of our receiving It, the HOLY GHOST is the Agent and the Sacrament the means of His imparting It; and therefore we call It a sacramental Presence. We kneel before His heavenly throne, and the distance is as nothing; it is as if that throne were the Altar close to us.[1015]

Christ, a spiritual being, could not be spatially located, "…but Christ in becoming incarnate did, of course, subject Himself to such a limitation."[1016] Christ's incarnate nature remained and now he sits at the right hand of the Father with a nature both human and spiritual, yet his body is a spiritual one. The mystery of Christ's indivisible nature meant that his presence in the Eucharist is at one and the same time spiritual, yet indivisible from his incarnate nature.[1017] Newman argued that "…while beings simply spiritual seem not to exist in place, the Incarnate SON does; according to our Church's…" rubric.[1018] Hence, there was nothing in what he stated which was against the literal translation of Anglican Sacramental theology. The orthodoxy of this statement[1019] was underlined by his argument that faith was necessary on the part of the receiver. For,

---

[1014] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraph 27.
[1015] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraph 30.
[1016] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 159.
[1017] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraphs 26 & 27. Also, see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 159.
[1018] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 26.
[1019] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 168.

while as human "…sight…annihilates space…"[1020] it followed that Christ could "open the heavens" and "…in the sacramental rite…dispense with time and space… ."[1021] It was only the "sight" of faith which apprehended Christ within the Eucharist.[1022] Christ was objectively in the Eucharist, but for the full benefits of the Sacrament to be efficacious the receiver must be worthy.[1023] This was much the same argument as Newman used with respect to the doctrine of justification. Both faith and baptism had a distinctive and complementary role in imparting justification, for: "Baptism might be (considered) the hand of the giver and Faith the hand of the receiver."[1024] Faith must be alive within the receiver for the Sacraments to have any effect. He rejected any notion of mere receptionism.

Section 8 of *Tract 90* contained a substantial proportion of the letter to Faussett. This demonstrated that, in relation to Newman's contention concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation, there was (literally) nothing new here which had not been previously published. There remained a question as to why Newman chose to use only the material from his letter to Faussett as almost the entire basis for his argument. This followed no previous pattern set in *Tract 90*. Take, for example, the fact that he began the section with an excerpt from a favoured authority, the *Homilies*. In this instance the quote was taken from the *Homily on the Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament*, which pertained in turn to a quote from St. Cyprian:

> …the meat we seeke for in this Supper, is Spirituall food, the nourishment of our soule, a heauenly refection, and not earthly, an inuisible meat, and not bodily, a

[1020] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 29.
[1021] Ibid.
[1022] Ibid., Section 8. Paragraph 28.
[1023] John Henry Newman, *University Sermons*. VIII. 152*f*. Cited in: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 170.
[1024] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 226. Also see: Selen, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882*. 142. Also see: Chapter 5 of this thesis.

> ghostly substance, and not carnall, so that to thinke that without Faith wee may enioy the eating and drinking thereof…[1025]

Many statements which would be favoured by the Tractarians might be found elsewhere in this *Homily*. The *Homily* spoke of the Sacrament as a "mysterie" from which a "…newnesse or purenesse of life…" flowed, a mystery which was known only by a "sure faith."[1026] The Sacrament must be administered "…as our Lord and Sauiour did, and commanded to bee done, as his holy Apostles vsed it, and the good Fathers in the Primitiue Church frequented it."[1027] Moreover, the *Homily* stated:

> …in the Supper of the Lord, there is no vaine Ceremonie, no bare signe, no vntrue figure of a thing absent (Matthew 26.26): But (as the Scripture saith) the Table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the memorie of Christ, the Annuntiation of his death, yea the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marueilous incorporation, which by the operation of the holy Ghost (the very bond of our coniunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the soules of the faithfull, whereby not onely their soules liue to eternall life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortalitie (1 Corinthians 10.16-17).[1028]

Much the same formula that Newman presented with respect to the Real Presence might be found in this statement. "…Faith is a necessary instrument in all these holy Ceremonies…" which, in the Lord's Supper is fed "…Spirituall food, the nourishment of

---

[1025] AN HOMILIEOF THE worthy receiuing and reuerend esteeming of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily 15. Paragraph 4. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom15.htm: retrieved 11 January, 2009. Cited in Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 4.
[1026] AN HOMILIEOF THE worthy receiuing and reuerend esteeming of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. *Books of Homilies*. Book II. Homily 15. Paragraph 1. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom15.htm: retrieved 11 January, 2009.
[1027] Ibid., Paragraph 2.
[1028] Ibid., Paragraph 3.

our soule, a heauenly refection, and not earthly, an inuisible meat, and not bodily, a ghostly substance, and not carnall… .”[1029] Newman’s statement, that in the bread and wine Christ was spiritually present, found resonance in the *Homily*’s observation that the Sacrament was a spiritual food. Newman’s notion of Christ’s ‘spiritual body’ able to be really present in the Sacrament, while at the same time being at the Father’s right hand would again find parallels in the earlier notion that the Sacrament was a “heavenly reflection”. The *Homily* emphasised the mysterious nature of the Sacrament along with its authority being located with Christ and the Primitive Church. This appeared to be fertile ground around which Newman could have built an argument, yet he did not. Perhaps one reason was that the *Homily* was ambiguous regarding receptionism.

Beyond the fact he did not use the *Homily* there laid an even greater mystery. On 6 May 1838, some six weeks before the letter to Faussett, Newman preached a sermon entitled ‘The Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Church.’ Perhaps because they were composed in much the same timeframe, the letter and sermon contained identical reflections. There was a startling difference, however, for while the letter only considered matters philosophical, the sermon considered arguments from Scripture. In the letter, and for that matter *Tract 90*, by employing only philosophical arguments, Newman did not question the doctrine of the Church based as it was in Scripture. In the sermon he chose to argue from Scripture, this effectively challenged Anglican doctrine. The same formula which would be found later in the letter to Faussett was stated in the sermon; Christ was present both in Heaven and spiritually on earth at one and the same time.

> “As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” And our Lord says; “I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him … We will come unto him, and make Our abode with him.” Thus we Christians stand in the courts of God

[1029] Ibid., Paragraph 4.

> Most High, and, in one sense, see His face; for He who once was on earth, has now departed from this visible scene of things in a mysterious, twofold way, both to His Father and into our hearts, thus making the Creator and His creatures one…[1030]

Newman also reflected on two passages from the Gospel of Matthew. "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them," (Matt 18:20) and "Lo, I *am with you* alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt 28:20) Interpreting these pericopes, he stated that Christ, the "Incarnate Mediator" was with his Church forever. "When then He says He should go away," Newman wrote, "and come again and abide for ever, He is speaking, not merely of His omnipresent Divine nature, but of His human nature."[1031] From this, it could have appeared that Newman argued for a carnal presence in the Eucharist, for he stated (the orthodox position) that Christ had an indivisible nature, human and divine. But, Christ did not come and make himself present in any other way than through the Holy Spirit. "He *has* come again, but in His Spirit; that is, His Spirit has come instead of Him; and when it is said that He is with us, this only means that His Spirit is with us." (Eph 2:22)[1032] Christ, because he is God, is able to make himself manifest in ways that are imperceptible to human beings.[1033] The human senses cannot know, comprehend or understand God. It is only when like "speaks" to like that the possibility of comprehension occurs. "Only by faith is He known to be present; He is not recognized by sight."[1034] The Sacramental Presence is not a carnal presence, nor is the

---

[1030] John Henry Newman, "Sermon 10. The Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Church", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. VI: 124. The Scripture citations are from Gal 3:27 and John 14:21-23 respectively.
[1031] Ibid., 125.
[1032] Ibid., 126.
[1033] Ibid., 128-9.
[1034] Ibid., 132. Newman made this statement in respect to the disciples on the Road to Emmaus who only apprehended Christ in the breaking of the bread. This they did by faith, not by sight. (Luke 24:13-35)

Lord's Supper merely a memorial. For the Tractarians, Christ was present *under* the Sacramental sign, invisible to the senses and only accessible by the eyes of faith.[1035]

Newman demonstrated restraint in describing how Christ was present in the Eucharist. He was concerned with dispelling any notion of a carnal presence and most particularly he was concerned with the effect of the Sacrament on the communicant.[1036] The effect of the Sacrament was emphasised, for Newman considered that ongoing investigation as to how Christ was present in the Eucharist could lead to an undue "rationalism" whereas the Sacraments were what God intended them to be, a mystery, inaccessible to human minds.[1037] For Newman rationalism was "…the great evil of the day."[1038] Newman's dispute with Faussett defined his stance on the mystery of the Eucharist. It was surprising that this was Newman's first substantial statement on the nature of the Real Presence and was written only as a defence of Froude's *Remains*. While Pusey's major work on the Eucharist, *Tract 81*, was the major Tractarian document concerning the Sacrament, it contained little on the nature of the Real Presence. There was relatively little by way of Tractarian doctrine on the Real Presence. (Compare this, for example, to the considerable works on apostolic succession or the doctrine of justification.)

The very fact that *Tract 90* contains much of Newman's letter to Faussett was evidence that there was nothing new in the Tract.[1039] Moreover, whereas Newman's commentary on Article XXII, concerning Purgatory, was the flashpoint for the *Letter of the Four College*

[1035] John Henry Newman, "Sermon 11. The Eucharistic Presence", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. VI: 136-7. Also see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 157.
[1036] Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 150.
[1037] Ibid., 151.
[1038] Newman, *Apologia*. 137.
[1039] Cf. Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 56.

Tutors,[1040] no mention was made by them of the equally contentious doctrine of transubstantiation. Newman's two major statements justifying *Tract 90* in letters to Jelf[1041] and the Bishop of Oxford, Richard Bagot[1042] contained only two references to the doctrine of transubstantiation. These were made in the former document. It was possible, Newman reflected, "…to hold with Andrewes that, taking away the doctrine of Transubstantiation from the Mass, we shall have no dispute about the Sacrifice; or with Hooker to treat even Transubstantiation as an opinion which by itself need not cause separation… ."[1043] A review of Newman's *Letters and Diaries* from this period demonstrated that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not an issue. What was an issue was the nature of the Real Presence, but this had nothing to do with *Tract 90*. In December 1841 Newman wrote to Mary Holmes (1815?-78)[1044] and Samuel Wood (1811-91).[1045] He described "…a much more definite view of the (promised) inward evidence of the Presence of Christ with us in the Sacraments… ."[1046] The meaning of this passage was unclear. It might have referred to Newman moving to a Roman Catholic view of the Real Presence[1047] or to often-denied "natural visitations."[1048] But there was nothing in Newman's correspondence that had direct relevance to either Article XXVIII or transubstantiation.

What was noteworthy was the striking resemblance between the events surrounding the publication of Froude's *Remains* and Newman's letter to Faussett in 1838 and the publication of *Tract 90* in 1841. All three documents caused internal dissent within the

---

[1040] From: T. Churton and Others. 8 March, 1842, "To The Editor of the Tracts for the Times." Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 59-60.
[1041] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Ibid. 78-88.
[1042] To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Ibid. 129-44.
[1043] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Ibid. 84.
[1044] To: Miss Holmes. 6 December, 1841. Ibid. 366-7.
[1045] To: S.F. Wood. 13 December, 1841. Ibid. 374-5.
[1046] Ibid., 375.
[1047] Ibid., 375. *n.* 3.
[1048] To: Miss Holmes. 6 December, 1841. Ibid. 367. *n.* 1.

Tractarian party and considerable external reaction. The events of 1838 and those of 1841 had another parallel in that, in each instance, the Tracts were in danger of censure by the Bishop of Oxford, Richard Bagot. In 1838 Newman wrote that "…Bishop of Oxford is delivering a Charge in our favour…" with respect to the Tracts.[1049] However, Newman was "disappointed" to read the Bishop's Charge. Richard Bagot found no fault in matters of discipline and doctrine and "…he had found many most excellent things in the 'Tracts for the Times'…"[1050] nevertheless "…but for some words and expressions he was sorry, as likely to lead *others* into error; he feared more for the disciples than for the masters… ."[1051] The Bishop of Oxford's Charge, which Newman took to be stating that some parts of the Tracts were dangerously close to Romanism,[1052] was troubling, for he considered "…a Bishop's lightest word, *ex cathedra*, is heavy… ."[1053] Newman's fears were premature, for, as in the case of *Tract 90*, the Bishop neither issued a censure against the Tracts nor their writers, neither did he call for a cessation of their publication. Rather, Bagot "…had in his Charge approved very much of what we had done, censured nothing…" and assured Newman that there were "…persons who thought the Tracts were doing good, and had a great respect for (Newman)… ."[1054] Three years later, Newman reflected on this series of events and in his letter to Richard Bagot justifying *Tract 90* he noted that the Bishop had "…expressed an unfavourable opinion of Tract 90…" and, should it be his desire to discontinue the Tracts, Newman would "…at once obey it… ."[1055] Newman referred to his statement of 1838 that "A Bishop's lightest word *ex Cathedra* is heavy."[1056] The letter to Richard Bagot of 29 March 1841 (published at the Bishop's insistence) to a large extent assuaged the bishop's concerns. Consequently he

[1049] To: James B. Mozely. 2 August, 1838. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VI: 270.
[1050] To: John Keble. 14 August, 1838. Ibid. 285 -6.
[1051] Ibid.
[1052] To: J. W. Bowden. 17 August, 1838. Ibid. 291.
[1053] To: John Keble. 14 August, 1838. Ibid. 286. (This was written in a second letter to Keble on the same day – see footnote 107.)
[1054] To: John Keble. 22 August, 1838. Ibid. 301.
[1055] To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 130.
[1056] Ibid.

wrote to Newman and stated "…satisfaction and gratification…"[1057] at Newman's published letter and accompanying personal note. Moreover, Bagot considered that the published letter would cause a calm to succeed the "threatened storm." He also wrote that he was concerned that he had "…caused pain to one in whom I feel much interest… ."[1058]

The 1838 publication of the *Remains* caused considerable dissent among the Tract writers. Newman wrote to Keble that he "…must not be vexed to have a somewhat excited letter from Edward Churton (1800-74) on the subject of dear Hurrell's 'Remains'…All persons whose hearts have been with Cranmer and Jewel are naturally pained, and one must honour them for it."[1059] Yet, while Churton and others who were half-committed or, at best, neutral to the Tractarian cause, others like William George Ward (1812-82) were strongly drawn towards it, principally through the publication of Froude's *Remains*.[1060] By 1841 none of Edward Churton's propensity for compromise had left him. On 19 March 1841, he wrote to William Gresley (1801-76):

> I have written in answer to (William) Palmer (of Worcester College), begging him as a man of peace and mediator, to try to get the No. 90 called in by the Editor, and then get the Heads to say publicly what it seems they say privately, that they intended no censure on the other Tracts…[1061]

But, if the waverers were much the same in 1838 as in 1841, those who came forward to defend the Tracts, and especially No. 90, were of a very different type. The later events which played out in 1841 again surrounded the actions of Godfrey Faussett who was

---

[1057] From: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 2 April, 1841. Ibid. 144.
[1058] Ibid.
[1059] To: John Keble. 29 March, 1838. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VI: 227.
[1060] Gilley, *Newman and His Age*. 183.
[1061] Edward Churton to W. Gresley. 19 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 114. *n*. 1.

"firing away" at *Tract 90* and "…glorying that the University is at length beginning to persecute."[1062] It was in reaction to Faussett's attacks that Thomas Mozley (1806-93) wrote a piece in the *British Critic* titled 'The Oxford Margaret Professor.'[1063] The article was met with some considerable astonishment from John Keble. He wrote to Newman: "Has not our friend gone beyond the just limits of Christian…and of gentlemanly severity in several parts…in the general conception and execution of that paper?"[1064] With respect to the article Newman wrote to Pusey that he "…was much annoyed at it…"[1065] and to Thomas Mozley that "…because the Article is *too* true, it seems cruel to old F (Faussett)."[1066] Indeed, his disquiet went further than the *British Critic*'s treatment of Faussett, it was becoming "…a matter of great anxiety…"[1067] to him. The cause of the concern was the continuing attacks on the English Reformers by William Ward and Frederick Oakeley. Newman was not only concerned to "…put a stop to all attacks on the Reformers…" but he considered that Ward and Oakeley were only "…possessed with (this) one subject."[1068] The attacks on the Reformers centred on two articles. Oakeley's article in the *British Critic* had been on Jewel[1069] while Ward's spirited defence of the Roman Catholic Church *The Ideal of a Christian Church* had become notorious.[1070] There was evidence that towards the end of 1841 the matter of *Tract 90* was of less concern, but what was causing disquiet were the articles written by Ward and Oakeley,

---

[1062] To: Thomas Mozley. 3 June, 1841. John Henry Newman, Ibid. 200.
[1063] Thomas Mozley, "The Oxford Margaret Professor", *British Critic*, 30, 1841 (July): 214-43.
[1064] From: John Keble to John Henry Newman. 4 July, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 217.
[1065] To: E. B. Pusey. 23 July, 1841. Ibid. 228.
[1066] To: Thomas Mozley. 23 August, 1841. Ibid. 253.
[1067] To: John Keble. 7 July, 1841. Ibid. 218.
[1068] To: E. B. Pusey. 30 July, 1841. Ibid. 234.
[1069] Frederick Oakeley, "Bishop Jewel, His Character, Correspondence, and Apologetic Treatises", *British Critic*, 30, 1841 (July): 1-46.
[1070] Ker, *John Henry Newman*. 294 Ward's extremist anti-Reformer views had been published in a series of articles in the *British Critic* beginning in 1841; these were later collected into a book. See: William George Ward, *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered in Comparison With Existing Practice, Containing a Defence of Certain Articles in* the *British Critic in Reply to Remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's 'Narrative'* (London: James Toovey, 1844).

together with Newman's criticisms of Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850).[1071] These criticisms were made in a series of letters by Newman under the name of 'Catholicus' to *The Times*. The source of this disquiet came from the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Howley (1766-1848), via Pusey. According to Pusey, Howley was inclined to put a "favourable interpretation" on the *Remains* and (by inference) on *Tract 90*. This left open the possibility that it was not so much *Tract 90* which caused the furore in 1841, but there was considerable uneasiness at the more 'radical' Tractarians who had used it as a point of departure to launch an extreme agenda.

The more radical position of Ward could also be perceived through his understanding of transubstantiation. He held that there was, in essence, no difference in the teaching of the English and Roman Churches, rather there was a misunderstanding within the former of the philosophical terminology employed, that there was a misreading of the scholastic notions of "substance" and "accident," the former inconceivable by human senses. Thus, when Roman Catholic doctrine spoke of the annihilation of the bread and the wine, it was referring only to that which cannot be seen, the internal real nature of the bread and wine, the "substance," while the "accidents" accessible by the senses remain the same.[1072] This was a more Catholic understanding than Newman ever ventured. *Tract 90* and Newman's earlier writings were far less clear, or, for that matter provocative. Newman could only say that the mystery of the Eucharist was invisible, imperceptible and unapproachable to the human senses, and that the spiritual Presence was only apprehended by the eyes of faith.[1073] This measured language was a mark of

---

[1071] See: "Peel's Tamworth Reading Room Speech and the Letters of 'Catholicus' to *The Times,* 5-26 February, 1841", Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 525-61.
[1072] Ward, *Ideal of a Christian Church*. 118-9. n. i. Also see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 193.
[1073] Newman, "Sermon 10. The Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Church", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. VI: 122, 132 & *passim*. See also: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 157.

Newman's presentation of the Tractarian doctrine of the Real Presence throughout the debate. He also used this considered language in *Tract 90*. The Tract presented nothing beyond that which he had presented before. If anything, Newman's presentation in it was a more confused understanding of the nature of the Real Presence. This reflected the state of his mind at the time of writing. Moreover, the Tract represented an earlier doctrine held by Newman, one not necessarily formed in the context of the need for a clear theological position, but one taken as a stance to defend his friend Hurrell Froude. It was, after all, Froude to whom Newman owed much, for it was through him that Newman was "…gradually (led) to believe in the Real Presence."[1074]

[1074] Newman, *Apologia*. 48.

CHAPTER 12

TRACT 90 – SECTION β9

ARTICLE XXXI

XXXI. Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

The Offering of Christ once made in that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

Despite its considerable length, the argument Newman offered in Section 9 was succinct. "Here the sacrifice of the Mass is not spoken of…," wrote Newman, "…but "the sacrifice of masses," certain observances, for the most part private and solitary… ."[1075] Hence, Article XXXI was not directed as such against the propitiatory nature of the celebration, but against private Masses. From this clarification Newman went on to make three observations concerning popular practices in the Roman Church. The Article was not directed against the Mass, or against the "…the creed of the Roman Church, but against actual existing errors in it… ."[1076] The first, he noted, was the "blasphemous fable" to which the Article referred "…is the teaching that there is a sacrifice for sin other than CHRIST'S death, and that masses are those other sacrifices."[1077] He rejected the notion that "…in the Mass (there was) a second or rather continually recurring atonement…" for the forgiveness of sins.[1078] The celebration of the Eucharist was a

[1075] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 2.
[1076] Ibid., Paragraph 1.
[1077] Ibid., Paragraph 5.
[1078] Ibid., Paragraph 9.

commemoration of the one sacrifice at Calvary; it was not a repetition of it, but a participation in it.[1079] Secondly, he rejected the sacrifice of Masses by priests without a congregation, particularly where they were celebrated to obtain an indulgence for a (paying) penitent. Thirdly, disallowing this doctrine, he condemned the sacrifice of Masses because they were bought by "…filthy lucre."[1080] Newman contended that the Article did not condemn the doctrine of sacrifice, but the false notion that the Mass could be seen as

> …independent of or distinct from the Sacrifice on the Cross, which is blasphemy; and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition.[1081]

Newman argued that, by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, each communicant received the merits of the one full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, the remission of sins and the promise of eternal life.[1082] To support his argument he turned to the authorities of the Council of Trent, Burnet, Bull, the *Homilies* and *The Book of Common Prayer*. Of these, only excerpts from the latter addressed the "blasphemous fable" that private Masses were a propitiation for sin.[1083] The other sources, in long extracts, addressed the "blasphemous and pernicious imposture" of paying for private Masses.[1084] The volume of evidence directed against private Masses demonstrated that this was the crucial point on which he hung his claims

---

[1079] Ibid., Paragraphs 4, 5, 8 & 16. Also, see: John Henry Newman, "Lecture 10. Righteousness the Fruit of Our Lord's Resurrection", *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 205. Newman argued that the Eucharistic sacrifice was not merely symbolical. Christ's death on Calvary and the Eucharistic sacrifice were one and the same. The first was a fleshly sacrifice; the Eucharist was a spiritual sacrifice. The Atonement was a "…work of Flesh and Blood…" but "…for our individual justification, there must be a spiritual, ubiquitous communication of that Sacrifice continually." Also see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 209.
[1080] Ibid., Paragraph 4.
[1081] Ibid., Section 9. Paragraph 16.
[1082] Ibid., Paragraphs 5-8.
[1083] Ibid.
[1084] Ibid., Paragraphs 10-15.

Newman took three excerpts from *The Book of Common Prayer* to illustrate his argument that there was one sufficient sacrifice on Calvary, not many sacrifices repeated in Masses.[1085] Newman quoted one of the collects after the Prayer of Consecration which declared the Eucharist was a "…sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that *by the merits and death of Thy* SON JESUS CHRIST, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain *remission of our* sins and all *other benefits* of His passion."[1086] In the *Exhortation*, or notice of celebration of Holy Communion, Newman noted that it was the oblation of bread and wine "…the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST…" through which communicants "…obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven."[1087] From the Prayer of Consecration he affirmed there was only one act of sacrifice by Christ and that the Eucharist was a commemoration of "…His *one* oblation of Himself *once* offered, a *full perfect* and *sufficient* sacrifice, oblation, and *satisfaction* for the sins of the whole world."[1088]

The doctrine of Christ's one perfect sacrifice on the Cross could be found in earlier Anglican literature. Burnet's *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* contained a highly developed doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice. He perceived that the Eucharist might be characterised as sacrifice in three ways. Firstly: "In general, all acts of religious worship may be called *sacrifices*…" and it is in "…this large sense…that the *eucharist* is a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' and our church calls it so in the office of

[1085] Ibid., Paragraphs 6-8.
[1086] Ibid., Paragraph 7. Also, see: *The Book of Common Prayer*. 176-7. (Or equivalent pages in different impressions of the book.) This prayer is offered after the Lord's Prayer and before the Gloria. It is the first of two alternatives offered, the second of which does not refer to 'sacrifice' nor to 'praise and thanksgiving'.
[1087] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraphs 8. Also, see: *The Book of Common Prayer*. 168-70. (Or, the first of the *Exhortations* in any impression.)
[1088] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraphs 6. Also, see: *The Book of Common Prayer*. 175. (Or, the *Prayer of Consecration* in any impression.)

the Communion."[1089] Secondly, the Eucharist was a sacrifice because "…there is an oblation of bread and wine made in it, which being sanctified are consumed in an act of religion."[1090] Thirdly, the Eucharist was a sacrifice "…because it is a commemoration, and a representation to God of the sacrifice that Christ offered for us on the cross…."[1091] The last two of Burnet's observations were cited by Pusey in *Tract 81* (*Catena Patrum No. IV*).[1092] In his introduction to the Tract, Pusey also contended that the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist was to be understood in the same three ways, as one of praise and thanksgiving,[1093] an oblation of bread and wine[1094] and as a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice.[1095] In *Tract 81*, Pusey quoted George Bull. Here again was presented the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice which placed it in the terms of being one of "prayer and thanksgiving,"[1096] an "Oblation"[1097] which he held to be "…a "reasonable Sacrifice," a "Sacrifice without blood"…"[1098] and a "commemorative Sacrifice."[1099]

Prior to the publication of Pusey's *Tract 81* there had been little written in Tractarian literature concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice.[1100] Newman made no reference to Pusey's

---

[1089] Gilbert Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1850), 459.
[1090] Ibid., 459.
[1091] Ibid., 460.
[1092] Pusey, *Testimony of Writers of the Later English Church To the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, With an Historical Account of the Changes Made in the Liturgy as to the Expression of that Doctrine. Tract 81. Catena Patrum No. IV.* §40. (HICKES, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.--The Christian Priesthood asserted.) Paragraph 40.
[1093] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 7.
[1094] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 3.
[1095] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 3*f*.
[1096] Bull, "Sermon 13: Prescribed Forms of Prayer in the Public Worship of God, Practised from the Very Beginnings of Christianity, and Are Not Only Ancient, But Useful and Necessary on Many Accounts", *Works.* I: 330. Cited in: Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Tract 81.* §34. Paragraph 4.
[1097] Bull, "Sermon 13" *Works.* I: 333. Cited in: Pusey, *Tract 81. IV.* §34. Paragraph 5.
[1098] George Bull, "Corruptions of the Church of Rome", *The Works of George Bull, D.D. Lord Bishop of St. David's*, Edward Burton, editor, 2 Volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1846), II: 251. Cited in: Pusey, *Tract 81.* §34. (ID.--Corruptions of the Church of Rome.) Paragraph 2.
[1099] Bull, "Corruptions of the Church of Rome", *Works* II: 251. Cited in: Pusey, *Tract 81.* §34. (ID.--Corruptions of the Church of Rome.) Paragraph 3.
[1100] Newman's early unpublished sermons from 1830 demonstrated he believed that the Eucharistic sacrifice contained the notions of worship, commemoration and private intercession for the Church. The Eucharist was in essence only one form of sacrifice, for this doctrine did not contain any reference to the need for the oblation offering. Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 200-4.

work in *Tract 90*, neither did he use any of the authorities contained in *Tract 81*. There were two apparent reasons for these omissions. Pusey was prepared to allow that Cranmer and Ridley did not intend to reject the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but only did so because of the extreme influences of the Continental Reformers.[1101] Newman considered that the Article was written as a reaction to practices which the framers of it saw with their own eyes.[1102] One further major difference separated the two. Pusey stated, with respect to the sacrifice of the Mass and the doctrine of Transubstantiation:

> …the Article itself furnishes, that the doctrine which it condemns is one which implies Transubstantiation, a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the deliverance of souls from pain and guilt in Purgatory, it follows that no other doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is contemplated by it.[1103]

Newman considered that the Eucharistic sacrifice and the doctrine of transubstantiation were separate and "…that, by taking away the doctrine of Transubstantiation from the Mass we shall have no dispute about the Sacrifice… ."[1104]

The second of two extracts from Burnet in *Tract 90* referred to the practice of purchasing Masses so that "…souls were redeemed out of purgatory… ."[1105] Newman claimed that Article XXXI was directed against Masses sacrificed by priests, often alone, for financial

---

[1101] Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraphs 35-8. See Also: E. B. P. to J.H.N. 9 August, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 240.
[1102] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 2. Also, see: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 210-2.
[1103] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *The articles treated on in Tract 90 reconsidered and their interpretation vindicated : in a letter to the Rev. R.W. Jelf, D.D., canon of Christ Church ; with an appendix from Abp. Ussher on the difference between ancient and modern addresses to saints* (Oxford: J. H. Parker: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, London, 1841), 67. (See pp. 60-7 for Pusey's argument which he based on the objections of Ridley to the Romish doctrine concerning the sacrifice of the Mass.)
[1104] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 84.
[1105] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 14. Also, see: Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 297.

gain. Article XXXI read that the sacrifice of Masses was "…dangerous deceits." Newman included in his extract of the Article two Latin terms: *sacrificium* and *perniciosæ imposturæ*. The term *perniciosæ imposturæ* was translated in all versions of the Articles as "dangerous deceits." For the purpose of his argument Newman translated this as "pernicious imposture(s)."[1106] Each was an acceptable translation of the Latin (the Articles were prepared in both languages), although "dangerous deceits" was the authorised translation.[1107] The reason for Newman's different translation was apparent, for the term 'imposture' appears in the second excerpt where Burnet referred to the purchase of Masses for releasing souls from Purgatory.[1108] (The word was italicised by Newman to signify its importance.) However, there was no reference to the sacrifice of Masses for the purpose of releasing souls from Purgatory in the extract from Burnet. Neither was such a link made in its original context.[1109] Only much earlier in his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* did Burnet make reference to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass for the release of souls from Purgatory.[1110] But, here he was referring to the sacrifice of the Mass, not the sacrifice of Masses. Burnet made the link between the sacrifice of Masses by individual priests, usually for profitable gain, and their purpose, which was release souls from Purgatory, but this was evidence not used by Newman.[1111] Burrnet and Newman differed on one substantial point. It was clear from Burnet's text that the terms 'transubstantiation' and 'Purgatory' were interchangeable. Like Pusey, as distinct from Newman, Burnet

[1106] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 10.
[1107] Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*.46-7. Neither is the authoritative translation questioned by Pusey. See: Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraph 3. Also see: Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. xvii.
[1108] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 14.
[1109] Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 297.
[1110] Ibid., 285.
[1111] Ibid., 465.

interpreted the doctrine of transubstantiation to include the principle that Calvary was repeated on the altar at each Mass.[1112]

Newman used the first of the two excerpts from Gilbert Burnet to argue against the practice of celebrating private Masses. Burnet considered the ancient Church "…did not know what *solitary masses* were, without a communion."[1113] The practice of the early Church was to offer one Mass in any one particular city or location, as distinct from many Masses. Newman inferred from this that Article XXXI was never directed against the sacrifice of the Mass, but the sacrifice of individual Masses, which for the most part were celebrated in private.[1114] Further evidence, condemning the practice of celebrating private Masses, came from George Bull who considered the Roman Catholic "…doctrine of men's playing an after game for their salvation in purgatory…" gained by "…a *solitary* mass, *bought for a piece of money*, performed and participated by a priest alone… ."[1115] Newman pursued the subject of private Masses offered for the redemption of souls by quoting passages from three different *Homilies*. From the *Homily on Repairing and Keeping Clean the Church*, he provided one of the more lurid statements found in *Tract 90*.

> What dennes of theeues the Churches of England haue beene made by the blasphemous buying & selling the most precious body and blood of Christ in the Masse, as the world was made to beleeue, at diriges, at monthes minds, at trentalles, in abbeyes & chantries, beside other horrible abuses (GODS holy name be blessed for euer) which we now see & vnderstand. All these abominations, they that supplie the roome of Christ, haue cleansed and purged

[1112] Ibid., See especially 454-5.
[1113] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 3. Also, see: Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 464.
[1114] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraphs 2-3.
[1115] George Bull, "Sermon 1: The Necessity of Works of Righteousness in Order to Salvation; Though the Reward of Them is Only to be Expected From the Free Grace and Mercy of God; Against the Antimonians and Papists", *Works*. I: 13. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 13.

> the Churches of England of, taking away all such fulsomnesse and filthinesse, as through blinde deuotion and ignorance hath crept into the Church these many hundred yeeres.[1116]

This was supported by a description taken from the *Homily on the Place and Time of Prayer* which described popular practice and belief.

> …haue not the Christians of late dayes, and euen in our dayes…prouoked the displeasure and indignation of Almighty GOD? partly because they haue prophaned and defiled their Churches with heathenish and Iewish abuses, with images and idoles, with numbers of Altars, too too superstitiously and intolerably abused, with grosse abusing and filthy corrupting of the Lords holy supper,…hauing a vaine and dangerous fansie and perswasion, that if they come to the Church, besprinckle them with holy water, heare a masse, and bee blessed with the chalice, though they vnderstand not one word of the whole seruice, nor feele one motion of repentance in their hearts, all is well, all is sure.[1117]

The *Homily Concerning the Sacrament* claimed "…the cause of this mummish Massing… ." had been ignorance. It required of the people: "Let vs therefore so trauaile to vnderstand the Lords Supper, that we be no cause of the decay of GODS worship, of no Idolatry, of no dumbe Massing, of no hate and malice: so may we the boldlier haue accesse thither to our comfort."[1118]

[1116] AN HOMILIE FOR REpayring and keeping cleane, and comely adorning of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. Book 2. Homily 3. Paragraph 4. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom03.htm: retrieved 12 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 10.
[1117] AN HOMILIE OF THE place and time of prayer. *Books of Homilies*. Book 2. Homily 8. Part ii. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom08.htm: retrieved 12 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 11.
[1118] [1118] AN HOMILIE OF THE worthy receiuing and reuerend esteeming of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. *Books of Homilies*. Book 2. Homily 15. Part i. Paragraph 3. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom15.htm: retrieved 12 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 12.

In *Tract 90* and *Tract 81*, the *Homily Concerning the Sacrament* was used for quite different purposes. Pusey cited the *Homily* twice. Referring to the first excerpt he made the claim that "…the writer of one of our Homilies uses the simple word "sacrifice" in the Popish sense, and employs that of "the memory" for what antiently (sic) was designated by "sacrifice.""[1119]

> We must then take heed, lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice, lest of a communion, it be made a priuate eating, lest of two partes, we haue but one, lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be aliue…[1120]

Pusey went on to describe how the Gallican Church took this particular passage to be at one with the "old Catholic Doctrine," for it separated "memory" from "communion" and believed the sacrifice was "…a mystical offering and sacrifice of CHRIST."[1121] Pusey also asserted this position was held by John Jewel.[1122] Considering that Newman had constantly highlighted the inconsistencies in the *Homilies* it was perplexing that he did not take up the opportunity to do so in this instance. Newman also ignored confirmation in the *Homily on the Sacrament* that the Eucharistic sacrifice was one of "thankesgiuing,"[1123] an "oblation"[1124] and a "…publike celebration of the memory of his pretious death at the Lords table."[1125]

[1119] AN HOMILIE OF THE worthy receiuing and reuerend esteeming of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. *Books of Homilies*. Book 2. Homily 15. Part i. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom15.htm: retrieved 12 January, 2009. See also: Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraph 55.
[1120] Ibid.
[1121] Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraph 55.
[1122] Ibid.
[1123] AN HOMILIE OF THE worthy receiuing and reuerend esteeming of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. *Books of Homilies*, Book 2. Homily 15. Part ii. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom15.htm: retrieved 12 January, 2009.
[1124] Ibid., Part i. Paragraph 4.
[1125] Ibid., Part i. Paragraph 1.

Newman complemented the excerpts from the *Homilies* with an extract from the Council of Trent, Session 22, the longest extract from the council found in *Tract 90*.[1126] There was a considerable difference in his choice of quotation compared to that offered by Pusey in *Tract 81*. Newman wished to highlight the council's condemnation of the celebration of Mass for the financial benefit of priests. Pusey more correctly reflected the breadth of the Tridentine Decrees and Canons. Both noted that the council was concerned with the "…corruptions, occasions of avarice, superstition, and profaneness thence ensuing, exceed all bounds."[1127] Pusey also accurately reflected the intention of the Session 22 of the council, for it was less about reforming corrupt practices in the celebration of Mass, but rather a doctrinal statement on the sacrifice of the Mass.[1128] Indeed, Session 22 of the council issued the decree on the *Doctrine on the Sacrifice of the Mass*.[1129] Pusey specified that it was the belief of the Roman Church that the sacrifice of the Mass was propitiatory and for it to be so the sacrifice required an immolation on the altar.[1130] He consequently determined that there was a nexus between sacrifice, transubstantiation, Purgatory and private Masses.[1131] The council permitted private Masses to be said,[1132] decreed that Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice and not a "bare commemoration,"[1133] one which was offered for the sins of both the living and the dead.[1134] Newman made nothing of this,[1135] but he did make one observation in the summary of his interpretation of Article XXXI. He noted that in respect to the sacrifice of the Mass for the remission of sins for the quick

---

[1126] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 15. See: Appendix XVI.
[1127] Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraph 4.
[1128] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraphs 5 & 59.
[1129] J. Waterworth, editor & translator, *The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent* (London: Dolman, 1848), 152.
[1130] Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraphs 4-5.
[1131] Ibid., Paragraph 5.
[1132] Waterworth, *The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent.* Session 22. Chapter VI. 156-7.
[1133] Ibid., Canon III. 158-9.
[1134] Ibid., Chapter II. 154-5.
[1135] Newman heavily edited the extract from Trent. The Decree began with the words: "no other work can be performed by the faithful so holy and divine as this tremendous mystery itself, wherein that life-giving victim, by which we were reconciled to the Father, is daily immolated on the altar by priests… ." Decree on the Things to be Observed, and to be Avoided, in the Celebration of the Mass. Ibid. 160

and the dead, the Article had not spoken against such doctrine, provided that the sacrifice was held to be a commemorative offering.[1136] He added Trent held that "…the fruits of the Bloody Oblation are through this (sacrifice) most abundantly obtained; so far is the latter from detracting in any way from the former…," which he interpreted to mean that the remission of sin was obtained through Christ's sacrifice on the Cross commemorated in the Eucharist.[1137] However, Newman had misquoted the original which stated:

> For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different. The fruits indeed of which oblation, of that bloody one to wit, are received most plentifully through this unbloody one; so far is this (latter) from derogating in any way from that (former oblation).[1138]

Excluding "…of that bloody one to wit…" changed the meaning of the Tridentine Canon completely, for the council was stating the sacrifice on the altar was the same as that at Calvary and equally propitious.[1139] While this was Pusey's interpretation of Roman Catholic doctrine it was not Newman's. In an attempt to provide a Catholic reading of the Article, Newman necessarily needed to establish that it was not addressing the Roman Catholic doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice. The difficulty was he never really established what the Roman doctrine was. Only in the last paragraph did he obliquely mention the doctrine and then inaccurately.[1140]

[1136] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 16.
[1137] Ibid. However, the meaning of this paragraph was most unclear.
[1138] Waterworth, *The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent.* Session 22. Chapter II. 154-5.
[1139] Newman tried to add further explanation to this passage in his letter to Jelf. He argued that the Tridentine statement had "…no strength at all compared with the comment contained in the actual (current) teaching and practice of the Church, as regards private masses." To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 80.
[1140] This phrase was not included in the first edition of *Tract 90.*

Surprisingly, Newman ignored evidence from Session 22 of the Council of Trent which supported his claim that the sacrifice of the Mass was offered to God alone. This was found in an earlier excerpt in *Tract 90* in Section 6 concerning the invocation of saints. Here the excerpt declared that "…the Church has been accustomed sometimes to celebrate a few masses to the honour and remembrance of saints, yet she *doth not teach that sacrifice is offered to them*, but to GOD alone… ."[1141] This statement dispelled the false notion that the Eucharistic sacrifice was for any other purpose other than to honour God alone for his mercy.[1142] The Mass was not offered in honour of the saints[1143] and, by inference, for any purpose other than to celebrate Christ's one, true, perfect sacrifice on the Cross.[1144]

From reading Section 9, three observations can be made. Firstly, in determining whether the section contained any new material, the answer must be that it did not. Secondly, as to the question concerning the relevance of the material it did contain, the answer is that apart from a few, relatively short, excerpts from *The Book of Common Prayer*, the contents of the section were largely not relevant. Most of the sources quoted only alluded to the sacrifice of private Masses for the forgiveness of sins obtained through payment of "filthy lucre." Thirdly, as a consequence of the inadequate argument proffered by Newman, the contention did not stand, based as it was on his interpretation that the Article referred only to private Masses offered for the souls in Purgatory. Alf Härdelin noted that this section of the Tract contained not only the "…worst type of sophistry…" but was also the "…most controversial part of the whole tract… ."[1145] A survey of primary documents, particularly Newman's *Letters and Diaries*, showed no evidence of the

[1141] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 64.
[1142] Cf. Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 7.
[1143] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 64.
[1144] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 6.
[1145] Alf Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 210. Härdelin cited Brilioth as his authority for this statement. See: Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*. 154 *f*.

doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice causing any form of controversy or reaction in the aftermath of the *Tract 90*'s publication.[1146] With respect to the charge of sophistry: in the 1883 edition of *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* (Volume II) Newman admitted that his argument was not "satisfactory."[1147] Newman stated that as a whole he had been able to defend the Tract "…but not this portion of it."[1148]

> It argues that what the Article condemns is not the authoritative teaching of Rome, but only the common belief and practice of Catholics, as regards Purgatory and private Masses. But the words in which the Article condemns the so-called abuse are *ipso facto* a condemnation also of the ordinance itself which is abused.[1149]

Newman went on to note that the "…distinction between what is dogmatic and what is popular being…" was unsustainable in *Tract 90*.[1150] It was untenable that "…"the Mass" was the aboriginal divine Rite, which the Article left alone, and "the Masses" were those private superstitions which the Article denounced."[1151] He noted that the terms "Mass" and "Masses" grammatically "…do but respectively denote abstract and concrete…"[1152] and as a consequence the terms should not be in any way perceived as different.[1153] In essence, Newman described the difficulty in his own argument. He also wrote that in

---

[1146] The only communications regarding Eucharistic sacrifice in the aftermath of *Tract 90* concerned the Bishop of London's refusal to ordain a candidate on the grounds that he believed that there was some form of sacrifice within the Eucharist. There was, however, no ostensible link between this and the *Tract*. See: To R. W. Church. Christmas Eve, 1841. And: T Thomas Mozley. Christmas Eve, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII. 383-5.

[1147] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 351. Newman's statement concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice was appended as a note to the 1877 edition. The addition was entitled: *Note 2 On Section 9, p. 323 of the above Tract.*

[1148] Ibid.

[1149] Ibid.

[1150] Ibid., 352.

[1151] Ibid.

[1152] Ibid.

[1153] The difficulties in grammar had been discussed previously in 1842. Newman had misread the Article. In the first four editions of the Tract the term "sacrifices of Masses" had been printed as "sacrifice of Masses". To: William Wordsworth. 1 February, 1842. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 448.

Tract 81 Pusey had correctly communicated the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice.[1154] This position being that "…THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRIFICE CANNOT BE THE SAME, WHERE TRANSUBSTANTIATION is HELD AND WHERE IT IS NOT."[1155] For the purposes of his argument Newman had attempted to decouple the Sacrifice of the Mass from transubstantiation. In Roman Catholicism these were indivisible. Newman's attempt to formulate a doctrine of sacrifice which was sympathetic to Roman Catholic doctrine came unstuck on this point. As Pusey had written, to accept the Roman Catholic doctrine of sacrifice was to also accept the doctrine of transubstantiation.[1156] Newman stated it was "…the categorical teaching of the Tracts…"[1157] summarised in *Tract 81*, that:

> …there was no Christ present in the Eucharist till after the offering, oblation, or sacrifice, which sacrifice consisted in bread and wine in their natural substances; and thus there was not even the slightest approximation to that doctrine of Christ offered in the Mass for the quick and dead, which was condemned in the 31st Article.[1158]

Newman noted that this was a position he had taken as an Anglican.[1159] This statement should not be taken as disingenuous. In 1836 Newman had written to Pusey:

> As to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine Decree. Does not the Article on "the

[1154] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 352-3.
[1155] Ibid., 353. Here Newman quoted from *Tract 81*. He noted that in the *Tract* Pusey had written these words in capitals, he did not do so himself. See also: Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraph 58.
[1156] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 353. See also: Pusey, *Tract 81*. Introduction. Paragraph 58.
[1157] Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 353.
[1158] Ibid.
[1159] Ibid.

> Sacrifices of *Masses,*" &c. supply the doctrine or notion to be opposed? What that is, is to be learnt historically, I suppose.[1160]

This letter summarised Newman's difficulty. With respect to every other Article he discussed in *Tract 90* Newman had attempted to show they could be both literally and grammatically taken in a sense which did not exclude a Catholic interpretation. Such a methodology left aside the aims of the English Reformers who framed the Articles. However, Newman wrote that the meaning of Article XXXI was to be interpreted historically; it described practices "…which the writers of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past, and saw before their eyes… ."[1161] In this instance, therefore, it was inconsistent that Newman attempted to establish a literal or grammatical sense to the doctrine, because it was formulated by the Reformers specifically to address abuses which they saw around them.[1162]

Newman's attempt to provide a Catholic reading of Article XXXI was not successful. It suffered from a charge of sophistry based on a grammatically incorrect reading of the Article. His argument relied solely on creating a link between the sacrifice of private Masses in which Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was repeated and, through the celebration of these Masses, the remission of sins for paying penitents.[1163] He considered this to be popular practice and belief which was not the doctrine of the Roman Church. He did not accept that the common practice in the Roman Catholic Church concerning indulgences, or the common understanding of Purgatory, in any way reflected the official teaching of

---

[1160] J. H. N. to E. B. P., September, 1836. Cited in: Henry Parry Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* Four Volumes (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1894), 33.
[1161] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 2.
[1162] F. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Westminster, Md. & London, 1960), 26 *f.*, 30. Cited in: Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist.* 211. Cf. Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 2. Also see the Conclusion of *Tract 90*, §1, § 2, §3.
[1163] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 9. Paragraph 16.

the Church.[1164] Sections 6, 7 and 8 of *Tract 90* concerning indulgences, transubstantiation and sacrifice were the foundation of Newman's doctrine of the Eucharist. If one part of it fell then the whole doctrine became untenable. Newman's argument ultimately failed because he did not accept that, in the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, the link between the propitious sacrifice of the Mass and transubstantiation was indissoluble. There was nothing new in Newman's words concerning sacrifice. His few statements in the Tract regarding the nature of Eucharistic sacrifice were in keeping with what Pusey had previously written in *Tract 81*. What was new in *Tract 90* was Newman's methodology. Any charge that Section 9 contained new material cannot be sustained, one that it demonstrated Newman's height of creativity can.

[1164] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 79-80.

CHAPTER 13

TRACT 90 – SECTION β10

ARTICLE XXXII

XXXII. Of the Marriage of Priests.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

Prior to the publication of *Tract 90* Newman's thoughts on celibacy were private and not expressed frequently, nor were they generally intrinsically evident.[1165] Section 10 contained just six paragraphs revealing his thoughts, which included references to four authorities, those of St. Jerome, the Council of Trent, the *Homily on Fasting,* and Article XXXIV. Only the first two of the four citations considered clerical celibacy, the third and fourth addressed the Church's discretion to create regulations. These authorities had no equivalent use in other Tractarian literature regarding clerical celibacy. Nevertheless, the general tenor of the thoughts contained in Section 10 was there in earlier works by Newman. His thoughts on celibacy had not previously been made apparent. This might be attributed to two reasons. The first of these reasons was the Tractarian doctrine of reserve, which promoted the notions of the hiding of oneself, no overt expression of religiosity, little engagement with the world and the saying of one's prayers in private quietude.[1166] The Tractarians also perceived that it was judgment based on conscience,

[1165] Placid Murray, *Newman the Oratorian: his unpublished Oratory Papers* (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 2006), 28.
[1166] Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 138.

not reason, which was the primary way to religious knowledge through which the soul grew into apprehending God. It was by doing right, judged by good conscience, that grace was allowed to sanctify.[1167] Conversely, good actions were not necessarily open to be observed by others. In the case of reserve and celibacy, it was a moral good for the nurture of the soul and the desire for conformity to Christ. Newman made a recorded connection between reserve and celibacy as early as 1824.[1168] The second of the two reasons was that Newman had a desire to live and die a celibate, committed zealously to the missionary cause.[1169] These two factors were the setting for Newman's early thinking on celibacy. By 1840, while he was writing *Tract 90*, his opinion had developed to the point that he had "…a repugnance to a clergyman's marrying."[1170] This statement was made in the context that he was "…too disgusted with this world…,"[1171] hence indicating again the strong bond between reserve and celibacy. Each was a withdrawal from the imperfections of the world in order to attain closeness to the divine.[1172] The deepest level of access to the divine wisdom, the knowledge of things heavenly, was attained through moral decisions, the greatest of which was to love Christ above all else. To enter into a "marriage" with Christ was the greatest expression of the moral decision, one that separated the believer from the world. Such a connection paralleled that of Christ's marriage to his Church, which, for the Tractarians, was a "…higher, or virgin, state of

---

[1167] Ibid., 27.
[1168] MS, Oratory Archives, C. 5. 12. Cited in: Murray, *Newman the Oratorian: his unpublished Oratory Papers.* 28.
[1169] MS of *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. (Oratory Archives A. 36. 1.) Cited n: Murray, *Newman the Oratorian: his unpublished Oratory Papers.* 28.
[1170] John Henry Newman, *Autobiographical Writings,* Henry Tristram, editor (London & New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956), 137. In *Loss and Gain,* the Newman character Charles Reding considered clergy who did not marry were "black sheep", yet he perceived that it was a far nobler vocation if a priest was to be celibate. John Henry Cardinal Newman, *Loss and Gain: The Story of a Convert* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1906), 193.
[1171] Newman, *Autobiographical Writings*. 137.
[1172] See: Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 119.

life…," a mystery.[1173] There were only the barest of shadows concerning Newman's thinking evident in this section of *Tract 90*.

Newman began his critique by citing the Article up to and including the word "marriage."[1174] He quoted the rest of the Article in paragraph five, but bisecting the Article enabled him to place a different meaning and emphasis on it than was originally intended. Consequently, while he stated that there was "…literally no subject for controversy in these words, since even the most determined advocates of the celibacy of clergy admit their truth…," [1175] the purpose behind the Article was to permit marriage, not support clerical celibacy.[1176] Newman's core argument rested on the words that it was not "GOD'S law" which demanded either marriage or celibacy, but it rested "…on the Church's rule, or on vow."[1177] He gave some insight into his view, describing clerical celibacy as "a duty."[1178] This declaration must be viewed in the light of Newman's own understanding of celibacy, not merely as a personal choice, but a duty to which he was called; one lived in the spirit of reserve for the purpose of seeking a deeper relationship with the divine.[1179] Two authorities were cited to support the concept of 'duty' to live a celibate life. The first was that of St. Jerome (*c.*342-420) writing against Jovinian (d. *c.* 405) where the debate turned to the teaching of the Apostles concerning virginity.

> …the Apostle says, that he has not a precept concerning virgins, yet gives a counsel, as having received mercy of the Lord, and urges throughout that discourse a preference of virginity to marriage…[1180]

[1173] Isaac Williams, *On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge, Tract 80* (Rivingtons: London, 1837), PART II. §4.
[1174] This was its original form under Edward VI. See: Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. 467. Also see: Appendix XIX.
[1175] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 2.
[1176] Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. 702-4.
[1177] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 2.
[1178] Ibid.
[1179] Ker, *John Henry Newman*. 132-3.
[1180] *Adversus Jovinianum* (A. D. 392). i. 34. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 3.

These remarks were tempered by Jerome, who believed such a rule could not be imposed on some, particularly the Gentiles. Jerome considered that it would be too great a burden for man's nature and, having perceived failure, the newly formed Churches would collapse. The decision not to impose such a burden was not only for the sake of the individual but also ecclesiastical order.[1181] The states of marriage and celibacy were good for the individual and for the Church.[1182] The Council of Trent, the second authority cited, made evident the requirement for clerical celibacy.

> If any shall say that clerks in holy orders, or regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, can contract matrimony, and that the contract is valid *in spite of ecclesiastical law or vow*, let him be anathema.[1183]

This law was imposed not by God's law but "…simply upon rule of the Church or upon vow, neither of which exists in the English Church."[1184] Any priest who considered it his duty to remain celibate made the choice through personal discretion.

Newman also studied the phrase in the Article "…*is* lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry *at their own discretion*… ."[1185] He emphasised with respect to marriage or celibacy the Church of England "…leaves the discretion with the clergy; and

---

[1181] Ibid.
[1182] In a different context, Newman had previously argued against the principles held by Jovinian, Aerius (4th. cent.) and Vigilantius (*fl. c.* 400). Newman noted that each had protested against the merits of celibacy, clerical or otherwise. In this, he noted that each was a protestant, for they protested against the teaching of the Church in the 3rd and 4th centuries. Clerical celibacy was in itself not a requirement of the Church, but it was held in high regard. Newman contended that the three protestors had attempted to justify their arguments for celibacy from reason and Scripture, neither of which were sufficient. See: John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, 2 Volumes (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), I: 401-16 *passim*.
[1183] The Council of Trent. Session 24. Canon 9. (See: Appendix XIX.) Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 4.
[1184] Ibid., Section 10. Paragraph 5.
[1185] Ibid.

most persons will allow that, *under our circumstances*, she acts wisely in doing so."[1186] The core of Newman's claim was that the Church had the authority to make a law concerning clerical marriage or celibacy, but chose not to do so. To support this assertion he quoted an excerpt from the *Homily on Fasting*.

> GODS Church ought not, neither may it be so tyed to that or any other order now made, or hereafter to be made and deuised by the authoritie of man, but that it may lawfully for iust causes, alter, change, or mitigate those Ecclesiasticall decrees and orders, yea, recede wholy from them: and breake them, when they tend either to superstition, or to impietie, when they draw the people from GOD, rather then worke any edification in them. This authoritie Christ himselfe vsed, and left it to his Church.[1187]

The consistency of Newman's claim was apparent. Tractarian doctrine held that Christ empowered his Apostles to formulate laws for the good of the Church, an authority logically inherited by the bishops. A claim also supported by the *Homily*:

> …that the Church hath full power and authoritie from GOD, to change and alter the same (laws), when neede shall require, which hath beene shewed you by the example of our Sauiour Christ, by the practise of the Apostles, and of the fathers since that time.[1188]

[1186] Ibid.
[1187] An Holmilie of Good Works. And First of Fasting. *Books of Homilies*. Book 2. Homily 4. Part ii. Paragraph 2. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom04.htm: retrieved 14 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 5.
[1188] An Holmilie of Good Works. And First of Fasting. *Books of Homilies*. Book 2. Homily 4. Part ii. Paragraph 3. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom04.htm: retrieved 14 January, 2009. Cited in: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 6.

This assertion was also supported by the partly cited Article XXXIV.[1189] The Article in essence stated that the Church had the authority to make rules to meet diverse circumstances. Moreover, any person who through his or her private judgement made a decision which "…purposely doth openly *break* the traditions and ceremonies of the Church…," that person "…ought to be rebuked."[1190] There were no comments appended to the extract from Article XXXIV, but in this context it was obviously used to highlight the right of the Church to make ordinances.[1191]

Newman constructed his argument concerning celibacy around two contentions. The first of these being that the Church of England made no ordinance that clergy must either remain celibate or marry. The second was that the Church had the authority to make such regulations but chose not to do so.[1192] "That (the Church) has *power* did she choose, to take from them this discretion, and to oblige them either to marriage…or to celibacy…though, whether an enforcement either of the one or the other rule would be expedient and pious, is another matter."[1193] In themselves each was correct, but what Newman failed to accurately reflect was the intention of Article XXXII, that is, clergy were free to marry; the Church was not concerned with the individual choice of clergy to marry or otherwise.

Nothing of which appeared in *Tract 90* concerning clerical celibacy had been published in earlier Tractarian literature; hence what appeared in the Tract was new material. However, Newman's attitude towards celibacy was detectable in material published

---

[1189] See: Appendix III for the full text of *Article XXXIV*.
[1190] *Article XXXIV. Of the Traditions of the Church*. See also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 10. Paragraph 7.
[1191] This was also the reading given to *Article XXXIV* by Burnet. See: Gilbert Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. 485.
[1192] The Newman character, Charles Reding, in *Loss and Gain* stated that neither *The Book of Common Prayer* nor *Articles* argued against celibacy. Newman, *Loss and Gain*. 192.
[1193] Ibid., Section 10. Paragraph 5

previously, notably in his books of poetry. The earliest of these was *Verses on Various Occasions*. In *A Fragment from St. Gregory Nazianzen,* Newman's thoughts on the preference of celibacy over marriage were evident.

> AS, when the hand some mimic form would paint,
> It marks its purpose first in shadows faint,
> And next, its store of varied hues applies,
> Till outlines fade, and the full limbs arise;
> So in the earlier school of sacred lore
> The Virgin-life no claim of honour bore,
> While in Religion's youth the Law held sway,
> And traced in symbols dim that better way.
> But, when the Christ came by a Virgin-birth,—
> His radiant passage from high heaven to earth,—
> And, spurning father for His mortal state,
> Did Eve and all her daughters consecrate,
> Solved fleshly laws, and in the letter's place
> Gave us the Spirit and the Word of Grace,
> Then shone the glorious Celibate at length,
> Robed in the dazzling lightnings of its strength,
> Surpassing spells of earth and marriage vow,
> As soul the body, heaven this world below…[1194]

The superiority of the celibate over the married life was clear. Also evident was the exalted position of the Virgin Mary, the pattern of the "…intrinsic excellence of

[1194] John Henry Cardinal Newman, "The Married and the Single: A Fragment from St. Gregory Nazianzen", *Verses on Various Occasions* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1903), 202-3. The place and date of the verse is noted as "Oxford: 1834."

virginity."[1195] This "…high severe idea…" he had gained from Froude quite early in their relationship.[1196] One other verse of note came from the *Lyra Apostolica*, entitled 'Awe.'

> And this is tidings good,
>
> But in the Angels' reckoning, and to those
>
> Who Angel-wise have chose
>
> And kept, like Paul, a virgin course, content
>
> To go where Jesus went :
>
> But for the many laden with the spot
>
> And earthly taint of sin, 'tis written, "Touch Me not."[1197]

Within this poem there appeared the concept of separation from the world.[1198] There was a single-mindedness to commit himself to purity, not for his own sake, but for the very reason that he could commit himself completely to God.[1199] A pure life would allow the person of faith to be filled with the divine presence of God. Freed from the responsibility of marriage the prospect of this occurring was of an exponentially higher order. To follow Christ in Paul's path was to be chosen by God; those tainted by sin

---

[1195] Newman, *Apologia*. 47.
[1196] Ibid.
[1197] John Henry Newman, editor, "Awe", *Lyra Apostolica*, 11th. Edition (London & Oxford: John & Charles Mozeley; F. & J. Rivington; J. H. Parker, 1856), 13. In the later edition, published in 1879, Newman noted that the book was inspired by Froude (vii). While the earlier editions, the first of which was published in 1836, remained anonymous, the 1879 edition contained a list of contributors (viii) and key to the Greek letters which denoted the authors of each poem which were previously the only indication of different authors. The *Advertisement* to 1879 edition written by Newman also made it clear that he was the editor. Of great interest was that in the later edition, re-published and edited by Newman when he was a Catholic and hence required to take a vow of celibacy, this stanza was omitted. The poem was also printed in *Verses on Various Occasions* with the title "Reverence", it has the place and date of "Off Monte Pellegrino" June 14, 1833. The reason for the omission of this stanza from both early and late versions of the poem is not recorded by Newman.
[1198] This notion is also found in a sermon preached on 22 May, 1822. "It is in His mercy that He hides Himself from those who would be overcome by the sensible touch of the Almighty Hand." John Henry Newman, *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902), 139. Also see: Duc Dau. *Perfect chastity: celibacy and virgin marriage in Tractarian poetry*. http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-5439507/Perfect-chastity-celibacy-and-virgin.html: retrieved 12 October, 2007.
[1199] Newman, *Apologia*. 34.

would not be touched by the hand of God. In this verse sin was equated with marriage. Newman had considered himself called to the chaste life since 1816.[1200]

The paucity of material on celibacy before the appearance of *Tract 90* might possibly have been linked to the Tractarian idea of reserve which prevented Newman from writing at any length on this matter.[1201] Only a few, relatively minor observations existed. In a series of articles entitled 'The Church of our Fathers' written for the *British Magazine*, Newman noted the *Ecclesiastical Canons*[1202] acknowledged that in Primitive Christianity the: "The state of celibacy was recognized."[1203] In context this was pertinent, for the articles questioned the veracity of fundamentalist Protestantism based on the Bible alone, over and against the Church Catholic which measured itself against the practices of the Primitive Church and Scripture. Much the same argument concerning the Protestant emphasis on the Bible and its undervaluing of Tradition was found in the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*.[1204] These were quite different arguments to those which later appeared in *Tract 90*.

There was no internal or external evidence to indicate why Newman included a commentary on Article XXXII in *Tract 90*. Notably, he alluded to Article XXXII in Section 7 on the Sacraments. Referring to a Sacrament as "…*an outward sign of an invisible grace under it*…"[1205] he included celibacy in his general discussion on Sacraments.[1206] Here

---

[1200] Ibid.
[1201] See: To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 14 April, 1842. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 504-7. Newman stated to the bishop that the call to celibacy was a personal vocation, one which he would want imposed on no other member of the clergy by ecclesiastical law.
[1202] Also called the *Apostolic Canons*. The authorship of these 85 canons is unknown. They date from the late 4th century and were the final Section in a work the *Apostolic Constitutions*. From the Eastern Church the canons had by the 7th century become the basis for canon law in both the East and the West. Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 75-6.
[1203] Newman, *Historical Sketches*. I: 440.
[1204] Newman, "On the Abuse of Private Judgement", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 153.
[1205] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 7. Paragraph 4.

was a possible insight into his thoughts. Newman believed celibacy was a grace given by God, one which remained hidden under the form of the celibate priest. Conspicuously, unlike elsewhere in *Tract 90*, Newman did not turn to Burnet to seek support for his contention. It was conceivable that his reason for not doing so was that he had never considered celibacy as a discipline of the Church[1207] and Burnet's commentary on Article XXXII was anything but a personal reflection.[1208] Beginning with a review of the nature of God's ordinances with Moses through apostolic and patristic times to the eleventh century, Burnet argued that celibacy had never been prescribed because of the weakness of human nature. He acknowledged the supremacy of the celibate state, for it followed that the clergy would concern themselves only with matters spiritual.

> It is certain that every man, who dedicates himself to the service of God, ought to try if he can dedicate himself so entirely to it, as to live out of all the concerns and entanglements of life. If he can maintain his purity in it, he will be enabled thereby to labour the more effectually, and may expect both the greater success here, and a fuller reward hereafter.[1209]

Burnet believed human nature meant would allow sin to lead a priest to fall to the temptations of the flesh.[1210] He also concluded that it was not God's ordinance which demanded celibacy, but that a national Church could make regulations concerning the marriage of clergy.[1211] It was perplexing that Newman did not cite Burnet with respect to this particular argument, for this was Newman's literal contention. It was all the more surprising that Newman did not cite Burnet for the latter concluded his exposition of

---

[1206] Ibid., Paragraph 5.
[1207] Murray, *Newman the Oratorian: his unpublished Oratory Papers.* 28. This view he had held from the time of his Fellowship at Oriel when to have married would have meant giving it up. Fellowships at Oxford University were for unmarried men only.
[1208] Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 266 *f.*
[1209] Ibid., 475.
[1210] Ibid.
[1211] Ibid., 474-5.

Article XXXII by noting that: "He that marries does well, but he that marries not does better."[1212] This position Newman surely would have admired.

Inevitably little could be said about Newman's explanation of Article XXXII. The private nature of his commitment to celibacy, one that remained even after his conversion to Roman Catholicism, meant that prior to *Tract 90* Newman wrote little of his ardour for it. Much of what was written appeared in verse. Yet, shrouded as it was in poetic terminology, Newman's position on clerical celibacy was evident very early in his public life. It was of note that it first appeared in the *Lyra Apostolica*, verses written during his Mediterranean tour of 1832 with Froude, because it was the latter who led him to understand the significance of celibacy. Newman's attitude toward celibacy might best be summarised in a reference he made to Tertullian who wrote of being "married to Christ."[1213] Newman's life was directed towards seeking conformity to Christ, to be attained by removing himself from the human distractions of the world in order to seek God's will and, having done so, to love God more fully and work for the good of others.[1214]

[1212] Ibid., 476.

[1213] Tertull. de Virg. Vel. 16 and 11. Cited in: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, Second Edition (London: James Toovey, 1846), 383.

[1214] While speculative, one reason proffered for Newman's choice of celibacy was purely pragmatic. He did believe that young men, freed from the responsibilities of family, could more easily convert the great cities. See: Joyce Sugg, *Ever Yours Affly: John Henry Newman and His Female Circle* (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 1996), 40-1.

CHAPTER 14

TRACT 90 – SECTION β11

ARTICLE XXXV

XXXV. Of the Homilies.

The Second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

Newman's commentary on Article XXXV had largely appeared previously in *Tract 82* written in 1836, entitled a "Letter to a Magazine on the Subject of Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism." It was responding to an article that had appeared in the *Christian Observer*[1215] in December 1836 attacking Pusey's Tracts on baptism.[1216] Out of some ninety paragraphs in *Tract 82,* Newman chose to reproduce only four in *Tract 90*. Whereas the earlier Tract contained a comprehensive series of comments on the *Homilies*, the Articles, baptismal regeneration, justification, the Fathers of the Church and Popish doctrines, plus a spirited defence of Pusey and Keble, in addition to Newman's own publications, *Tract 90* was concerned with substantiating the Catholicity of the *Homilies*. At the very core of *Tract 82* was a response to the article in the *Christian Observer*, which challenged the Tractarians to name the authority on which their doctrines lay. The editor of the magazine asserted that the authority for the Tractarian doctrines "…rests upon, we can only say, Upon the

[1215] A magazine published from 1802 onwards by the Evangelical 'Clapham Sect'. See: Geoffrey Cantor, editor, *et al, Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 76.
[1216] Edward Bouverie Pusey, *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism. Tracts 67, 68 & 69* (London: Rivingtons, 1835). (Published on 24 August, 29 September and 18 October 1835 respectively.)

authority of the darkest ages of Popery, when men had debased Christianity from a spiritual system… ."[1217] The *Christian Observer* also posed the question:

> We ask Professor Pusey how, as a conscientious man, he retains any office in a church which requires him to subscribe to all the Thirty-nine Articles, and to acknowledge as Scriptural the doctrines set forth in the Homilies?[1218]

Answering this question Newman argued that it was not a requirement for clergy to subscribe to the *Homilies*, only to the Articles. Newman declared that he had not "…*subscribed* (to) the Homilies, nor was it ever intended that any member of the English Church should be subjected to what, if considered as an extended confession, would indeed be a yoke of bondage."[1219] "Romanism surely is innocent…," asserted Newman, "…compared with that system which should impose upon the conscience a thick octavo volume, written exactly, sentence by sentence… ."[1220] Newman could not conceive any "…grosser instance of a pharisaical tradition than this… ."[1221] He considered the Article spoke "…of the *doctrine* of the Homilies…"[1222] that was "…a certain line of doctrine, which maybe contemplated continuously in its shape and direction."[1223] The *Homilies* were to be regarded as "seasonable" documents, which the Article declared were "necessary for these times."[1224] Taking these general observations as the basis for his central argument, Newman proceeded to consider the topics of Rome as the Antichrist and the subsidiarity of the *Homilies* to the Articles.

[1217] John Henry Newman. "Letter to A Magazine on the Subject of Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism", *Tract 82* (London: Rivingtons, 1837), Paragraph 2. The *Tract* included an extract from the text of the article in the *Christian Observer*. It formed the first part of the *Tract*.
[1218] Ibid., Paragraph 6.
[1219] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 3. And: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 48.
[1220] Ibid.
[1221] Ibid.
[1222] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 4. And: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 48.
[1223] Ibid.
[1224] Ibid.

The *Christian Observer* had criticised the Tractarians for accepting benefices when they held such doctrines as baptismal regeneration, a doctrine not found in the *Homilies*. Likewise, the magazine enquired of the Tractarians how they could "…*reconcile their* consciences to such declarations as those which abound in the Homilies, affirming that the Church of Rome is 'Antichrist'… ."[1225] The *Christian Observer* also condemned the Tractarians for their Roman Catholic views and claimed "…Professor Pusey…ought to lecture at Maynooth, or the Vatican, and not in the chair of Oxford, when he puts forth this Popish doctrine (of baptismal regeneration)."[1226] Another question put forward was "…how (do) the writers (of the *Tracts*) reconcile some of the statements in them respecting the Sacraments, with some of those in the Articles and Homilies…?"[1227] Two Tracts, which addressed the topic of the Pope as Antichrist, had preceded the article in the *Christian Observer*. In *Tract 15,* Newman argued that if the Church of Rome were heretical, Anglican orders would not be valid, for they had been received from the "heretical Church." Newman deemed "…even if Rome be so considered now, at least she was not heretical in the primitive ages; no one will say that she was then Antichrist."[1228] *Catena Patrum No. I*, *Tract 74* on apostolic succession went even further. The *catena* from Edward Stillingfleet stated that some practises of the Roman Catholic Church should not be considered as unreasonable or with suspicion. Popery and antichristian practices should not be considered to have existed in the "Ancient Church," but both were recent characteristics of the Church of Rome.[1229] Both Tracts claimed the concept of the Pope as Antichrist was a relatively recent innovation dating from Trent.

[1225] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 44.
[1226] Ibid., Paragraph 4.
[1227] Ibid., Paragraph 6.
[1228] Newman, *Tract 15*. Paragraph 27.
[1229] Newman, *Catena Patrum No. I, Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. Tract 74*. §18. STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP.— unreasonableness of Separation; Preface.

Newman argued while the *Homilies* claimed Papal Rome was Antichrist[1230] this was based on a misinterpretation of a text taken from Daniel (Dan 11:38) which was a prophetic statement.[1231] He censured the *Christian Observer*:

> An iron yoke indeed you would forge for the conscience, when you oblige us to assent, not only to all matters of *doctrine* which the Homilies contain, but even to their opinion concerning the fulfilment of prophecy. Why, *we* do not ascribe authority in such matters even to the unanimous consent of all the fathers.[1232]

Statements concerning the Antichrist could not be considered doctrine "…but of opinion, as, that Rome is the Antichrist; or of historical fact, as, that there was a Pope Joan."[1233] Newman maintained he assented to the doctrines contained under the headings of the *Homilies* but not to "…certain matters, sub ordinate to the doctrines to which the headings refer… ."[1234] He rejoined the *British Critic*:

> But now, on the other hand, can *you* subscribe the doctrine of the Homilies under every one of its formal headings? I believe you *cannot*. The Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion is, in many of its elementary principles, decidedly uncongenial with your sentiments.[1235]

[1230] The reference to Papal Rome as Antichrist was found in: An Homilies Against Perill of Idolatrie, and Superfluous Decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. II. Homily 2. Paragraph 38. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 15 January, 2009. Paragraph 38. Newman had previously commented on the extract in *Tract 90*. See: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. Paragraph 39.

[1231] This was the sense of the excerpt from the *Homily* cited in Section 6 of *Tract 90*. Elsewhere in the *Homilies* the 'prophetic' nature of the statements are not as easily demonstrated. See: An Homilies Against Perill of Idolatrie, and Superfluous Decking of Churches. *Books of Homilies*. II. Homily 2. Paragraphs 18 & 35. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm: retrieved 15 January, 2009.

[1232] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 5. And: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 52.

[1233] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 7. And: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 54.

[1234] Ibid.

[1235] Ibid.

Newman considered there were statements in the *Homilies* that his detractors in the *Christian Observer* would find impossible to hold because they were at variance with those in the Article. Consequently the *Homilies* were "…subsidiary to the Articles; therefore they are of authority so far as they *bring out* the sense of the Articles, and are not of authority where they do not."[1236]

Nowhere in *Tract 82* or in *Tract 90* did Newman use Burnet as an interpreting authority in respect to Article XXXV. In the case of the former Tract, this was in all probability because the *Christian Observer* had criticised Pusey for holding that Burnet "…ought to be allowed to have great weight in controversies respecting the doctrines of our Church."[1237] However, there appears to be no reason for Newman not to have cited Burnet in Section 11. He quoted him exhaustively elsewhere in *Tract 90*. Newman offered much the same opinion as Burnet concerning the *Homilies*. Burnet wrote about giving assent to the *Homilies*.

> But by this approbation of the two books of Homilies, it is not meant that every passage of scripture, or argument that is made use of in them, is always convincing, or that every expression is so severely worded, that it may not need a little correction or explanation: all that we profess about them, is only that they contain a godly and wholesome doctrine. This rather relates to the main importance and design of them, than to every passage in them.[1238]

Newman held the view that the Articles were seasonal, to be perceived and read in the context in which they were written. Burnet too held these views.

[1236] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 6. And: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 53.
[1237] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 2.
[1238] Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 492.

> By necessary for these times, is not to be meant that this was a book fit to serve a turn; but only that this book was necessary at that time to instruct the nation aright, and so was of great use then: but though the doctrine in it, if once true, must be always true, yet it will not be always of the same necessity to the people.[1239]

Newman thought that the *Homilies* should be regarded as commentaries on the Articles. Burnet had made the same observation. When he wanted to interpret the meaning of an Article, Burnet claimed he turned to Jewel, the compiler of the Second *Book of Homilies* and looked "…on his works as a very sure commentary on our Articles, as far as they led me."[1240] The unanimity of the arguments held by Newman and Burnet extended beyond a discussion of the *Homilies*. Burnet insisted that many of the *Homilies* referred consistently to one doctrine, the idolatry of the Church of Rome. Consequently, a person who "…according to his sense (believed) they contain a false and an uncharitable charge of idolatry against a church that they think is not guilty of it…are bound…not to sign this Article, but to declare against it."[1241] In essence, this was the same argument Newman advanced in Section 6 of *Tract 90*.

An early Tractarian, Henry Cary[1242] (1804-70) wrote a work entitled *Testimonies of the Fathers of the First Four Centuries to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England as Set Forth in the Thirty-nine Articles*. This work relied heavily on Burnet and, published in 1835, it preceded *Tract 82* by one year. The fundamental argument concerning doctrine and the

---

[1239] Ibid., 492.
[1240] Ibid., Preface.
[1241] Ibid., 492.
[1242] In 1849 Bishop William Grant Broughton (1788-1853) welcomed Cary to Sydney. Cary managed to conciliate between his parishioners of St. Mark's, Alexandria (Darling Point) with Bishop Broughton. They had been impatient with the bishop's Episcopal direction. *Australian Dictionary of Biography Online Edition.* http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A030340b.htm Accessed: 26 October, 2007.

Homilies, which was found in Burnet and repeated by Newman, was also found in Cary's work.[1243] An even earlier publication from 1727 written by Thomas Bennet (1673-1728) repeated the same formula Burnet had written twenty-eight years before.[1244] Bennet affirmed: "We muft fubfcribe the Articles, 'tis true: but not the Homilies."[1245] An examination of all documents demonstrated there was no evidence to suggest that Newman relied on Cary's work, even though it was in close proximity in timeframe and content to *Tract 82*. The content of the three earlier works was further evidence that *Tract 90* contained nothing new.[1246]

The extract from *Tract 82* was essentially the preamble to the heart of Newman's contention regarding the *Homilies*. What followed were sixty-five statements taken from the *Homilies*. This was not done "…with the intention of maintaining that they are one and all binding on the conscience of those who subscribe to the Thirty-fifth Article… ."[1247] Newman considered the Evangelicals demanded subscription to the belief that Rome was the Antichrist because this statement was found in the *Homilies*. But, if subscription to this statement was demanded "…as if it were thus proved to be the doctrine of our Church, it may be as well to show that, following the same rule, we shall be also introducing Catholic doctrines, which indeed it far more belongs to a Church to profess… ."[1248] Newman had effectively countered the Evangelicals by arguing that if they demanded compliance to the notion of Rome as Antichrist, because it was found in

---

[1243] Henry Cary, *Testimonies of the Fathers of the First Four Centuries to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England as Set Forth in the Thirty-nine Articles* (Oxford: D. A Talboys, 1835), 371-2.
[1244] Thomas Bennet, *Directions for Studying, I. A General Syftem or Body of Divinty. II. The Thirty nine Articles of Religion* (London: James & John Knapton, 1727), 149*f*.
[1245] Ibid., 150.
[1246] See: Arthur Middleton, *Fathers and Anglicans: The Limits of Orthodoxy* (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 2001), *Passim*. Middleton addressed the relationship between the Fathers of the Church and Anglicanism. He specifically addressed both Cary's work on the *Thirty-nine Articles* and that of Newman in *Tract 90*. Nowhere in this academic work was there noted any use by Newman of Cary's earlier work. Cary did contribute to the *Library of the Fathers* and knew both Pusey and Newman.
[1247] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 8.
[1248] Ibid.

the *Homilies*, it was equally acceptable to argue that the Catholic doctrines found within the *Homilies* also demanded subscription.[1249]

Newman listed sixty-five citations from the *Homilies* grouped under the twelve broad headings of:

> …the authority of the fathers, of the first councils, and of the judgements of the Church generally, holiness of the Primitive Church, the inspiration of Apocrypha, the sacramental character of marriage other ordinances, the Real Presence in the Eucharist, Church's power of excommunicating kings, the profitableness of fasting, the propitiatory virtue of good works, the Eucharistic commemoration, and justification by a righteousness [within us]…[1250]

Under these general titles, the sixty-five statements reflected the core arguments in *Tract 90* and hence many fundamental Tractarian doctrines. Several of the citations could be found in earlier Tractarian literature.[1251]

Newman had been assiduous in searching the *Homilies* for supporting statements, a task in which he was for the most part successful. An examination of the quotes in context demonstrated that Newman in some instances had used the citation in a manner that did not reflect its context.[1252] Despite this anomaly, Newman's stated intention to prove that the *Homilies* were tolerant of Catholic doctrines was generally successful.[1253] The *Homilies* were employed as "proof texts" but, in a greater sense, they provided a fuller

---

[1249] Ibid.
[1250] Ibid., Concluding paragraph.
[1251] Justification through good works, for example, was comprehensively addressed in the sixty-five statements. Many statements from the *Homilies* could be found in Newman's earlier work, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. See: Appendix XX. Also refer to: Section 3 of *Tract 90* & Chapter 6 of this thesis.
[1252] See: Appendix XX.
[1253] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 11. Paragraph 8. Also see: Newman, *Apologia*. 95.

understanding of the Church's teaching beyond what existed in Scripture. Newman considered that "…as the Homilies show…Scripture has been overruled to contain the whole Christian faith…that the early Church so taught… ."[1254] Newman considered the *Homilies* to be more than interpreters of the *Articles*. He placed the *Homilies* on an altogether higher plane, that of providing access to the entire Christian faith, either directly or vicariously, providing pathways to other documents. In much the same manner, Section 11 acted as the catalyst for an insight into almost the entirety of Tractarian teaching.

[1254] Members of the University of Oxford, "Lectures on the Scripture Proof of the Doctrines of the Church. Tract 85", *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Volumes (London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1840), 35. See also: Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*. 126.

CHAPTER 15

TRACT 90 – SECTION β12

ARTICLE XXXVII

XXXVII. The Bishop of Rome.

The King's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction. Where we attribute to the King's Majesty the chief government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England. The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offenses.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

The penultimate section of *Tract 90* was, in most part, a reprint of an article that appeared in the *British Critic* in January 1840 titled 'Catholicity of the Anglican Church.'[1255] The article should be considered both as a precursor and as complementary to *Tract 90*. Newman envisaged the Tract and the article as a response to a piece by Nicholas Wiseman in the August 1839 edition of the *Dublin Review*.[1256] Wiseman had written "…on the Donatists with an application to Anglicanism."[1257] What particularly concerned Newman was a phrase Wiseman had taken from St. Augustine, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarium.*"[1258] Against Newman's usual measure of orthodoxy, he perceived there was "…a simpler rule than that of Antiquity… ."[1259] The authority and orthodoxy of the Church lay not in Antiquity, but "…the deliberate judgment, in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces, is an infallible prescription and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede."[1260] The Roman Catholic Church had not declared Donatism or Monophysitism heresies based on the authority of Antiquity, but "…on a much simpler rule…"[1261] of the Church assembled in council declaring each to be heretical. This created immense difficulties for Newman's *Via Media*, for now he necessarily came to the conclusion that the Anglican system could no longer be located in Antiquity, for, if it could be, it would be in the same relationship to the whole Church as the Monophysites.[1262] This challenge to the *Via Media* caused Newman substantial

---

[1255] Only paragraph 3 contained any material that had no direst equivalent in the *British Critic* article. In this paragraph Newman defined the difference between Providence, miracle and revelation. He claimed that the papacy was a human institution which could therefore have its authority removed by human beings. The paragraph is based on *Tract 20*. See: John Henry Newman, *The Visible Church. Letters to a Friend III. Tract 20* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraphs 2 & 7. Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 3.
[1256] Newman, *Apologia*. 120, 131-2.
[1257] Ibid., 120. See: Nicholas Wiseman, "The Anglican Claim of Apostolic Succession", *The Dublin Review*, Vol. vii. (August 1839): 157, 158.
[1258] 'The whole world judges securely.'
[1259] Newman, *Apologia*. 120.
[1260] Ibid., 121.
[1261] Ibid., 120.
[1262] Ibid., 123.

distress, but by 21 February 1840 this had disappeared.[1263] Nevertheless, the article in the *Dublin Review* did have a marked effect on others who were not so committed to Anglicanism.[1264]

So, in answer to Wiseman's challenge, Newman wrote the article in the *British Critic*, but he also set himself the more difficult task of reinterpreting the Thirty-nine Articles through which "…the old Church must live and speak… ."[1265] Newman perceived that Wiseman's article had unsettled those around him who were leaning towards Rome. He considered that his duty was "…to keep men straight…" by speaking out.[1266] In March 1840 Newman retired to Littlemore to write *Tract 90*, the purpose of which was to demonstrate: "Our Church teaches the Primitive Ancient Faith."[1267] The fact that he had returned to Antiquity as the mark of the True Church so soon after Wiseman's challenge gave credibility to Newman's own statements that he had soon put aside his own doubts.[1268] In the year between his initial doubts and the publication of *Tract 90* Newman wrote the article for the *British Critic* in which he attempted a defence of Anglicanism accepting that it contained "…not the note of Catholicity…" yet it did possess other "notes" of the Church.[1269] Newman turned to a standard Tractarian doctrine to confirm that Anglicanism did have a "note of the Church," that of apostolic succession.[1270] This was the nucleus of Newman's contention, for while the Pope did not have any jurisdiction within England this did not preclude the apostolicity of the English Church. The bond once established could not be broken, for while the Church of England and

---

[1263] Ibid., 132.
[1264] Ibid., 131-2.
[1265] Ibid., 132
[1266] Ibid., 131-3.
[1267] Ibid., 133.
[1268] Ibid., 121, 132, 134.
[1269] Ibid., 132. Also see: Appendix XV which lists the 'notes' which define a Church. These are taken from the article in the *British Critic* of January, 1840. This is discussed in Chapter 7 of this thesis.
[1270] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. In: Newman, *Essays Historical and Critical*. II: 19. Also: Newman. *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.

the Church of Rome were in schism, the apostolic order begun with the Apostles, and passed on by the Roman Catholic Church, was now established in her branches.[1271] With apostolicity as a core 'note' the Church of England could be nothing else but the Church Catholic.[1272]

Sections 4 and 12 of the Tract together considered the essential 'notes' or marks of the Catholic Church. Section 12 of *Tract 90* should be read in conjunction with Section 4 which considered Article XIX on the Visible Church. While Section 4 contained no reference to episcopacy as a 'note' of the Church, Section 12 addressed the question of how the Church of England could be a Catholic Church without one of Catholicity's essential 'notes,' the papacy.[1273] To defend the Catholicity of Anglicanism Newman had to maintain the papacy as a 'note,' or mark, of the Church. If he had not done so, it would have meant the denial of Rome as a Church and "…the foundation of the faith."[1274] Yet, Newman considered it necessary to remove the notion that the Church was a "…communion of all Christians everywhere viewed as one body under the supremacy of the Pope."[1275] Rather, each bishop was a pope in his own diocese which was "…a perfect independent Church, sufficient for itself…" in communion with other dioceses joined by what they had "…in common, in their possession of the Succession, their Episcopal form, their Apostolic faith, and the use of the Sacraments."[1276] The difficulty with the Anglican system of Catholicity was that it relied on apostolicity as its 'note.' In effect, with a diffuse system of episcopal power, there was no universal

---

[1271] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 3.
[1272] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 24. Also see: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.
[1273] Newman, *Apologia*. 125. See also: Wiseman, *Dublin Review*. 163. Wiseman argued that the schismatics of the fifth century were those not in communion with the Roman see.
[1274] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 16.
[1275] Ibid., 29. Cf. Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 499-500.
[1276] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 20. Also see: Newman. *Tract 15*. Paragraph 15.

teaching authority or even universal understanding of the Sacraments.[1277] On the other hand the Roman Catholic Church had as its 'note' a universal, living teaching authority. Newman granted to the Roman Catholic Church "…their assumption that they have the power…in matters of faith, of developing the faith."[1278] Although each relied on a different 'note' or mark for evidence of their Catholicity, Newman considered that the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches were one, and both were stigmatised by the name of Antichrist.[1279] Both Churches were equally deficient, for while the Church of England was in schism "…from the rest of Christendom…the faith of Rome is an addition to the primitive."[1280]

Having argued that the Churches were branches of the One True Church, a final difficulty remained. While the external form of each Church was essentially the same, Newman noted that: "It is not the *acts* that make the difference, it is the *authority* for those acts."[1281] Fundamentally this was the greatest difficulty, for Article XXXVII clearly bestowed authority over the Church of England to the State, most particularly the Crown. From the beginning of the Movement in 1833, in the minds of the Tractarians this was an anathema whereby the State exercised power over the Church. To the Tract

---

[1277] The Sacramental system was based not on earthly communion, one bishop with another, but in that all bishops were in communion through the one Bishop in heaven, Christ. All on earth was a shadow or organ of what was in heaven. In this same sense the Sacraments were universal because of the one Priest in heaven. Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 22-3 and *passim*.

[1278] Ibid., 11-12. This is a very different position to that which Newman took in 1833 when he declared that in respect of spiritual matters: "The Church goes by *fixed laws*; and this usurpation has all along been counter to one of her acknowledged standing ordinances, founded on reasons of universal application." Newman. *Tract 15*. Paragraph 20.
With respect to the different 'notes' of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches see also an interchange between protagonists from the two Churches in: Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 5-6. Also see: To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII. 78-9.

[1279] Newman, *Apologia*. 125. In notes written for an article in the *British Critic* of October, 1840, Newman observed that the Puritans and Independents had declared that the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches were equally Antichrist and Antichristian. See also: John Henry Newman, "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist", *British Critic* (October, 1840). In: Newman, *Essays Historical and Critical*. II: 115.

[1280] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 11.

[1281] Newman, "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist", *British Critic*. In: Ibid. 171. See Also: Newman. *Apologia*. 125-6.

writers the Church was an autonomous sacred institution (albeit an Established Church) which acquired its spiritual authority *via* the apostolic succession. While the Pope had his authority removed by the English Reformation, the Church of England "…did not revolt from those who in that day had authority by succession from the Apostles."[1282] Newman considered that the bishops and clergy "…remained the same as before the separation and it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church…from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation… ."[1283] No new Church was founded in England "…but the rights and the true doctrines of the Ancient existing Church were asserted and established."[1284] Thus, while the civil authorities aided the establishment of the Church of England by removing it from the yoke of papal power and the excrescences of contemporary Popish popular piety, the difficulty remained as to which authority exercised power within Anglicanism. The events of 1833 were condemned by the early *Tracts for the Times*,[1285] but by 1840 the same questions reappeared, that of authority in the Church of England and from whence that authority derived. These questions were not posed in the face of a new threat of state interference, but the threat from an emancipated Roman Catholic Church which could equally claim apostolic succession[1286] and more so because it was without the incumbrance of Establishment. An added complexity was that while Newman and the Tractarians rejected papal power, which claimed for itself supremacy and infallibility, they did not reject the papacy as an office which had primacy among equals.[1287] Moreover, the greatest difficulty was that Article

[1282] Newman, *Tract 15*. Paragraph 11.
[1283] Ibid.
[1284] Ibid.
[1285] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraphs 3, 5, 10, 13 & *passim*. And: John Keble, *Tract 4* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraph 7.
[1286] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 20. Also see: Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*. 3.
[1287] Ibid., 24-5.

XXXVII claimed civil authority over the Church, an authority which could not claim for itself apostolic succession whereas the Pope most emphatically could.[1288]

The jurisdiction of the papacy over the Church was of crucial importance in Newman's argument. He contended that miracles and Providence which came from God may also be taken away "…by the agents and causes by which they are done."[1289] There was a difference between miracles and Providence, albeit each was God acting but differently. When a miracle was annulled Providence could suffice, yet when this was withdrawn nothing remained.[1290] Newman gave as his example the election of Israel. He argued that the Babylonian captivity was not a sign of God's annulment of the miracle of election, but rather an event in Providence.[1291] Hence, Newman asserted that while both miracles and Providence were of God, the latter was the terrestrial external expression of the former.[1292] There was one further significant difference; the gift of God's Providence could appear to remain present even though God had withdrawn the gift.[1293] The example he gave was that of the Roman Empire, which continued after Providence had been withdrawn, but did not last long at the hands of the barbarians.[1294] Likewise, the papacy had some claim on an earthly jurisdiction, but only when that was "ordained of GOD." However, it was an institution begun "…in the exertions and passions of man;

[1288] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 4. Newman, "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist", *British Critic*. 173 & *passim*.
[1289] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 4.
[1290] Ibid.
[1291] Ibid.
[1292] Providence occurs through the ordinances, laws and polities which already exist in the world. However, what can be observed with the senses veils the unseen one who gifts Providence. See: Newman, "Sermon 17. A Particular Providence as Revealed in the Gospel", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. III: 17, 119. See also: John Henry Newman, "Milman's View of Christianity", *British Critic* (January, 1841). In: Newman. *Essays Historical and Critical*. II: 190, 192.
[1293] In *Tract 20* Newman contended that both the English and Roman Churches contained the same elements of truth, but through its own excesses Providence had been withdrawn from the latter although it remained in its fullness with the former. John Henry Newman, *Tract 20* (London: Rivingtons, 1833), Paragraphs 2 & 7.
[1294] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 4.

and what man can make, man can destroy."[1295] Papal authority was destroyed at the English Reformation which "…could destroy a Dominion which the Popes founded…" but "…could not destroy a Ministry, which the Apostles began… ."[1296] Human beings could tear down the papacy, but apostolic succession was altogether different for: "The Gospel Ministry began in CHRIST and His Apostles; and what they began, they only can end."[1297] The English Reformation had ended papal supremacy, but the True Church remained extant through the apostolic succession, a divine institution commissioned by Christ.[1298] The apostolic succession was guaranteed by divine providence[1299] and those who were ordained by the successors to the Apostles were the "…appointed channel by which the peculiar Gospel blessings are conveyed to mankind… ."[1300] God's providence had not been withdrawn because of the English Church's fracture with Rome, it was ensured through the existence of the successors of the Apostles, the bishops.[1301]

Essentially both Section 12 and the January 1840 article in the *British Critic* contended that apostolic succession ensured that the English Church was not cut off from the "…fountains of grace…"[1302] because it was a "colony" of the universal Church which derived from the "common parent," the Church of Jerusalem.[1303] The Anglican Church "…was essentially complete without Rome and naturally independent of it… ."[1304] Additionally, in the Anglican system, each diocese, each episcopal province was independent of the other, and:

[1295] Ibid.
[1296] Ibid.
[1297] Ibid. Also see: Newman, *Tract 15*. Paragraph 11. In *Tract 15* Newman argued that miracles had ceased to exist, but the sign of the Church lay in right ordination and apostolic succession.
[1298] Newman, *Tract 15*. Paragraph 5 & *passim*.
[1299] John Henry Newman, *Tract 7* (London: Rivingtons, 1833) Paragraph 3.
[1300] Newman, "Sermon 25. The Christian Ministry", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. II: 305.
[1301] Ibid., 306. Also see: Newman, *Tract 15*. Paragraphs 5, 9 & 11.
[1302] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 24. Also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.
[1303] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 18.
[1304] Ibid., 24. Also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.

> …the communion of Christians one with another, and the unity of them altogether, lie, not in a mutual understanding, intercourse, and combination, not in what they do in common, but in what they are and have in common, in their possession of the Succession, their Episcopal form, their Apostolical faith, and the use of the Sacraments.[1305]

Such a view made unnecessary any requirement for any central unifying figure or symbol of unity. However, while this argument sufficed for the *British Critic* article concerning the continuity of apostolic succession in the Anglican Church, it did not address the difficulty posed in Article XXXVII, that of State supremacy over the Church. In the *British Critic*, Newman described the wide powers of the king over which the "…whole jurisdiction (of the Church) is his; his are all the spiritual courts; his the right of excommunication; his the control of revenues; his the organization of dioceses; his the appointment of bishops."[1306] This statement was noteworthy for two reasons. Firstly, Newman noted that this allowed the Church authority only with respect to "…spiritual power (and) to the sacramental or quasi-sacramental privileges."[1307] It was not included in Section 12, the purpose of which was to argue that the Church was a sacred institution, separate from the State, an institution founded by Christ.[1308] This was the doctrine repeated persistently from the outset of the Oxford Movement, the famous Assize Sermon and the electric words of *Tract 1*.[1309] However, the *British Critic* article served to

---

[1305] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 20. Also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.
[1306] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 20. In this description of the King's authority over the Church Newman nowhere indicated that he either accepted or agreed with the sovereign's jurisdiction over the sacred. His described the reality of the Church of England.
[1307] Ibid., 18.
[1308] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 1. Paragraph 11 & Section 12. Paragraphs 5 & 6. Also see: Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 18, 25 & *passim*. Also see: Newman, *Catena Patrum No. 1.Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. Tract 74*. Paragraph 3.
[1309] See also: Arthur Philip Perceval, *The King and The Church Vindicated and Delivered; or, The Prime Minister Convicted of Counselling to the Crown, a Violation of the Coronation Oath: In an*

highlight a great difficulty for the Tractarians. At one time they argued the Church was founded by Christ and was authenticated through the apostolic succession, yet they also sought to maintain the privileges, protections and rights afforded to the established Church.[1310] The king could be afforded supremacy over the Church if the argument emphasised the apostolic succession which ensured legitimacy, but not necessarily authority. However, in the context of Article XXXVII Newman could ill afford to include this particular statement from the *British Critic* in the quote cited in *Tract 90*. The purpose of Section 12 was not to argue for the authenticity of the orders of English bishops but to assert their authority.[1311] This was in essence the key difference between the purpose of the article which Newman wrote in the *British Critic*[1312] and his reflections in *Tract 90* using excerpts from that article. The second point of note regarding Section 12 concerned the reason Newman perceived that it was so important to employ the *British Critic* article in this context. Article XXXVII defied any notion of Catholicity in that the maxim "the whole world judges securely" could not apply in the case of the Anglican Church. There was no central teaching authority. The Tractarians noted time and again that each bishop in his own diocese was quite unconnected to any other except through communion with the 'unseen' bishop who united all: Christ.

Address to the House of Lords, and in a Plain, Solemn and Faithful Appeal to His Grace, The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, (London: Hatchard and Son, 1833), 16 & *passim*. In this document by Arthur Perceval (1799-1853), it is clear that the Tractarians did not believe that the Crown was at fault but that the King had been ill advised by the government of the day. The Tractarians saw the role of the King was to protect the ancient rights of the Church in matters temporal.

[1310] The difficulties of balancing the obligation of the State to protect the rights and privileges of the Church over and against the State's perception that it could interfere in Church matters were described in: Richard Hurrell Froude, *Tract 59* (London: Rivingtons, 1835),Paragraphs 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & *passim*.

[1311] Paul Avis argues that the Oxford Movement essentially reflected the reality of the early 19th. century. 'The Erastian paradigm' of State supremacy over the Church had been replaced by 'the apostolic paradigm.' In this model the Bishops replaced the Crown as the sacred symbol of the Anglican Church. Paul D. L. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (London: Continuum, 2002), xv-xvi.

[1312] Newman set the tenor of the article by noting the excellence of a recently published work by Arthur Philip Perceval which had as its singular purpose to establish the unbroken continuity of the apostolic succession within the Church of England. Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 1. See Also: Arthur Philip Perceval, *An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession: With an Appendix on the English* Orders, Second Edition (London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1841), and iv*f.* & *passim.* (N.B. The first edition, to which Newman referred, was published in 1839.)

> As there is one Bishop invisible in heaven, so there is but one bishop on earth; and the multitude of bishops are not acknowledged in the Gospel system *as* many, or as if (viewed *as* representatives of the Bishop invisible) they were *capable* of mutual relations one with another, but as being one and all shadows and organs of one and the same divine reality.[1313]

Such a view maintained a valid apostolic succession, but there remained the difficulty that such a fractured Church could hardly speak as one. Nor could it claim any temporal unity in the same manner of the Roman Catholic Church. Newman addressed these difficulties by citing epistles from St. Cyprian. In one he wrote the Bishop of Rome took "…the place of Peter, and (held) the rank of the sacerdotal see… ."[1314] In another epistle Cyprian wrote regarding a see in North Africa: "…God is one, and Christ is one, and the Church one, and the see one, founded by the Lord's voice upon Peter."[1315] Newman interpreted Cyprian as saying St. Peter's authority existed not in Rome only, but extended to all bishops.

> …(Cyprian) considers St. Peter's authority not as bound up in the see of Rome only, but as extending to all bishops. He does not speak of him merely as the local Bishop of Rome, but as the type of all bishops, and as if ruling in every see all over Christendom. And every Bishop is St. Peter's successor: and to separate

---

[1313] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 23.
[1314] St. Cyprian. *Epistle 40*. Cited in: Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 31. This extract is taken from a point in the epistle which refers to the Chair of Peter being vacant. Newman misquoted the number of the epistle. See: St Cyprian, "To Antonianus about Cornelius and Novatian", *Epistle 52*. §8. http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/050651.htm: retrieved 19 November, 2007.
[1315] St. Cyprian. Writing in condemnation of Felicissimus, the African schismatic. Cited in: Newman "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 31. In context Newman's use of the excerpt is correct. See: St. Cyprian, "To the People, Concerning Five Schismatic Presbyters of the Faction of Felicissimus", *Epistle 39*. §5. http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/050639.htm: retrieved 19 November, 2007.

> from St. Peter does not mean separation from Rome, but from the local see wherever a man finds himself…[1316]

This was the Anglican system:

> …each Church is naturally independent of every other; each bishop an autocratic channel of grace, and ultimate centre of unity; and that unions of see with see are only matters of ecclesiastical arrangement; further, that no jurisdiction but the episcopal is of divine right…[1317]

This was an elaborate clarification and yet it still left unexplained what the Church of England was. How did such an institution possess a unity, when it existed with each diocese independent of the other? Newman could not get away from the reality that in respect of the dioceses it was only "…the civil power (which) unites any of them together… ."[1318]

Newman's appeal to Antiquity to argue for the legitimate apostolic succession of Anglican bishops was in the most part successful. However, his contentions concerning the Catholicity of the English Church were less convincing. Despite his public statements that the Pope had no supremacy in the Roman Catholic Church, that the essence of the Church was its Catholicity and not the papacy, and that the Pope was only a symbol of unity not a figure of authority, Newman's private thoughts were quite different. This internal questioning was largely evident within the *British Critic* article. In 1839, Newman had become seriously alarmed after his study of the Monophysites, for in his

---

[1316] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 31.
[1317] Ibid., 32. Also see: Newman, *Tract 15*. *passim*. Also see: Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 500*f*.
[1318] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 18. Also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.

"stronghold" of Antiquity, the middle of the fifth century, he saw "…Christendom of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries reflected."[1319] In 1850, writing as a Roman Catholic and reflecting on the events of 1839, Newman considered that it was "…difficult to make out how the Eutychians or Monophysites were heretics, unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also… ."[1320] The schismatics had been declared heretics by the Church, in addition Antiquity, Newman believed, the dictum "*Securus judicat orbis terrarium*" had proven truthful because orthodoxy had been preserved. Two institutions had secured Christian doctrine: the Council of Chalcedon and the papacy. In this, he also perceived parallels, he considered "…it was difficult to find arguments against the Tridentine Fathers which did not tell against the Fathers of Chalcedon, (and) difficult to condemn the Popes of the sixteenth century without condemning the Popes of the fifth."[1321] It was the Church teaching as one, which had secured orthodoxy; the papacy as the unifying office of communion had ensured the universal authority of doctrine. This was a dynamic teaching authority, which existed only in the Roman Catholic Church. Despite Newman's arguments for its apostolicity and conformity with Antiquity, no argument could be found to support a view that the Church of England had a singular teaching authority. It was a Church in schism, cut off from the rest.[1322] In reply, Newman argued that the Church was a:

> …confederacy of sees and churches—the metropolitan, patriarchal, and papal systems—mere matter of expedience, or of natural duty from long custom, or of propriety from gratitude and reverence, or of necessity from voluntary oaths and engagements, or of ecclesiastical force from the canons of Councils, but not

[1319] Newman, *Apologia*. 119.
[1320] Ibid.
[1321] Ibid.
[1322] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 3, 9, 19 & *passim*.

> necessary in order to the conveyance of grace, or for fulfilment of the ceremonial law, as it may be called, of Unity.[1323]

With respect to the assertion the Pope was a figure of unity, Newman argued that the Church was a human institution created under divine Providence and under Providence the Church "…(is) under the King now, and we obey him; we were under the Pope formerly, and we obeyed him."[1324] This was a specious argument, for the king of England was not a symbol of unity of the universal Church, but provided the civil authority under which the Anglican Church functioned. Both the Pope and the king had supremacy given to them by the Providence of God, but neither their status nor roles were equivalent.[1325]

Newman's argument was compromised largely by the reality that in *Tract 90* he was citing an earlier document which had little or nothing to do with the authority of either the king or Pope over the Church of England. This was a matter addressed in *Tract 15*, which presumably was not cited because he had moved on from his opinions of 1833.[1326] The fact Newman had cited the January 1840 article from the *British Critic* at length demonstrated that *Tract 90* contained no new material. The manner in which he employed the extracts from the *British Critic* remained a matter for discussion. The *British Critic* article was cited to answer a problem which could not easily be resolved by Tractarian ecclesiology. How could a Church in schism from the universal Church claim to be the True Church? The papacy, even if disregarded as an institution of supremacy and infallibility was, nevertheless, an office which united the Roman Catholic Church and was a symbol of that unity. Newman's attempts to interpret St. Cyprian as believing that

---

[1323] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 24. Also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 5.
[1324] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 25. Also: Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 12. Paragraph 6.
[1325] Cf. Newman. *Apologia*. 119.
[1326] Ibid., 70*f*.

the Chair of Peter was not a uniting power within the Church were disingenuous. In the Church of the fourth century, the status of the Bishop of Rome had slight relationship to the power of the papacy which existed in the nineteenth century. Newman's contention that the Church in the fourth century existed as a grouping of individual sees, with little or no interconnection, was an argument difficult to maintain.[1327] Indeed, the Church survived the early heresies principally because it spoke as one and consequently judged securely (*Securus judicat orbis terrarium*).[1328]

Anglicanism did not have this 'note' or mark of the Church and, despite Newman's attempts to supplant Catholicity with Antiquity, his efforts failed because they did not take into account the dynamic character of the Roman Catholic Church.[1329] It was this dynamism alone that led the Church to summon councils or to papal intervention which addressed the concerns of the Church in every age, especially to prevent heresy. Newman's "…historical and emotional attachment to a Laudian monarchical and hierarchical ideal…"[1330] of ecclesiology meant that despite the "…disillusionment he felt with the Crown for failing to protect the Church from Whig encroachments…" he continued with the principle of "Throne and Altar."[1331] Here was yet another dilemma and paradox in which Newman found himself. His loyalty to the Crown placed him in the position where he had to repudiate the papacy, yet in doing so he placed the Anglican Church outside the sphere of Catholicity. Inevitably his arguments failed. He accepted the Primitive notion of the Bishop of Rome, yet was blind to the role of that See as a symbol of orthodoxy. Newman rejected the notion of the Pope as Antichrist because the

---

[1327] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 29-30.
[1328] Newman, *Apologia*. 120
[1329] Ibid., 119.
[1330] Paul Asveld, "Newman and Wiseman in the days of the Oxford Movement", *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, Paul Vaiss, editor (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 1996), 105.
[1331] Ibid.

notion of the Antichrist was prophetical. Furthermore, to reject Rome as Antichrist was to reject the Church of England as Antichrist, for it was from the former that the latter gained legitimate orders. In addition, to accept the model of the fourth century Church in its entirety would inevitably mean the destruction of any branch notion of the Church.[1332] Newman had to write this section of *Tract 90* as self-reassurance of his Tractarian ecclesiology. In doing so, he wrote nothing new, but demonstrated the growing difficulties with Tractarian thought.

[1332] Nigel Yates, *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830-1910* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 65.

CHAPTER 16

TRACT 90 – SECTION β13

THE CONCLUDING SECTION

In conclusion, Newman noted that an objection could be raised "…that the tenor of the above explanations is anti-Protestant…,"[1333] which went against the conventional view "…that the Articles were drawn up by Protestants, and intended for the establishment of Protestantism… ."[1334] He observed that such an objection would also contend that a Catholic interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles would be "…an evasion of their meaning to give them any other than a Protestant drift, possible as it may be to do so grammatically, or in each separate part."[1335] Newman provided no less than seven responses to this objection, which taken together he described as a "simple" answer. Despite being titled 'Conclusion,' the final section was not a summary of what had been written. Rather, Newman gave a short history of the ways in which the Articles had been interpreted. Moreover, he observed the rights of their interpreters to do so. While there was ample evidence to demonstrate that most of the material in *Tract 90* was not new, in that each topic had been discussed before by Newman, to provide a methodology for their 'Catholic' interpretation was, in essence, something innovative. In addition, to support that methodology by reference to several historical instances of the (re)interpretation of the Articles was also new. Despite the novel methodology, each of the seven arguments had previously appeared in Tractarian literature. In this sense, it was old material employed as part of a new methodology.

[1333] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 1.
[1334] Ibid.
[1335] Ibid.

In answer to the charge that the Articles were drawn up by Protestants for the establishment of a Protestant Church,[1336] Newman's first argument was that even if the framers of the Articles were Protestants, such a view denied the reality that Convocation had modified the Articles several times.[1337] The Articles were not "…from their original framers, but from several successive convocations after their time; in the last instance, from that of 1662… ." Therefore, noted Newman, "…we have no duties toward their framers."[1338] For this reason, "…it is a duty which we owe both to the Catholic Church and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit… ."[1339] This argument was not new; Newman had used it earlier in *Tract 82* where he asserted:

> We at this day receive the Articles, not on the authority of their framers, whoever they were, English or foreign, but on the authority, i.e. in the sense, of the Convocation imposing them, that is, the Convocation of 1571.[1340]

Newman also noted that the Convocation passed the Canon about Preachers, which "…is rendered special by its originating in the Convocation from which we receive the Articles."[1341] The canon stated:

> *Imprimis Vero vide bunt, new quid nunquam docent pro coniine, quod a populi religiosae teneri et credit valent, nisi quod consentaneous sit doctrines Veneris auto Novi Testamenti, quod que ex ilia ipsa doctrinal catholic partes, et voters episcope colligating.*[1342]

[1336] Ibid.
[1337] Ibid., Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §1.
[1338] Ibid.
[1339] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2.
[1340] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 53.
[1341] Ibid., 192.
[1342] In the first place, let them be careful never to teach anything in their sermons, as if to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected from that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops. Canon 25. *Liber quorundam Canonum discipline ecclesise Anglicanse. anno Dom. 1571. anno Eliz. 13*. In: Edward Cardwell, *A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons and Proceedings of Convocation sin the*

Newman concluded that it was "…quite impossible that the Convocation wished us to receive and explain the doctrines contained in them in any other sense than that which "the catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops" drew from Scripture."[1343] For this reason he wrote that "Far from explaining away, I am faithfully maintaining them, when I catholicize them."[1344] There was less of a case, he argued "…for Calvinizing or Zuinglizing them."[1345] Ironically, Newman also cited this canon to argue that, as distinct from the Roman Catholic Church which claimed for itself the right to "…decree points of faith *beyond* Scripture…"[1346] the Church of England had ruled "…herself by Scripture and antiquity…" hence "…she may securely and implicitly be trusted in all matters of necessary doctrine… ."[1347] In this sense, Newman argued "…the Church of Rome is not the Church Catholic, but a particular Church; because she has avowed and used a different rule."[1348]

In a series of pieces by Newman in the *British Magazine*, published in 1834 and 1835, he presented an historical overview of the relationship between Convocation and the Crown, particularly noting the right of Convocation (albeit regularly usurped by the Crown) to draw up and modify the Articles of Religion.[1349] Newman contended that while Henry VIII had imposed the Articles of Religion on the Church, they were "…in

---

Province of Canterbury, from the Year 1547 to the Year 1717, 2 Volumes. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842), I: 126-7. The Canons of the Convocation were written in Latin.

[1343] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 61.

[1344] Ibid.

[1345] Ibid.

[1346] John Henry Newman, "Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. By Nicholas Wiseman, D.D. London: Booker. 1836", *British Critic*, Vol. 19 (Oct. 1836): 378.

[1347] Ibid., 379.

[1348] Ibid.

[1349] John Henry Newman, "Relation of Convocation to the Crown", *British Magazine* (1834-5.) In: John Henry Newman, "The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury", *Historical Sketches*, 3 Volumes (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909), III: *passim.* Also see: John Henry Newman, "Its Constitution and Rights", *British Magazine* (1834-5.) In: John Henry Newman. 'The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.' *Historical Sketches.* 349-50. Also see: Newman, "Lecture 14. On the Fortunes of the Church", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, The Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 335.

the reign of Elizabeth, regularly passed in Convocation."[1350] The six Articles which had been imposed by Henry were redefined, reinforced and re-imposed through an authoritative synod of the Church, not by Elizabeth. Subsequently the same model of Church government emerged, when in later Convocations one of the many responsibilities they held included "…framing articles of faith… ."[1351] The royal supremacy, the Crown as head of the Church, was seen as secondary to the authority of the Church which possessed "…apostolical rights and powers…"[1352] committed to it by "…by Christ and His Apostles… ."[1353] In all the literature which preceded *Tract 90*, Newman argued consistently that the framers of the Articles, who may have had a Protestant 'drift,' largely had their intentions usurped by later Convocations and that these synods set down interpretations of the Articles which were by nature Catholic. The Church had the right to set down the sense of the Articles because she had the apostolic authority given to her by Christ. Moreover, the Articles contained teaching which was truly Catholic because they were set against the measure of Scripture and antiquity and found to be adequate.

In Tractarian thought there was one measure of Catholicity which was unassailable, *The Book of Common Prayer*, for if many argued that the Articles "…were inconsistent with the Catholic faith…"[1354] the "…Prayer Book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin… ."[1355] If the Articles were to have a Catholic interpretation applied to them, consistency demanded they be in "…harmony with the Book of Common Prayers…"[1356] if for no other reason than it was "…an object of the most serious moment in those who

[1350] John Henry Newman, "Relation of Convocation to the Crown", *British Magazine*. 411.
[1351] Ibid., 412 & 420.
[1352] Ibid., 417.
[1353] Ibid., 419.
[1354] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 1.
[1355] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 3. See also: John Henry Newman, *Via Media No. 1. Tract 38* (London: Rivingtons, 1834), Paragraph 68 & *passim*.
[1356] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §2.

have given their assent to both formularies."[1357] In essence, this, the second of Newman's seven arguments, was a summary of the entire intent of *Tract 90* and was perceived by some as its major difficulty, that of attempting to put a Catholic reading on the Articles which, at best, was one-sided.[1358] Any claim, however, that the argument was new could be dismissed. In the two *Via Media*, *Tract 38* and *Tract 42* respectively, in the conversation between two figures, *Clericus* and *Laicus*, Newman's view of this exact prescription of the relationship between *The Book of Common Prayer* and the Articles was described. Any notion that the Articles were "Calvinistic" and the Liturgy was "Popish" was dismissed as "calumny."[1359] The relationship between *The Book of Common Prayer* and the Articles was described as one of complementarity, for while the Liturgy came down from the Apostles and "…is the depository of their complete teaching…,"[1360] the Articles "…are mainly protests against certain definite errors… ."[1361] In *Via Media II*, *Laicus* also commented that every member of the Church of England accepted as true the apostolic commission, yet no such doctrine could be found in the Articles. This doctrine of the "Church Catholic," however, was implied in the Articles, and where these were found wanting the doctrine was contained in the Liturgy.[1362] The reply of *Clericus* was startling: "…I maintain that, while I fully concur in the Articles, as far as they go, those who call me Papist, do not acquiesce in the doctrine of the Liturgy."[1363] This same prescription for understanding the relationship between *The Book of Common Prayer* and the *Thirty-nine*

[1357] Ibid.
[1358] One current commentator who makes this claim is Peter Nockles. He cites a number of writers to support this contention, the most eminent (and surprising) is that of Dean R. W. Church. See: Nockles, "The Oxford Movement," *Anglicanism and the Western Tradition*. 172. This is not a reasonable claim, for while Dean Church did acknowledge the criticism of Newman's methodology, he also recognised that "…no thinking theologian could now (dismiss) Mr. Newman…." He also noted that with regard to some theological points *Tract 90* contained nothing new. Finally, because of Newman's work the *Articles* now needed to be viewed with some "elasticity". Richard W. Church, *The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years, 1833-45* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1894), 286-7.
[1359] Newman, *Via Media No. I. Tract 38*. Paragraph 68.
[1360] Ibid.
[1361] Ibid.
[1362] Newman, *Via Media No.II. Tract 42* (London: Rivingtons, 1834), Paragraph 29.
[1363] Ibid., Paragraph 30.

Articles of Religion was contained in *Tract 82*. Newman noted that, while the Liturgy had a set meaning, the Articles could be read as containing many different meanings and they could only be considered authoritative when in accord with the Liturgy.[1364] *Tract 71* reiterated the argument. While the Liturgy was "…so primitive and beautiful in its matter…"[1365] the Articles were "…scarcely more than protests against specific existing errors of the 16th century, and neither are nor profess to be a system of doctrine."[1366] Yet, in one instance, Newman placed the Liturgy and the Articles as equals. In his *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* Newman stated that the flawed Roman Catholic and Lutheran doctrines were to be measured against "…the doctrine of our Liturgy and Articles…."[1367]

The third contention was similar to the first. However, in this instance he drew his argument not from the proceedings of Convocation, but from the *Royal Declaration* prefixed to the Articles in November 1628 under the authority of Charles I but which was, in fact, penned by Archbishop Laud.[1368] Without naming the "…leading men of our Church…"[1369] Newman justifiably claimed it was written by those "…especially noted for those Catholic views which have been here advocated."[1370] However, its legal standing depended on royal assent. Having, by implication, claimed ascendancy of Convocation in all matters concerning the Articles it was difficult for Newman to claim that the Declaration provided an authoritative means by which to interpret them. (His mode of argument to claim such an authority for interpreting the Articles was, at best,

---

[1364] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 52.
[1365] John Henry Newman, *On the Controversy with the Romanists Against Romanism – No.1. Tract 71*. Paragraph 83.
[1366] Ibid., Paragraph 84.
[1367] Newman, "Lecture 1. Faith Considered as the Instrument of Justification", *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 2.
[1368] Charles Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion: to Which is Added a Series of Documents, A.D. 1536 to A. D. 1615; Together With Illustrations From Contemporary Sources* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1859), 204. *n.* 1.
[1369] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §3.
[1370] Ibid.

slight.) Newman somewhat unconvincingly began his third argument by noting: "Whatever be the authority of the [Declaration] prefixed to the Articles, so far as it has any weight at all, it sanctions the mode of interpreting them above given."[1371] In the very next sentence the possibility of the Declaration carrying no "weight at all" had given way to a claim that:

> …its enjoining the "literal and grammatical sense," relieves us from the necessity of making the known opinions of their framers, a comment upon their text; and its forbidding any person to "affix any new sense to any Article," was promulgated at a time when the leading men of our Church were especially noted for those Catholic views which have been here advocated…[1372]

There was an inconsistency in Newman's argument. He had utilised the same contention previously in *Tract 82*, though in not such compromised manner. Newman noted the importance of the Declaration and its injunction that the Articles were to be taken only in a literal sense, for:

> …they were not written upon any one view, and cannot be taken *except* in the letter; because I think they *never* had any one simple meaning; because I think I see in them the terms of various schools mixed together—terms known by their historical associations to be theologically discordant, though in the mere letter easy and intelligible.[1373]

[1371] Ibid. It must be noted, however, that Charles I had previously been described by Newman as a "religious King", the Church's "…governor, considered as a Christian prince. In this light he is the father of his subjects, a natural priest ordained of God; and, as the head of a family is bound to superintend the instruction of his children and servants, so the King has a sort of patriarchal power over the Bishops and clergy." Newman, "Relation of Convocation to the Crown", *British Magazine*. (1834-5.) 410, 415.

[1372] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §3. The relevant section of the *Declaration* reads: And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense. *His Majesty's Declaration* prefixed to the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion* is found in any edition of *The Book of Common Prayer*.

[1373] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 60.

Newman contended that "…the Church stands in a *Via Media*; the first five Articles being directed against extreme Protestantism, the remaining ones against Rome."[1374] The Declaration proclaimed that the Articles "…contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's word… ."[1375] Newman claimed that this statement was to be interpreted to mean that the Articles contained the "…doctrine of the English church *so far* as distinguished from other churches… ."[1376] The Articles should not be seen as containing a particular system of doctrine but only "English doctrine" as it was different from that of Romanism, Socinianism, Arminianism and Calvinism.[1377] The Articles were a series of protests against sixteenth-century excesses in both the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, not a systematic dogma. The Declaration served to ensure that they continued to be read and translated literally, but also to be perceived as what they were, statements directed against abuses of their time. For Newman, the stipulation that the Articles were to be read "literally and grammatically" served his purpose in that it was further weight to his argument that their framers could be ignored.

Newman's fourth argument contended that the Articles were principally drawn from the work of Philip Melanchthon "…whose Catholic tendencies gained for him that same reproach of popery, which has ever been so freely bestowed upon members of our own reformed Church."[1378] To support this statement he quoted from a work by the Lutheran Church historian and Divine, Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1694-1755).[1379] The excerpt

---

[1374] Ibid., Paragraph 63.
[1375] *His Majesty's Declaration* prefixed to the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion* is found in any edition of *The Book of Common Prayer*.
[1376] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 63.
[1377] Ibid. Also see: Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion: to Which is Added a Series of Documents, A.D. 1536 to A. D. 1615; Together With Illustrations From Contemporary Sources*. 191 *f*.
[1378] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §4.
[1379] Cross described Mosheim's work as "…marked by a hitherto unprecedented objectivity and penetration…" for which reason "…he may be considered the first of modern ecclesiastical historians."

was accurate, although in the original work the passage in question was considerably longer. Mosheim wrote that, after the death of Luther, Melanchthon became "indifferent" about a number of doctrines which were "…of the highest importance to Luther… ."[1380] Those matters to which he became indifferent included:

> …the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the necessity of good works to eternal
>
> salvation, the number of the sacraments, the jurisdiction claimed by the pope and the bishops, extreme unction, the observance of certain religious festivals, and several superstitious rites and ceremonies.[1381]

The reason lying behind Melanchthon's indifference lay in the reality "…that, for the sake of peace and concord, many things might be connived at and tolerated in the church of

Rome, which Luther considered as absolutely insupportable."[1382] Newman built his argument on the real differences between Melanchthon and Luther.[1383] While these differences existed, particularly on the doctrine of justification and the importance of good works,[1384] it was also true that they were not nearly as far apart as Newman would assert.[1385] Furthermore, Newman's contention that Melanchthon was the principal source of the Articles was not completely true. The Thirty-eight Articles of 1563, (which were

---

Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 944. If this is so the importance of the citation is to be noted.

[1380] John Lawrence Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern; in which the Rise, Progress, and Variations of Church-Power, are considered in their Connexion with the State of Learning and Philosophy, and the Political History of Europe during that Period,* Archibald Maclaine, translator, Charles Coote, editor, 6 Volumes (Oxford: T. Cadell *et al*, 1826): IV: 280.

[1381] Ibid. And: Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §4.

[1382] Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern; in which the Rise, Progress, and Variations of Church-Power, are considered in their Connexion with the State of Learning and Philosophy, and the Political History of Europe during that Period.* 277. And: Newman, *Tract 90*. Paragraph 2. §4. Note: Newman's wording is slightly different, but carries the same meaning and intention.

[1383] Newman, *Apologia*. 86.

[1384] John Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 85.

[1385] Ibid., 147.

the blueprint for the Thirty-nine Articles) were prepared by Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504-75), some of which he based on the Würtemberg Confession of 1552.[1386] Johannes Brenz (1499-1570) who used as his model the Augsburg Confession of 1530 compiled the Würtemberg Confession in 1552. However, while the Augsburg Confession, compiled by Melanchthon was decidedly Lutheran, the Würtemberg Confession was decidedly Calvinist.[1387] There were some similarities between the Augsburg Confession and the Articles, but it could not be claimed that Melanchthon was the primary source of the latter.[1388] Charles Hardwick argued that of the thirty-nine, only Articles IX, X, XVI, XXIII and XXXI were based on the Augsburg Confession.[1389] Edgar Gibson noted that of the Forty-two Articles, only Articles I, II, XXIII, XXVI, XXVII and XXXII showed a similarity in language to the Augsburg Confession.[1390] Despite the similarity, "…the debt to Lutheranism is but a limited one."[1391] Recent scholarship by John Schofield demonstrated that only Articles X, XVII, XXVIII and XXIX were specifically Lutheran in doctrine.[1392] Newman's claim was apparently made on the basis of Melanchthon's doctrine of justification[1393] and doctrine of the Real Presence.[1394] There was little evidence to support Newman's contentions contained in his fourth argument. Importantly, while there was evidence that he cited Melanchthon's theology as a foundation for the

---

[1386] Edgar Gibson noted that Parker made additions taken from the Würtemberg Confession to the *Forty-two Articles*. The *Articles* to which additions were made were numbers *II, V, VI, X, XI, XII* and *XX*. Gibson, *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*. 30, 38.
[1387] Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 1502.
[1388] Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion: to Which is Added a Series of Documents, A.D. 1536 to A. D. 1615; Together With Illustrations From Contemporary Sources.* 125-7.
[1389] Ibid., 375-96.
[1390] Gibson, *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*. 27.
[1391] Ibid. See: Appendix XX.
[1392] Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation*. 196-7.
[1393] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 1, 9 *n.* 9, 19 *n.* 15, 21 *n.* 18, 22 *n.* 19, 25 *n.* 21, 96, 97 *n.* 3, 102, 244, 244 *n.* 9, 245, 247, 249 *n.* 9, 316, 359 *n.* 11, 368, 372, 388, 393, 396. Also see: Newman, *Apologia*. 86.
[1394] Schofield noted that Elizabeth I was influenced by Lutheran theology. At her insistence the wording of *Article XXVIII* was altered from the wording contained in the *Forty-two Articles* in a way which did not preclude the possibility of an objective presence in the Eucharistic elements. "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." The Body of Christ is not said to be given by faith. This differs markedly from *Article XXIX* of the *Forty-two Articles*. See: Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation*. 196-7. See also: Gibson. *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*. 660-4. See also: Appendix XIX.

Anglican doctrine of salvation, nowhere in his earlier writings did Newman offer the same argument as that found in *Tract 90*. In the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* there was no claim made by Newman that Melanchthon's doctrine and Anglican doctrine were the same, or even similar. Newman also wrote, that despite severe criticism of Melanchthon by other Reformers for his moderate views he could never be accused of Popery.[1395] This was one of the few instances in *Tract 90* that Newman had apparently introduced a completely new argument. However, it was one which had previously been inferred in the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*.

If Newman's fourth argument was innovative, his fifth was anything but. Reiterating previous arguments in *Tract 90*, Newman contended that the Articles were "…evidently framed on the principle of leaving open large questions, on which the controversy…" centred.[1396] They stated "…broadly extreme truths…" yet they were "…silent about their adjustment." [1397] This argument had also appeared in *Tract 82*.

> …the Articles are confessedly wide in their wording, though still their width is within bounds; they seem to include a number of shades of opinion…They have one meaning, so far as they embody the doctrine of the Creed; they have different meanings, so far as they are drawn up by men influenced severally by the discordant opinions of the day.[1398]

The Articles, insofar as they contained the tenets of the Creed, had one sense. Where they did not they had been written by their framers to answer one particular controversy or another. They contained material that was open to interpretation. Moreover, no

---

[1395] See: Footnote 58.
[1396] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §5.
[1397] Ibid.
[1398] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 52, Paragraph 59 & *passim.* Also see: Newman, *On the Controversy with the Romanists Against Romanism – No.1. Tract 71*. Paragraph 95.

methodology of interpretation was provided. The Articles must always seek to mirror the "Truth" which was founded in the Catholicity and apostolicity of the Church.[1399] This echoed Newman's earlier statements that the 'mind' of their framers should be ignored. The Articles were to be interpreted in any given age, precisely because they were intended as statements to be open to further clarification. Based on this premise Newman presented a series of contentions, which were a précis of his main arguments in the first five sections of *Tract 90*. Newman noted that the Articles "…say that all necessary faith must be proved from Scripture, but they do not say who is to prove it."[1400] The Articles also "…say that the Church has authority in controversies, they do not say what authority…"[1401] and "…that it may enforce nothing beyond Scripture, but do not say where the remedy lies when it does."[1402] The Thirty-nine Articles, Newman wrote, asserted that "…works before grace and justification are worthless and worse, and that works after grace and justification are acceptable, but they do not speak at all of works with GOD'S aid, before justification."[1403] They also state, "…that men are lawfully called and sent to minister and preach, who are chosen and called by men who have public authority given them in the congregation to call and send; but they do not add by whom the authority is to be given."[1404] Finally, Newman noted, "They say that councils called by princes may err; they do not determine whether councils called in the name of CHRIST will err."[1405] In presenting these short epithets Newman not only largely summarised a major contention underlying *Tract 90*, but he also employed them to give example to his argument that the Articles were written in a sufficiently vague style that

---

[1399] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 57. Also see: Newman, "The Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic*. 8, 40*f*., 70.
[1400] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §5. Cf. Section 1. Paragraph 11 & *passim*. Also see: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 60.
[1401] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §5. Cf. Section 1. Paragraph 11 & *passim*.
[1402] Ibid.
[1403] Ibid.
[1404] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §5. Cf. Section 4. Paragraph 3 & *passim*.
[1405] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §5. Cf. Section 5. Paragraph 4 & *passim*.

they could be reinterpreted at any given time to meet theological, ecclesiological, ecclesiastical or disciplinary questions.

In his sixth argument, Newman referred to Section 11 regarding the *Homilies*. He considered that the doctrinal views contained in the *Homilies* precluded them from being regarded as Protestant documents, rather, like the Articles, they were to be considered as appealing to the authority of "…the Fathers and Catholic antiquity… ."[1406] In this, he reiterated his argument in the earlier section. Based on this premise Newman also attacked those who claimed the Articles to be wholly Protestant in their intent and teaching.

> …the Articles are not framed on the principle of excluding those who prefer the theology of the early ages to that of the Reformation; or rather since both Homilies are Articles appeal to the Fathers and Catholic antiquity, let it be considered whether, in interpreting them by these, we are not going to the very authority to which they profess to submit themselves…[1407]

To argue that the Articles must be interpreted by means of Reformation theology was, Newman contended, to ignore the truth that they were written under the guidance, influence and authority of the ancient Church and the Fathers.[1408] This contention merely reasserted what Newman had argued in Section 11; hence, it was not 'new' in any sense of the word. Both *Tract 71* and *Tract 82* anticipated these arguments. The purpose of the sixth argument, like that of its immediate predecessor, was to summarise a tenet which

---

[1406] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §6. Cf. Section 11. Paragraph 8 & concluding paragraph.
[1407] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §6.
[1408] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §6. Cf. Section 11. Paragraph 8 & concluding paragraph. Also see: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraphs 61-2. Also see: Newman. *On the Controversy with the Romanists Against Romanism – No.1. Tract 71*. Paragraph 100. Also see: Newman, "Lecture 9. On the Esssentials of the Gospel", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. II: 236-7.

ran right throughout *Tract 90*, that is, the Articles could be interpreted as Catholic statements and were not to be interpreted wholly as Protestant statements.[1409]

Newman's final argument rested in the assertion that those who framed the Articles "…constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves."[1410] The authors of the Articles had written them in such a manner as to be open to wide interpretation, even by those who did not hold the authors' own Protestant views. With the possibility of a diversity of interpretation allowed for, the "Anglo-Catholics then are but the successors and representatives of those moderate reformers; and (t)heir case has been directly anticipated in the wording of the Articles."[1411] Thus Anglo-Catholics were not "perverting" their sense "…they are using them, for an express purpose for which among others their authors framed them."[1412] Again, this argument had previously been expressed in *Tract 82*.

> I do sincerely and heartily consider my sense of the Articles, on certain points to be presently mentioned, to be the true sense; but I do not feel sure that there were not represented at the drawing up of the Articles, parties and interests which led the framers, (not as doing so on a principle, but spontaneously, from the existing hindrances to perfect unanimity,) to abstain from perfect precision and uniformity of statement.[1413]

Newman considered there was the possibility for Calvinist and Tractarian alike to subscribe to the Articles precisely because they were inexact in their wording.[1414]

[1409] Newman. *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 1. Also see: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 63.
[1410] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §7.
[1411] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §7.
[1412] Ibid.
[1413] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 53.
[1414] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §7. Also see: Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 53.

> Had it not been provided for, (it was) possible the Articles never would have been accepted by our Church at all. If, then, their framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, the Catholics have theirs too in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them.[1415]

This seemed to be a self-defeating argument, for it appeared that Newman had finally concluded that the Thirty-nine Articles were indeed Protestant in their inception and only allowed for a Catholic interpretation in order for subscription to them by both Low and High Churchmen. Newman had previously admitted autonomy in interpretation of the Articles in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church.* Where the "standard writers" agreed Churchmen were bound to follow them "…but when they differ, (Churchmen were) to adjust or to choose between their opinions."[1416] In this book, he provided a clear indication of the meaning and purpose of the Articles. They were Articles of religion, not faith,[1417] for subscription was required only by members of the clergy and the universities as a bulwark against Romanism,[1418] they were not considered necessary for salvation, except where they embodied the articles of the Creed and contained no divine authority except where they contained apostolic teaching.[1419] These important qualifications were not included in Newman's seventh and final argument, which, given his considerable effort in the previous six arguments to exclude a Protestant interpretation of the Articles, did appear extraordinary. This was even more so when the argument was compared with that found in *Tract 82*, which formed the basis for the

---

[1415] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §7.
[1416] Newman, "Introduction", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church,* Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. : 23-4.
[1417] Ibid. "Lecture 9. On the Esssentials of the Gospel." *The Via Media of the Anglican Church,* Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 234.
[1418] Ibid., 235.
[1419] Ibid., 234.

Conclusion to *Tract 90*.[1420] In the former Tract, he allowed for a wide range of foundations for the Articles. The first five were Catholic in origin; the sixth to the eighteenth were broadly founded in the Reformation, while the others were far from clear in their meaning.[1421] Because of their disparate origins, the possibility that they contained different meanings and that they were the products of "various schools,"[1422] the Articles could be read using private judgement.[1423] Moreover, the original meaning of the Articles placed on them by their framers was superseded by the Convocations of 1571 and 1603, which called the English Church into conformity with the Primitive Church.[1424] The Articles were not a system of doctrine, but were statements directed against the excesses of Romanism and ultra-Protestantism. It was for this reason that the Church of England stood firmly in a *Via Media*.[1425] These important qualifications were missing in Newman's seventh and final argument. Ending in this manner would have appeared to weaken Newman's overall position, or did it?

In his penultimate reflection on the Thirty-nine Articles Newman turned to Burnet writing on the Real Presence (Article XVIII). Burnet noted that the Convocation of 1563 subscribed to the Edwardian Article, which contained a paragraph directed specifically against the doctrine of transubstantiation.[1426] The intention of the government was to draw the "body of the nation" over to Reformation thinking, but it was recognised that "…the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the

[1420] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 49 *f*.
[1421] Ibid., Paragraph 63.
[1422] Ibid., Paragraph 61.
[1423] Ibid., Paragraph 59.
[1424] Ibid., 192-3. This exact formula may also be found in: Newman, "Lecture 9. On the Esssentials of the Gospel.' *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 236-7.
[1425] Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 63.
[1426] See above: n. 59. Also see: Appendix XIX.

corporeal presence of CHRIST in the Sacrament… ."[1427] Hence, despite subscription to the earlier formula by both houses of Convocation, the passage condemning outright the doctrine of the Real Presence was not published.[1428] The Convocation of 1571 published a new canon concerning the Real Presence, one which stated that Christ was present "…in an heavenly and spiritual manner, and faith is the mean by which he is received."[1429] Burnet stated that this prescription amounted to the same thing, but the earlier formula was not published because it was necessary to reach an agreed position, which would be acceptable to all.[1430] Newman used this excerpt to prove that the Articles were statements reached by compromise, were not particularly dogmatic and could be accepted by both High and Low Churchmen who could justifiably read and accept them from their own dogmatic position.[1431] Newman did not cite this excerpt from Burnet elsewhere but a version of the text that followed it appeared in *Tract 82*.

In the final paragraph of *Tract 90*, Newman Burnet again. He cited an example from what "…lately has taken place in the political world…" concerning a "French minister" who desired war.[1432] The minister drew up his papers "…in such moderate language, that his successor, who is for peace, can act up to them, without compromising his own principles."[1433] In the same manner, Protestants drew up the Thirty-nine Articles with the

---

[1427] Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 402. & Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 4. §7.
[1428] Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 403. & Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 4. §7.
[1429] Ibid. While Burnet does quote *Article XVIII* accurately, Newman inextricably changes the wording of Burnet's text, and hence that of the *Article*, to read: "He is by which He is received." This change does strengthen Newman's argument that such a broad statement could be accepted by all. However, it fails to acknowledge the intention of Convocation, the *Article* and Burnet to emphasise the Spiritual nature of the Presence.
[1430] Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. 403. & Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 4. §7.
[1431] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. §7.
[1432] Ibid., Conclusion. Paragraph 5. § 7.
[1433] Ibid. The parallel example in *Tract 82* concerned a Petition to Parliament which "…is put together by persons, differing in matters of detail, though agreeing together to a certain point and for a certain end." Those involved in writing the document were "…legislating and determining for posterity, they are respective representatives of corresponding parties in the generations after them." Hence, as with

intention of including Catholics. For this reason, Newman insisted "…Catholics now will not be excluded."[1434] Newman finally observed:

> What was an economy in the reformers, now a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then, is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning.[1435]

With these words, *Tract 90* concluded. After the considerable exertion by Newman throughout the Tract to demonstrate that the Articles were thoroughly compatible with Catholic doctrine, these words appeared as an anticlimax especially when compared to the stated aim in the Introduction, which was to demonstrate that

> …our articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through GOD'S good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine.[1436]

The intention, laid out in the Introduction, to demonstrate that the Articles were not 'uncatholic' was amply effectuated throughout *Tract 90*. Of the concluding seven arguments, the first six were decidedly more emphatic than the last. Nevertheless, the Conclusion as a whole did follow closely what Newman had written in *Tract 82*.[1437] The Articles were written by Protestants to address Roman Catholic excesses in the sixteenth

---

the papers drawn up by the French minister, the Parliamentary Petition could, in retrospect, be equally and legitimately be read with two meanings. Newman, *Tract 82*. Paragraph 52.

[1434] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 5. §7.

[1435] Ibid.

[1436] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 3.

[1437] Newman, *Tract 82*. *Passim*.

century. However, because their authors desired to include all manner of Churchmanship, the Articles were written in a way to exclude none.[1438]

Newman's intention in writing *Tract 90* was "…to keep…men straight…,"[1439] that is, those who were considering conversion from Anglicanism to Roman Catholicism. His final words were not only directed at this group, but they were also an acknowledgement of the growing hostility towards the *Tracts for the Times* both from within and outside Oxford.[1440] Despite his intention, the brevity of the conclusion, most particularly the abruptness of the finish, was in stark contrast to the intricate, often convoluted arguments Newman presented right throughout the Tract. There was evidence that by the end of 1840, at the time he finished writing *Tract 90*, life was undergoing a series of dramatic changes for Newman. In his *Apologia*, he presented the image of a man who was growing in tiredness, one who sought a new direction in his life.[1441] He resigned the editorship of the *British Critic*,[1442] wanted to quit his living at St. Mary the Virgin[1443] and considered an early retirement to Littlemore.[1444] Whatever the state of Newman's mind, the Tract did finish unsatisfactorily in the sense that there was no summary or conclusion in the conventional sense. Yet, these documents were indeed the *Tracts for the Times* and,

---

[1438] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 3.Conclusion. Paragraph 5. §7. Also see: Newman. *Apologia*. 91-2.
[1439] Newman. *Apologia*. 90.
[1440] This was evident in Newman's defence of Pusey and Tractarianism in *Tract 82. Passim*. In an 1839 *British Critic* article Newman also directed an attack against those who accused the Tractarians of Popery. The article named three protagonists, Edward Bicksteth (1786-1850), Baden Powell (1796-1860) and Hunter Gordon (*c.* 1837). See: John Henry Newman, "Prospects of the Anglican Church", *British Critic* (April, 1839. In: *Essays Historical and Critical*. I: 264-6. Also see: Newman, *Apologia*. 102-3.
[1441] Newman, *Apologia*. 134-8.
[1442] Ibid., 138.
[1443] Ibid., 134.
[1444] Ibid.

in addressing contemporary issues, perhaps it was that what was actually needed was a brief summary.[1445]

[1445] Cf. Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *The Australasian Catholic Record*. Note: It is possible Newman assumed that his audience was aware of earlier material in relation to given arguments.

CHAPTER 17

OBSERVATIONS, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Three main criticisms have been levelled against *Tract 90* and its writer, John Henry Newman. One accusation made was that it contained material that had been 'manipulated' by Newman to comply with a particular argument.[1446] Yet another concern was that Newman had introduced new material, which in turn led to innovatory contentions.[1447] Lastly and perhaps most importantly, *Tract 90* was perceived as a document that demonstrated that in 1841 Newman had already begun the journey towards Rome.[1448]

These perceptions were not correct. The contentions in *Tract 90* were supported by evidence Newman had chosen very carefully. Moreover, more often than not, the documentary excerpts cited in the Tract required further research by the reader, research that demonstrated Newman had so carefully selected an extract that reading the original document provided further, compelling proof of his argument. Rather than Newman 'manipulating' the facts, he had chosen the evidence in the same way as any writer attempting to prove a contention, no less, no more. On this point Newman really cannot be criticised. He chose his material from the Anglican Divines who themselves

---

[1446] Anne Mozley, "Dr. Newman's Apology", *Christian Remembrancer*. 8 (July, 1864). 178. Cited in: Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 173.
[1447] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 136*f*. Also see: William Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ Designed Chiefly for the Use of Students of Theology*, 2 Volumes (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1842), II: 264-5.
[1448] Chadwick, "The Mind of the Oxford Movement", *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. 43. While Chadwick noted that such opinions were held he did not agree with them. Also see: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 144-5. See also: Walter Walsh, *The History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England, 18333-1864* (London: James Nesbit & Co. Ltd., 1900), 164 & *passim*. Both Nockles and Walsh agreed with this perception.

demonstrated an inconsistency in their theology.[1449] Hence, to argue that Newman presented only one 'Catholic' argument from James Ussher[1450] when indeed Ussher was an Evangelical in all other matters theological and ecclesiological did not mean Newman was misrepresenting him.[1451] It was not unusual for High and Low Church elements to coexist within the theology of any number of the Divines. Such ambivalence was also in evidence in the *Homilies*.[1452] Both were further confused in that the 'Low Church' positions ranged from Calvinism to Lutheranism.[1453]

Furthermore, Newman did not misrepresent the Divines whom he cited. Indeed, as it has been demonstrated, he often quoted extracts that would appear to have come from the least likely sources, particularly the Low Church Divines. These documents located in their original context provided more, sometimes stronger evidence, to support a particular argument. This was no more so than in the case of John Jewel[1454], whose works

---

[1449] Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*. 67. Also see: Chadwick, "The Mind of the Oxford Movement", *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. 10. Chadwick noted that: "Three out of the six Archbishops of Canterbury from Parker to Laud would not have disdained the theology of Switzerland…." 10.

[1450] Newman cited Ussher as an authority on the Creed as the 'Rule of faith.' Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 1. Paragraph 13. He also cited an excerpt from Ussher with respect to the Real Presence which was vehemently anti-Roman Catholic. Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 10. James Ussher was regarded as having instituted the modern era of creedal studies. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds.* Ussher was at once a champion of Episcopal government and a latitudinarian. Jack Cunningham, *James Ussher and John Bramhall: The Theology and Politics of Two Irish Ecclesiastics of the Seventeenth Century*. (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2007.) 26, 27, 197, 201 and *passim*. Also see: Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective.* 69*f*.

[1451] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 134*f*. Nockles argued that both the Tractarian and anti-Tractarian forces often misrepresented the Anglican divines by only presenting material which supported a particular theological r doctrinal view. Also see: Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*.149*f*.

[1452] Ted A. Campbell, *Christian Confessions: A Historical Introduction* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 118.

[1453] Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective.* 22, 23, 163. See Also: Dairmaid Maculloch, "The Church of England 1533-1603", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 31*f*. Also see: Arthur Edward Litton, *The Church of Christ, in its Ideas, Attributes and Ministry: With Particular Reference to the Controversy on the Subject Between Romanists and Protestants* (Philadelphia & New York: Smith and English & Anson D. F. Randolph, 1856), vii and *passim*.

[1454] Newman's choice of Jewel to substantiate his contentions appeared inconsistent with the Tractarian view of this Calvinist Reformer. Froude described Jewel as a "…irreverent dissenter…." Froude, *Remains of the Late Richard Hurrell Froude*. I: 379. This was a position which Newman also

Newman quoted at length. Jewel's works, particularly the *Homilies*, displayed the uncertainty of the English Reformation with respect to doctrine and the Canon of Scripture.[1455] Pusey viewed the English Reformers as genuine men who "…wished to be Catholic…" and whose "…appeals to Antiquity were sincere… ."[1456] Pusey wrote to Newman that the English Reformers (and Jewel in particular) had been "…entangled more or less with the Zwinglian notions afloat and held unhappily by the foreign reformers with who they were intimate."[1457] He thought the real difficulty of the English Reformers was that "…of separating what was Catholic in the existing system from what was modern and uncatholic."[1458] Despite Ward and Oakeley's[1459] condemnation of Cranmer and Jewel for fraternising with Calvin (and who were therefore declared to be anti-Catholic) Pusey thought this unfair and defended the Reformers as "implicitly Catholic" in their views.[1460] In mid-1841, Newman held a very different view from Pusey and considered that it was not difficult to dislike the Reformation.[1461] The Reformers were disingenuous for "…when they would attack some tenet or practice of Rome, they attacked something which R C's could and do condemn as much as their opponents do… ."[1462] These were not sentiments Newman expressed in *Tract 90* directly, but implicitly, by demonstrating repeatedly that the Articles did not condemn Catholic but 'Romish' practices. He questioned the truthfulness of the Reformers (predominantly

---

embraced. Gary W. Jenkins. *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2006), 231.

[1455] A confusion caused in no small part by the dramatic changes imposed upon the English Church by subsequent monarchs, which saw Lutheran, Calvinist and Catholic doctrines holding primacy at different times over a period from 1530-1563. See: Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Society and Politics under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 14 and *passim*.

[1456] To: Newman. 9 August, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 240.

[1457] Ibid.

[1458] Ibid.

[1459] Oakeley had launched a vociferous attack on Jewel one month earlier. See: Frederick Oakeley, "Bishop Jewel; His Character, Correspondence and Apologetic Treatises", *British Critic*, 30 (July, 1841): 1-46.

[1460] To: Newman. 9 August, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 240.

[1461] To: E. B. Pusey. 13 August, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 242.

[1462] Ibid., 243.

Jewel), whom he particularly delighted in showing to be wrong, especially when he could cite contrary information from their own works.

His greatest success in demonstrating the inconsistencies in the doctrine(s) of the English Reformation came in his study of the *Homilies*.[1463] Newman's correspondence with Pusey exposed an important insight. Newman wrote that he considered his methodology of critical analysis of the Articles to be an "artifice," albeit one which he took from the Reformers themselves.[1464] Newman revealed that he had always attempted to understand "…in what sense…"[1465] the Reformers had condemned Roman Catholic practices and beliefs. He claimed that this often relied on a deliberate misrepresentation of Catholic teaching. To prove this point he paraphrased the *Homily on Prayer*.[1466] "'The Invocation of Saints is a miserable and wicked thing, FOR is it not wrong to *offer sacrifice* to creatures?'"[1467] Newman argued in this that the Reformers misrepresented the Roman Catholic doctrine. They did not offer sacrifice to saints, rather, they invoked the name of saints in seeking supplication from God. He contended that he could accept the argument of the Reformers if invocation was considered as a synonym for sacrifice, but the reality was that this was a construction of the Reformers, one which did not exist as Catholic doctrine. For those who condemned Newman of sophistry, he replied: "'This was [not] an evasion on my part - unless it was first an evasion on theirs.'"[1468] This was an important exchange between Pusey and Newman for it demonstrated the methodology used in examining the Articles and why it was used. Newman knew precisely that he was

---

[1463] Ibid.
[1464] Ibid.
[1465] Ibid.
[1466] AN HOMILIE OR SERmon Concerning Prayer. *Books of Homilies*. II. Homily 7. Part 2. Paragraphs 4 & 6. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom07.htm: retrieved 19 January, 2009.
[1467] To: E. B. Pusey. 13 August, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 242.
[1468] Ibid., 243.

playing the Reformers at their own game.[1469] The correspondence with Pusey showed Newman had not set out to do anything other than defend the possibility of a Catholic interpretation of the articles by employing an "artifice" used by the Reformers. His argument was with those of his contemporaries who insisted that only an Evangelical reading of them was possible.[1470]

While following a similar structure to the four *Catena Patrum* in that it consisted of long excerpts with little attendant commentary, the substance of *Tract 90* was substantially different and unique. Newman had long been accused of manipulating the Caroline Divines for the purposes of constructing his own style of Anglicanism, relying as it did on a "paper religion" constructed around the *Via Media.*[1471] The *Via Media* had been constructed around the twin fonts of the Primitive Church and the Caroline Divines. However, by 1840 the *Via Media*, in Newman's own mind, although not completely rejected, began to break down.[1472] The misgivings expressed by Newman with regard to the *Via Media* did not mean that he completely broke with the principle, for although he did not use the term in *Tract 90*,[1473] a reading of the document shows evidence of a 'new' *Via Media.* A letter written to Charles Russell in April 1841 was telling in this respect.

[1469] Newman, *Apologia*. 102.
[1470] Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraphs 1 & 10.
[1471] Although he viewed the *Via Media* positively, as early as 1837 Newman already understood it to be a theory merely on paper. "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…." Newman, "Introduction", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. I: 16. Also see: Chadwick, "The Mind of the Oxford Movement", *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. 57.
[1472] Newman recorded that the *Via Media* was finally destroyed after Nicholas Wiseman's September 1839 article in the *Dublin Review*. Newman, *Apologia*. 120-1. Nicholas Lash considered his statement in the *Apologia* that the *Via Media* was 'pulverised' by Wiseman's article to be an exaggeration on Newman's part. See: Nicholas Lash, *Newman on Development: The Search for an Explanation in History* (Shepherdsville, WV: Patmos Press, 1975), 14. See also: Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*. 207. Avis agreed with Lash, whereas other historians such as Nockles took Newman's words at face value. See: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 137. The overwhelming evidence supported the views of Lash and Avis.
[1473] Here there existed a distinct difference between *Tract 82* of 1837 and the *Tract 90*. The earlier *Tract* clearly perceived the *Articles* themselves as the *Via Media* of the Anglican Church. Newman, "Letter Addressed to a Magazine on Behalf of Dr. Pusey's Tracts on Holy Baptism and of Other Tracts for the Times", *Tract 82*. Paragraph 63.

Newman considered that he was not an advocate for Protestantism, but because of the "…grave errors on the side of Rome…" he was "…forced into a *Via Media*, short of Rome, as it is at present."[1474] Little was written of the *Via Media* after this time. Notably, neither of Newman's two great defences of *Tract 90*, his letters to Richard Jelf[1475] and Bishop Bagot,[1476] mentioned the *Via Media* by name. The letter to Jelf, nevertheless, did give some additional insight into Newman's thinking, beyond that indicated to Russell. The postscript added to the second and third editions of the letter contained the formula for the *Via Media* in all but name. The Tract was designed to demonstrate that the Articles, the doctrine and the practices of the Primitive Church could be reconciled.[1477] Conversely, the other filter of Tractarian orthodoxy, the Caroline Divines, was not mentioned. The *Homilies* supplanted the Divines, not as a measure of orthodoxy, but as a means to illustrate the Articles.[1478] The real victor as a determinant of orthodox belief was the Council of Trent, the decrees of which were shown to be only "…partially, if at all, committed to certain popular errors."[1479] This was the 'new' *Via Media*, not so much a middle way between Protestant and Romish extremes, but one that had moved decidedly away from Protestantism towards Rome without fully embracing it.[1480] Newman considered of the Church of England that she was no less than a "…branch of the Catholic Church."[1481] Taking the interpretation of the Articles "…in the most Catholic sense that they will allow…"[1482] meant that Protestant doctrine was no longer considered as part of the *Via Media*. Newman had expressed this opinion in mid 1839 in the *British Critic*. Newman judged "…our true wisdom now is to look for some Via Media which

---

[1474] To: Charles W. Russell. 26 April, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 182.
[1475] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Ibid. 78*f*.
[1476] To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Ibid. 129*f*.
[1477] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Ibid. 88. Part 1. *n*. 2.
[1478] Ibid., 88. Part 2. *n*. 5.
[1479] Ibid., 88. Part 1. *n*. 2. See also: 83-4.
[1480] Cf. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 184.
[1481] To: Charles W. Russell. 26 April, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 182.
[1482] R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*. VIII: 88. Part 2. *n*. 5. Also see: Newman, *Tract 90*. Conclusion. Paragraph 2. § 1.

will preserve us from what threatens, though it cannot restore the dead."[1483] To save the Anglican Church from Liberalism, Pantheism and Popery Newman believed that the *Via Media* would only be a viable "middle doctrine" if it was based firmly in doctrine which was "alive."[1484] "The spirit of Luther is dead…," wrote Newman "…but Hildebrand and Loyola are still alive."[1485] Six months later, also in a *British Critic* article, 'Catholicity of the Anglican Church,' Newman remained steadfast to a defence of the *Via Media*,[1486] although by this time, as with *Tract 90*, he never employed the term. He considered that since the miserable nadir of "…the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth…" the Church of England had "…it may be said all along to have grown towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement…" from Rome.[1487] These were the forms of the 'new' *Via Media*, far removed from Protestantism, pure in its Catholicism. Illustrated by these earlier documents, Newman's 'new' *Via Media* implied in *Tract 90* was not an innovative concept.[1488]

Construction of the 'new' *Via Media* presented Newman with a major difficulty, for if he was to seek the most Catholic interpretation of the Articles possible he could not do so with the aid of the Anglican Divines. Newman had come to the conclusion that the Caroline Divines were no longer a reliable measure or basis for that undertaking. When writing to Charles Crawley in January 1841 Newman considered he did not wish to make the Divines "…better than they are…" by publishing notes in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic*

[1483] Newman, "Prospects of the Anglican Church", *British Critic* (April, 1839). Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*. I: 306.
[1484] Ibid.
[1485] Ibid.
[1486] Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective.* 243.
[1487] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic* (January, 1840). Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*. II: 55 & *passim.*
[1488] Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times.* 92. Faught considered that Newman's theology in *Tract 90* was neither radical nor different from his previous works. Moreover, he considered Newman's task to prove the Catholicity of the *Articles* to be hardly one which was difficult.

Theology.[1489] Nor did he wish to "…bring the early Church to their judgement seat… ."[1490] The nexus between the Primitive Church and the Caroline Divines having been clearly broken, Newman considered that "…I think one can bear to differ from them."[1491] No longer was the idea acceptable "…of our wising to stand or fall by Jewell, Hicks, Waterland! nay by Jeremy Taylor, or Jackson or Laud themselves."[1492] The inclusion of both Protestant and Catholic Divines led Newman to the conclusion that it would be a "misnomer" to give to the volumes "…the title of Anglo-catholic Library…."[1493] Despite the indications that Newman no longer completely trusted employing the Caroline Divines in his anti-Roman polemic, there was no evidence to suggest that he had completely abandoned them. The situation, despite Newman's own statements to the contrary, was not as clear-cut as had been accepted by the historian Peter Nockles.[1494] Examination of *Tract 90* demonstrated that the Anglican Divines were not cited as readily as they had been in previous Tractarian literature, most particularly in the four *Catena Patrum*. Section 1 revealed that Ussher,[1495] Taylor,[1496] Laud,[1497] Bramhall, Thorndike, Stillingfleet, Jackson[1498] and Field[1499] were cited as authorities on the Rule of Faith. Beyond the first section, however, only Hooker,[1500] Taylor,[1501] Andrewes,[1502] Ussher[1503] and Bull[1504] were quoted as authorities, this despite Newman's claim that Hammond,

---

[1489] To: Charles Crawley. 14 January, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 17.
[1490] Ibid.
[1491] Ibid.
[1492] Ibid. Newman's disquiet with respect to the Anglican Divines had been brought about by his study of the Monophysite heresy in mid 1839. See: Newman, *Apologia*. 120.
[1493] To: Charles Crawley. 14 January, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 18.
[1494] Nockles suggested that by mid 1840 Newman had all but dismissed the Divines as unreliable controversialists against Rome. See: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 167-8.
[1495] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section One. Paragraph 13.
[1496] Ibid., Section One. Paragraph 14.
[1497] Ibid., Section One. Paragraph 15.
[1498] Ibid., Section One. Paragraph 16.
[1499] Ibid., Section One. Paragraphs 16-26.
[1500] Ibid., Section Six. §1. Paragraph 7.
[1501] Ibid., Section Six. §1. Paragraphs 8-10; Section Six. § 2. Paragraphs 7-12; Section Eight. Paragraphs 5-9.
[1502] Ibid., Section Six. §4. Paragraphs 13-18.
[1503] Ibid., Section Eight. Paragraph 10.
[1504] Ibid., Section Nine. Paragraph 14.

Andrewes and Hooker were to be exalted as the exemplars of Anglo-Catholicism.[1505] Despite the paucity of quotations from the Divines, any claim that Newman no longer held them in high regard was to be dismissed with the appearance of the letter to Jelf. This was suffused with references to, or excerpts from the works of Taylor,[1506] Bramhall,[1507] Bull,[1508] Wake,[1509] Andrewes,[1510] Hooker,[1511] Hammond,[1512] Thorndike,[1513] Pearson,[1514] Laud,[1515] Hall[1516] and Stillingfleet.[1517] Many of the Divines were quoted on the pretext they had gone "…far beyond anything I have said."[1518] Newman's return to the Divines as authorities for his defence of *Tract 90* belied any argument that he had abandoned them completely. While *Tract 90* demonstrated that he temporarily supplanted the Divines in favour of the *Homilies*, the letter to Jelf demonstrated that Newman returned to form and employed the sixteenth and seventeenth-century Churchmen to support his claims. Hence, as with Newman's arguments, his methodology, which placed the Caroline doctrine as a standard measure of orthodoxy, was also not new.

The second major criticism of *Tract 90* was that it contained new material introduced by Newman for the purpose of introducing innovatory arguments, which then translated into new conclusions.[1519] It has been conclusively demonstrated that *Tract 90* contained

---

[1505] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 2.
[1506] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 74, 85, 87.
[1507] Ibid., 82, 84, 85.
[1508] Ibid., 82, 85, 86.
[1509] Ibid., 82.
[1510] Ibid., 84.
[1511] Ibid.
[1512] Ibid.
[1513] Ibid.
[1514] Ibid.
[1515] Ibid., 85, 86, 87.
[1516] Ibid., 85.
[1517] Ibid., 85, 86.
[1518] Ibid., 85.
[1519] From: T. T. Churton and Others. To: the Editor of the 'Tracts for the Times.' 8 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 59-60. Also see: Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 171*f.* Also see: Herring, *What was the Oxford Movement?* 62-3.

no new material and, as a consequence, no new conclusions with respect to Tractarian doctrine. The doctrinal continuity of the Oxford Movement rested in the apostolic succession, which guaranteed the legitimacy of the Sacraments and was the sign of the visible Catholic Church extant in England.[1520] In turn, there existed in the Church of England the measures against which a genuine continuity was to be made: these were the Primitive Church and the Caroline Divines. What was new in *Tract 90* was not Newman's employment of the Divines or the *Homilies* to support his argument. Nor was it his use of Burnet, nor even of citing the Canons of the Council of Trent as authorities.[1521] Rather, *Tract 90* was a collection of Newman's arguments, thoughts and dissertations, which had been published since 1833. It was a synthesis of ideas taken from their original context and presented as substantive evidence to support the 'new' *Via Media.* Any notion that the Tract produced innovatory conclusions belied the fact that each section remained faithful to the fundamental Tractarian tenets. The evidence that Newman considered *Tract 90* to be a synthesis was found in his March 1841 letter to Bishop Bagot. Newman wrote that, in defence of *Tract 90*, he would present illustrations from earlier Tracts to demonstrate that consistent arguments had been maintained.[1522] He noted the concern that his reflections on the Articles appeared to "…betray a leaning towards Roman Catholic error, and a deficient appreciation of our own truth… ."[1523] To establish that this apprehension had "…no foundation in fact…,"[1524] Newman proposed to substantiate his statements in *Tract 90* with "…extracts from what I have before now

---

Also see: William Goode, *Tract XC. Historically Refuted; or, a Reply to a Work by Rev. F. Oakeley, Entitled, "The Subject of Tract XC. Historically Examined."* (London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1845), 2*f.*

[1520] Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity.* 160-1.

[1521] Indeed *Tract 90* was not the first attempt to establish a continuity between Catholic Truths enshrined in Primitive Christianity and the doctrines of the Church of England. Attempts had been made in earlier works by Christopher Davenport (1598-1680) and Samuel Wix (1771-1861). Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity*. 149*f*. Also see: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 137-8. Also see: Chadwick, "A Consideration of Newman's Apologia", *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement,* Paul Vaiss, editor (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing Publishing, 1996), 170-1.

[1522] To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries,* VIII: 131.

[1523] Ibid.

[1524] Ibid.

written on the subject, which, while they can be open to no suspicion of having been provided to serve an occasion, will, by being now cited, be made a second time my own."[1525] He made no less than eleven references to earlier Tractarian works. Included were references to Keble's *Tract 89*, Isaac William's *Tracts 80* and *87*,[1526] along with Newman's own *Tracts 75*,[1527] *72*,[1528] and *71*.[1529] Also included were substantial excerpts from *Cosin's Devotions*,[1530] *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*,[1531] and the *British Critic*.[1532] Here was the evidence that Newman had indeed written nothing new, nor had he expressed any opinions at variance with those he had previously made. His letter to Bishop Bagot again demonstrated the Tractarian precept of presenting material that was not at variance with what had been written previously. To have done so would have called into question the Tractarian doctrines which rested on a set of unvarying tenets, measured against, as always, the blessed antiquity of the Church of the Fathers.[1533] By his own words to Bishop Bagot Newman demonstrated that he knew only too well that the arguments needed to be consistent, despite his own opinion on matters of doctrine.

The letter to Bishop Bagot, written after *Tract 90*, showed that, as with his letter to Jelf, Newman had not abandoned either the precepts or the methodology by which he determined the legitimacy and Catholicity of the Church of England. It has been

---

[1525] Ibid.
[1526] Ibid., 132.
[1527] Ibid., 133, 139.
[1528] Ibid., 135.
[1529] Ibid., 139.
[1530] John Cosin, *A Collection of Private Devotions: In the Ancient Practice of the Church Called the Hours of Prayer: As They Were Much After This Manner Published by Authority of Queen Elizabeth, 1560* (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1838), xi-xiii. Cited in: To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 133.
[1531] Newman, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. I: 40-3, 44-5, 47-8, 211-3, 265. Cited in: To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 138-9.
[1532] Newman, "Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *British Critic* (January, 1840). Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*. II: 12-14, 53-9. Cited in: To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 29 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 139-40.
[1533] Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity.* 153*f.*

conclusively established that in *Tract 90* evidence existed to demonstrate that the Tract contained material that was not original,[1534] nor was the material employed in a novel manner.[1535] In the Tract, Newman made the observation "…that in several places the writer has found it convenient to express himself in language recently used, which he is willing altogether to make his own."[1536] Moreover, these passages were to be "…distinguished…by quotation marks."[1537] Newman only cited one of his earlier works by name, *Tract 82*, concerning subscription to the *Homilies*.[1538] Other major works appeared anonymously. It was noteworthy that this was the case particularly with respect to the most controversial of the major doctrines that he addressed. For example, with respect to Article XI, which directed that justification could be achieved by faith alone, Newman sought to distinguish the different roles of baptism and faith as instruments of justification.[1539] In seeking to distinguish the roles, he cited an excerpt from the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification.*[1540] Concerning the doctrine of Purgatory (Article XXII) Newman carefully drew the distinction between the Romish doctrine and the primitive doctrine.[1541] This was not a new argument; he had made this careful delineation in his earlier work, *Tract 78*.[1542] The doctrine of transubstantiation presented a major difficulty for Newman as Article XXVIII stated that Christ was spiritually present in the Communion and his Body was received and eaten in faith. Newman argued that Christ was locally present in heaven and yet in some unknown way was simultaneously present

---

[1534] It is not the intention at this point to re-present a substantial overview of the evidence presented throughout the thesis, rather it is to merely note that such material exists.
[1535] See reference above to the comparable methodologies used in constructing the four *Catena Patrum* and *Tract 90*.
[1536] Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 3.
[1537] Ibid., Introduction. Paragraph 3. Note: Evidence presented in this thesis has demonstrated that this was not always the case.
[1538] Ibid., Section 11. Paragraph 2.
[1539] Ibid., Section 2. Paragraph 5.
[1540] Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 226
[1541] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 6. §1. Paragraph 1.
[1542] Newman, *Tract 79. On Purgatory.* (*Against Romanism, - No. 3.*)Part ß 1. *STATEMENT OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY*. Paragraph 3.

in the Eucharist.[1543] This statement, however, came from a long excerpt taken from an 1838 letter addressed to Godfrey Faussett, an extract which ran to some nine paragraphs.[1544] That Newman's arguments were not in any way new might also be observed in the Conclusion to the Tract in which all but one of his summary points could be traced to his earlier works.[1545] Conclusively, therefore, it could be determined that no new arguments, little new material and, with one minor exception, no new conclusions were drawn in *Tract 90*.

The final matter of contention, which needed to be addressed, was the assertion that *Tract 90* not only demonstrated Roman Catholic inclinations, but also marked the beginning of Newman's relentless journey to Rome. Much of the recent scholarship to support this assertion came from Rune Imberg, Frank M. Turner and George Herring. Imberg had endeavoured to demonstrate that through alterations made to the different editions of the *Tracts for the Times* Newman was attempting to "Romanise" them.[1546] Imberg's based his efforts to substantiate his claims on a small selection of the Tracts, concentrating particularly on an analysis of *Tract 15*, which he subjectively found the "most interesting."[1547] Imberg questioned Newman's account in the *Apologia* of his drift towards Rome based on his study of the different editions of the Tracts.[1548] Imberg also made the startling claim that Newman could have hardly believed everything he had written in *Tract 90*.[1549] He did not provide any substantive evidence to support this

[1543] Newman, *Tract 90*. Section 8. Paragraph 22.
[1544]Ibid. Section 8. Paragraphs 22-31. Also see: Newman, "A Letter Addressed to the Rev. Margaret Professor of Divinity, on Mr. R. Hurrell Froude's Statements Concerning the Holy Eucharist, and Other Matters Theological and Ecclesiastical", *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. II: 229*f.*
[1545] See Section 17 of this thesis.
[1546] Imberg, *Tracts for the Times: A Complete Survey of all the Editions. Passim*.
[1547] Ibid., 143. See Section 7 of this thesis for an analysis of Imberg's arguments.
[1548] Imberg, "Who, Then, Was Dr. Newman?", *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*. 199.
[1549] Ibid.

statement.[1550] Evidence that Imberg had moved beyond rigorous historical methodology might also be observed in his claim that both the *Tracts for the Times* and the *Apologia* should be examined less from a theological view and more from a psychological aspect.[1551] Any such examination must be questioned. Some one hundred and fifty years on from the events surrounding Newman's translation to the Roman Catholic Church, it is almost impossible for any writer in the late twentieth or early twenty-first century to gain any accurate insight into his thinking or emotional state.

The same criticism might be levelled against Frank M. Turner whose work relied far too much on modern psychological analysis and far less on accepted historical method.[1552] Turner's criticisms of Newman, especially as he presented himself in the *Apologia*, all too often relied on sources which were, at best, questionable.[1553] Imberg and Turner made no apparent attempt to verify Newman's statements in the *Apologia* by reviewing documents from the time of the publication of *Tract 90* and Newman's subsequent conversion to Rome. Given that the Tract did take the *Via Media* to the very verge of Roman Catholic doctrinal thought, it could be argued that the proof for Newman's Romeward movement was intrinsically evident in the document. However, this denied the evidence available, not from Newman, but from correspondence to him by others with impeccable Anglican credentials. The veracity of the events recorded in the *Apologia* might be demonstrated by the events that led to the writing of *Tract 90*. Newman reflected that Wiseman's article in the *Dublin Review* had caused disquiet amongst the Oxford men.[1554] He considered that a

[1550] Ibid.
[1551] Ibid.
[1552] Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*. 425-36 & *passim*. This methodology has been reviewed uncritically by Nockles, See: Nockles, "The Oxford Movement", *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*. 14
[1553] George W. Rutler, "Newman's Own Church - John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion - Book Review", *National Review* (14 October, 2003) http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1282/is_19_54/ai_92049030: retrieved 5 March, 2008. Rutler noted that among Turner's 'authorities' were Newman's two hostile brothers.
[1554] Newman, *Apologia*. 131.

"…firm and powerful control was necessary to keep men straight…(and)…the reins had broken in my hands."[1555] Notable among the Newman acolytes and Catholic extremists were W. G. Ward and Frederick Oakeley. It was to these and other young Tractarians that Newman addressed *Tract 90*.[1556] If this were a revision of history by Newman, it would not be supported by documents from 1841. This was verified not only by Newman's correspondence,[1557] but also more importantly by Bishop Bagot, one whose Anglican credentials were unimpeachable.[1558] The cordiality of the correspondence between the two and the genuine affection and respect that each showed to the other was evidence that both men trusted each other implicitly.[1559] The evidence available in *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* depicted not only the context of the *Tract 90* 'row'[1560] but also Newman's psychological and emotional state.[1561] The correspondence indicated Newman believed there had been a satisfactory outcome regarding the *Tract 90* affair as his letter of qualification required by Bagot had not only contained "…a good many bits of Catholicism…" but these had "…*now* come out with the Bishop's sanction."[1562] Two letters addressed to Mary Holmes in August 1841 demonstrated that Newman was deeply disappointed that she had chosen to become a Roman Catholic.[1563] These were hardly the sentiments of one who was disaffected with the Church of

---

[1555] Ibid.
[1556] Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times.* 92.
[1557] To: R. W. Jelf. 13 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 88. Part 1. *n.* 2. To: E. B. Pusey. 23 July, 1841. Ibid. 228-9. Newman told Pusey he had "… just managed to stop two men from going over to Rome." Also see: Ker, *Newman,* 216.
[1558] From: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 2 April, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* 144. Bagot acknowledged that Newman's willingness to write a letter to him which qualified the contents of *Tract 90* would "…regulate friends… ."
[1559] From: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 19 March, 1841. Newman, Ibid. 100. To: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 20 March, 1841. Newman, Ibid. 100-1.
[1560] Noted his diary on 27 February, 1841 Newman wrote that "…this was the first day of the No. 90 row…" This was an addition to his *Chronological Notes* added in the mid 1870s. Ibid. 45.
[1561] Newman did not generally express his emotions overtly. His state of mind is gleaned from the letters and diary notes read as a whole. That he made few remarks of a personal nature may be taken from a letter to his aunt, Elizabeth Newman. In the correspondence he notes that it is not something he would normally do. To: Elizabeth Newman, 27 June, 1841. Ibid. 213.
[1562] To: John Keble (I), 1 April, 1841. Ibid. 148-9. In this letter to Keble Newman described his mood as one of being in good spirits and "jubilant".
[1563] To: Miss Holmes. 8 August & 15 August 1841. Ibid. 238-9, 247-8.

England. On the contrary, the correspondence post *Tract 90* demonstrated the desire of Newman to continue his work "…to kindle love for the national Church *and yet* to inculcate a Catholic tone…" which was "…the great cause we all have at heart."[1564]

Newman's critics did believe his sincerity. Despite the censure of *Tract 90* by the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses and Proctors,[1565] even this was not done with complete conviction to its appropriateness. Philip Wynter (1793-1871), the Vice-Chancellor, wrote to Pusey. He thought it "…wrong in advocating any *particular* censure now of any individual connected with…(Tractarianism)…but I believe it to be my duty… ."[1566] Wynter went on to describe his respect and esteem for the Tract-writing party and for Pusey in particular.[1567] Other correspondence also reflected both the Movement and Newman far from being in any crisis caused by the uproar over *Tract 90*. Pusey corresponded with Keble and commented that he was "…very calm…,"[1568] an observation also made by Arthur Perceval (1799-1853) who, writing to Newman, noted his "…inward satisfaction and peace of mind which the testimony of your own conscience affords you… ."[1569] Newman's life exhibited normalcy in other ways, for, despite theological controversies and sectarian differences, personal inter-relationships were often of quite a different nature. In July 1841, Newman received a visit from Nicholas Wiseman who "…stopped for an hour…" during which time they "…did not

[1564] To: J. W. Bowden. 4 April, 1841. Ibid. 154-5. This letter was important for several reasons. It demonstrated that Newman felt *Tract 90* had been well received by even the more "sanguine" of friends, citing Thomas Keble, Prevost and Moberley. Moreover, Newman wrote that, after he published his letter of qualification, Bagot had given it his "unqualified approbation." These are sentiments of one who felt secure in his theological position, his position in the Church and his standing in the Movement.
[1565] Censure on Tract 90. At a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses, and Proctors, in the Delegates' Room, March 15, 1841. Ibid. 77-8.
[1566] From: Philip Wynter to E. B. Pusey. 13 March, 1841. Ibid. 74-5.
[1567] Ibid., 74-5.
[1568] From: E.B.Pusey to J. Keble. 17 March, 1841. Ibid. 96.
[1569] From A. P. Perceval. 19 March, 1841. Ibid. 112.

talk on any religious subject… ."[1570] At the height of the *Tract 90* crisis Bishop Bagot called on Newman twice to view the building of the chapel at Littlemore.[1571] These few examples were but a small pastiche of the available primary documentary evidence. What each demonstrated was that revisionary history viewed through the perspective of the twentieth or twenty-first centuries might produce a distorted view of events. Most particularly and perhaps most importantly, writers such as Turner and Imberg failed to attend to the primary evidence. This in turn produced distorted historical interpretations of the events.[1572] Misinterpretation also occurred in respect of Newman's mindset. Rather than attempting to interpret Newman's psychological state in 1840 from a historian's position in the early twenty-first century, reference to the primary evidence would demonstrate that Newman was in high spirits. His relationship with Bishop Bagot was excellent. Indeed, despite the public censure by Wynter *et al*, there was a strong personal feeling of good will towards the Tractarians extant throughout the university.

It has been demonstrated that *Tract 90* contained no new material which led to new conclusions, neither had the material been changed by Newman for the purposes of his own argument. Additionally, it has been shown that any attempts by modern historians to conclusively determine the state of Newman's mind in 1840, or to determine the milieu in the university or the Church, were inadequate. Moreover, modern historical method failed to answer two further essential questions. Was the censure of *Tract 90* by the Bishops the reason for both the end of the Tracts and the beginning of Newman's disaffection with the Church of England? Did *Tract 90* signal the end of the Oxford

---

[1570] To: E. B. Pusey. 23 July, 1841. Ibid. 228-9. (Also see Newman's diary note on p. 226.)
[1571] Diary note: "The Bishop and party came over to see the chapel." 25 February, 1841. Ibid. 44. Also see: diary note of 10 March, 1841. Ibid. 64.
[1572] For a balanced review of Turner's book, see: Rutler, "Newman's Own Church - John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion - Book Review", *National Review*. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1282/is_19_54/ai_92049030: retrieved 5 March, 2008. Both Turner and Nockles have high praise for Imberg's work. See: Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*. 664. Also see: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 24.

Movement? Opinion was strongly divided with respect to each question. In the context of this study, it was important to consider both. The bishop's *Charges* gave an insight into the primary grounds for disquiet over *Tract 90*, not only amongst the episcopacy, but also within the Church as a whole. A brief consideration of exactly what was the Oxford Movement places clearly into context the importance of *Tract 90* and the subsequent events of 1845.

The bishop's *Charges* censuring *Tract 90* have been the subject of extensive study, not the least being that of William Simcox Bricknell (*d.* 1888) whose volume on the *Charges* was a substantial work.[1573] Bricknell listed thirty-eight *Charges*[1574] ostensibly directed against the Oxford Movement and most particularly *Tract 90*. Bricknell illustrated his sentiments by titling one chapter 'Remedies for the Evils of the Tractarian Movement.'[1575] A later biographical work by Richard H. Hutton (1826-97) noted twelve *Charges* that were vehemently anti-Tractarian.[1576] Volumes VIII and IX of *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* included seventeen *Charges*[1577] which, Gerard Tracey[1578] noted, contained "…those passages which bear upon Tractarian teaching and upon *Tract 90* in particular…Charges which paid no attention to the controversy…are ignored."[1579] Both Hutton and Tracey place the number of bishop's censures against the Tractarians at a far lower number than Bricknell. It suited the purposes of the anti-Tractarian Bricknell to portray the Oxford Movement as one without theological integrity and lacking the support of the bishops and clergy.[1580] He did this by over-emphasising the judgement of

---

[1573] W. Simcox Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops Upon Tractarian Theology* (London: Simpkin & Marshall, 1845), *Passim.*
[1574] Ibid., v-vi.
[1575] Ibid., 644*f.*
[1576] Richard H. Hutton, *Cardinal Newman* (London: Methuen & Co., 1891), 150-1.
[1577] Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: Appendix 5.569*f.* And: Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* IX: Appendix 2. 605.*f.*
[1578] Editor of Volumes VII, VIII and IX, the latter in conjunction with Francis J. McGrath.
[1579] Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 569. *n.* 1.
[1580] Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops Upon Tractarian Theology*. Advertisement.

the episcopacy against the Tractarians. Some Tractarians reflected on the apparently overwhelming censure of *Tract 90*. William Copeland (1804-85) considered that the bishops and Heads of Houses were persecuting Newman.[1581] Dean Church wrote that the "…public language of the greater part of the Bishops…specially directly against the foremost man of the party…(determined)…the fate of the party at Oxford… ."[1582] Both Copeland and Church sought to explain Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism by over-accentuating the judgements of the bishops. The contemporary historian Peter Nockles accepted that the majority of bishops censured *Tract 90*. He noted that Newman "recalled bitterly"[1583] the rejection of the Tract by the bishops. Newman wrote he "…considered that after the Bishop's Charges and the general disavowal of the Tract on the part of the Clergy, it was not for me to represent or attempt to champion, the Church to which I belonged."[1584] However, Nockles generally relied on much later documents rather than those from 1841-2.[1585] *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* offer a quite different depiction of the Tractarians' attitudes towards the bishop's *Charges*, one which was far more complex and which would not permit any gloss that was one dimensional in nature.

The accepted wisdom (one adopted by Nockles)[1586] that the majority of bishops condemned *Tract 90* was plainly not the case. The seventeen *Charges* included in the two volumes of *The Letters and Diaries* were a far more accurate representation of the Bishop's responses than that presented by Bricknell.[1587] There were thirty-nine sees in England,

[1581] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 299.
[1582] Richard W. Church, *The Oxford Movement* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2004), 166.
[1583] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 296.
[1584] Birmingham Oratory, Newman Papers, Ms note, 7 April 1863. Cited in: Ibid. 294.
[1585] Ibid., 294*f*. In this he has done what Imberg accused Newman of doing, using later reflections to gloss over earlier realities.
[1586] Ibid., 296.
[1587] Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops Upon Tractarian Theology*. v-vi.

Ireland and Wales extant in 1841.[1588] The seventeen censures did not represent a majority of the bishops, nor must it be assumed that the *Charges* were universal in their opinion. The Evangelical Daniel Wilson (1778-1858) lamented that many of the bishop's *Charges*, which condemned Tractarian doctrine and the division within the Church caused by them, so often also expressed "…respect for the motives of the movement party, as greatly to weaken the effect of their reproof."[1589] The High Churchman Samuel Wilberforce (1805-73) wrote to his brother, Robert, that the Bishop of Winchester, Charles Sumner (1790-1874), charged "…against the *dangers* he forsees in the Oxford views, rather than against the men."[1590] Wilberforce also considered that Sumner's *Charge* contained "…too little *Church* in his conscientious opposition to the Tract errors."[1591] The anti-Tractarian William Goode (1801-68) considered that Bishop Bagot was "a weak" man, "…evidently completely taken in by the representations of the Tractarians."[1592] Further confusion was caused by the remarks of William Gladstone (1809-98) who noted that he was "…firmly persuaded there never was an uproar, and there never were censures, which were more ascribable to the manner and language of a publication as contrasted with its substance."[1593] This observation, along with other remarks expressed *circa* 1841-2, demonstrated that opinions varied widely, both as to the effectiveness of the bishop's *Charges* and the reaction to them. There was overwhelming evidence to suggest that Bricknell's interpretation of the *Charges*, with respect to their meaning and intent, was prejudiced. One bishop who censured the content of *Tract 90*,

---

[1588] Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England c. 1800-1870* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 160 & *passim*.
[1589] Daniel Wilson, *Our Protestant Faith in Danger* (London: 1850), 9. *Christian Observer* (October, 1850): 716. Cited in: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 298.
[1590] Arthur R. Ashwell, *Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford and Afterwards of Winchester: with selections from his diaries and correspondence* (London: John Murray, 1880), 202.
[1591] Ibid.
[1592] LPL, Golightly Papers, Ms 1804, fol. 102-3. W. Goode to C. P. Golightly, 9 June, 1842. Cited in: Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 298.
[1593] D. C. Lathbury, *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*, 2 Volumes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910), I: 281.

but did not question the sincerity or integrity of Newman, was John Kaye (1783-1853), Bishop of Lincoln. Kaye, an Evangelical, stated in his *Charge* that he could not understand the motives of "…the learned writer to put forth the Tract."[1594] The bishop deemed the intent of Newman publishing the Tract was to address those who were "…in danger of straggling in the direction of Rome."[1595] Kaye expressed surprise "…that he should be most anxious to prevent their secession; though I must be allowed to express my regret that he did not resort to another mode of preventing it… ."[1596] Finally, Kaye considered the National Church was exposed to the danger of division and party strife caused by the "…differences of opinion which divide its members… ."[1597] In essence, Kaye described the view of many of the bishops, that, for whatever good intention Newman wrote *Tract 90*, he was misguided. The Tract was doctrinally unsound[1598] and despite its stated intent, defections to Rome continued.[1599] Jelf had signalled the probability of division within the Church three years earlier. He reacted to *Tract 90* by proclaiming that henceforth there would be "…Puseyites and AntiPuseyites…(i)n fact there will be a quasi-Schism…," a situation which Newman had "…in no slight degree (been) instrumental in bringing it to pass… ."[1600] Bagot was also concerned about the prospect of division and called for peace within the Church, "…not merely for any crisis of opinions, but for that tremendous final contest between good and evil… .[1601] The most scholarly *Charge* came from Henry Phillpotts (1778-1869), the Bishop of Exeter, an

---

[1594] From J. Kaye, *The Bishop of Lincoln's Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese, at his Lordship's Triennial Visitation in 1843*, as published in the *Oxford University City, and Country Herald*, Thursday 12 October 1843. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* IX: Appendix 2. §5. 639.
[1595] Ibid.
[1596] Ibid.
[1597] Ibid., 641.
[1598] Ibid., 638-41.
[1599] Ibid., 639. Bricknell does not cite Kaye's more positive sentiments towards Newman, Sumner was Bricknell's bishop whose *Charge* motivated him to write his book. See: Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops Upon Tractarian Theology*. Advertisement & *passim*. Bricknell's perceptions of Sumner's views were apparently different to those of Wilberforce (see above).
[1600] From: R. W. Jelf to Newman. 15 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* XIII: 89-90.
[1601] [R. Bagot] *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford by Richard Bagot, D.D., Bishop of Oxford, and Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter; at his Fourth Visitation, May, 1842.* Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* IX: Appendix 2. §1. 605.

old-fashioned High Churchman. His censure went into considerable detail addressing the content of *Tract 90*, including Newman's claim that the Articles pre-dated the Tridentine Canons, a claim Phillpotts contested.[1602] Phillpotts defended the Reformers and the English Reformation, declared Newman's principles for interpreting the Articles "unsound"[1603] and expressed deep concern at the agitation caused by *Tract 90*, one which led parties within the Church to "excesses."[1604] The *Charge* was not avowedly anti-Tractarian, for while he disputed Newman's interpretation of the Articles Phillpotts also expressed his

> …own deep sense of the debt which the Church owes to them. (They)…having most largely contributed, by their energy, and by exciting the zeal and energy of others, to that revival of a spirit of enquiry into the doctrines of the primitive Fathers, into the constitution of the Church of Christ, and, generally, into matters of high importance to the cause of the Gospel Truth, which has spread with a rapidity wholly unexampled since the days of Cranmer.[1605]

Along with many other bishops, Phillpotts' response was far from totally condemnatory; his *Charge* contained the further observation that the Tracts had provided a welcome stimulus to the Church with respect to acknowledging the importance of the Sacraments.[1606] He was not alone in these sentiments. Bagot had previously expressed his deepest respect for the Tract writers, as well as his thanks for all the good that had

---

[1602] From: [H. Phillpotts], *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, at the Triennial Visitation in June, July, August and September, 1842. By Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter.* Ibid. §8. 655-6.
[1603] Ibid., 653.
[1604] Ibid.
[1605] Ibid., 653. Austin Cooper made the observation that many of the bishops had not read the *Tracts*. See: Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record*. 356. However, it was apparent that they had read each other. These words were repeated by many other bishops. One who did so almost verbatim in his 1842 *Charge* was Edmund Knox (173-1849), Bishop of Limerick. Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops Upon Tractarian Theology*. 133*f*., 161.
[1606] From: [H. Phillpotts], *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, at the Triennial Visitation in June, July, August and September, 1842. By Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter.* Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* IX: Appendix 2. § 8. 653.

resulted from the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*.[1607] Along with the deepest respect shown by the bishops towards the Tractarians, here was in essence also an acknowledgement of the good achieved by the publication of the Tracts.[1608]

The publication of *Tract 90* effectively ended the series of *Tracts for the Times*. This was not the intention of Newman or the Tractarians. Bagot's immediate response to *Tract 90* was not to request Newman to end the Tracts but rather a discontinuation "…of discussion upon the Articles in the Tracts for the Times… ."[1609] Two further Tracts were planned, one on the *Apocrypha*, the other a continuation of Keble's *Tract 89* on "The Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church." It was Bagot's wish that the Tracts should cease after their publication.[1610] Pusey agreed to the bishop's request that his Tract on the *Apocrypha* be "dropped" and also wrote to the bishop that the second part of Keble's *Tract 89* would be published as a separate work, not as *Tract 91*.[1611] Newman was of a different opinion, he wrote to Keble that he wished to publish the Tract on mysticism in a sixth volume of the *Tracts for the Times*, along with his letter to Jelf as a preface, observing that it would make "…a very fair volume."[1612] These different letters from Pusey and Newman effectively described the differences in the Tractarian party post *Tract 90*, those who wished to comply fully with the wishes of the bishops to prevent further strife and those who wished to continue the cause. Newman considered that his

---

[1607] [R. Bagot] *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford by Richard Bagot, D.D., Bishop of Oxford, and Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter; at his Fourth Visitation, May, 1842.* Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* IX: Appendix 2. §1. 607.

[1608] Many, although not all of these comments were included in Bricknell's book. However, his analysis and codification of the *Charges* has meant that none are included as whole documents. This in turn has meant that comments are taken out of context, positive observations are separated from their context and *Charges* which are mild in their criticism of the Tractarians appear to be vehemently opposed. This was particularly the case with Bagot's *Charge*. See: Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops Upon Tractarian Theology*. 133*f*.

[1609] From: Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 19 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 100.

[1610] Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 115. *n*. 2. See also: Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey.* II: 192.

[1611] From: E. B. Pusey to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford. 28 March, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 127-8

[1612] To: John Keble. 5 April, 1841. Ibid. 155-6.

letter to Bishop Bagot "…had the effect of bringing the preponderating *authority* of the Church on our side."[1613] He considered that even though *Tract 90* had been suppressed the other "…Tracts are not *suppressed*."[1614] "No stopping the Tracts can humanly speaking, stop the spread of opinions which they have inculcated."[1615] Writing to Edward Coleridge (1800-83) Newman did acknowledge that "…the sum total of relief and comfort which Tract 90 has given does not equal the sum total of annoyance it has afflicted – I have no misgivings about it, nor have I had."[1616] Newman declared his actions to have been "necessary."[1617] Here was overwhelming evidence to suggest that Newman, in the aftermath of the *Tract 90* affair, did believe that he had assuaged the concerns of the bishops to the point that they could now support him. He believed that the cause in publishing the Tract was both just and necessary, and that there was little reason to curtail the publication of further pamphlets, Tracts in all but name only.[1618]

The period following the publication of *Tract 90* was one of some turmoil for Newman, yet the day after his letter to Bishop Bagot had been issued he wrote to Thomas Mozley and noted that "…things are mending."[1619] He further noted that William Sewell (1804-74) was "getting up" a declaration "…in favour of the Tracts…" which would be signed by the "*Heads of Houses*" and contained a "…statement authorised by the Vice-Chancellor

---

[1613] To: Ambrose Lisle Phillipps. 8 April, 1841. Ibid. 165-6.
[1614] Ibid.
[1615] Ibid.
[1616] To: Edward Coleridge. 10 April, 1841. Ibid. 168-9.
[1617] Ibid.
[1618] Although Newman was particularly concerned that a pamphlet by Keble on Catholic subscription to the *Articles* not be published. He considered that his principle of interpretation of the *Articles* had been accepted in that it had not been condemned. To: John Keble. 1 April, 1841. Ibid. 149. See also: John Keble. 9 April, 1841. Ibid. 167. This document, although printed, was not distributed widely. For the text see: John Keble, *The Case of Catholic Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles Considered: With Especial Reference to the Duties and Difficulties of English Catholics in the Present Crisis: In a Letter to The Hon. Mr. Justice Coleridge* (Printed Privately, 1841) http://anglicanhistory.org/keble/catholic_subscription.html: retrieved 19 January, 2009.
[1619] To: Thomas Mozley. 1 April, 1841. Ibid. 150-1.

that the Hebdomadal Act was *not* a theological censure."[1620] This and other letters dating up to April 1841 displayed Newman as one who was confident in his position theologically and as a member of the Church of England. There was no evidence to suggest that he was disillusioned with the Church, or that *Tract 90* controversy had seriously challenged his doctrines or theology. By late 1841, the situation had begun to deteriorate considerably. Newman's commitment to the Church of England had been challenged by the "…fearful business of the Bishop of Jerusalem…,"[1621] the Peter Young affair[1622] and the defeat of the Tractarian Isaac Williams (1802-65) in his attempt to secure the Professorship of Poetry.[1623] In November 1841 it was also apparent that Newman, writing to Henry Wiberforce, believed the bishop's *Charges* were "…sowing the seeds of further secessions…" nevertheless "…it seems there is something most unnatural and revolting about going over (to Rome) *suddenly* – unless indeed a miracle is granted."[1624] This statement reflected far more accurately Newman's state of mind than the evidence presented by Nockles who attempted to argue that Newman was withdrawing from public life in the Church of England because of the bishop's *Charges*.[1625] Such was not the case. Indeed, he also announced to Wilberforce that he would "publicly protest" the "…hideous Jerusalem affair… ."[1626]

Any attempt to single out the bishop's *Charges* as the prime motivation for Newman's later conversion to Rome needed to be questioned. The primary evidence demonstrated

---

[1620] Ibid., 150-1.
[1621] To: J.W. Bowden. 10 October, 1841. Ibid. 288-9.
[1622] Sumner had refused to ordain Keble's deacon-curate, Young, because of the latter's belief in the Real Presence. See especially: To: John Keble. 16 December, 1841. Ibid. 377-8. Young's dates are unknown but he was Keble's deacon-curate from 1841-57.
[1623] "Pusey's Circular in Support of I. Williams." 17 November, 1841. Ibid. 242.
[1624] To: Henry Wilberforce. 8 November, 1841. Ibid. 320-2.
[1625] Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*. 294. To support his argument Nockles cited a letter from Newman to Henry A. Woodgate (1801-74) which related much of what he had said in his letter to Wilberforce, written on the same day. See: To: H. A. Woodgate. 8 November, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 322.
[1626] To: Henry Wilberforce. 8 November, 1841. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.* VIII: 320-2.

that the *Charges* were a cause of major unease to Newman, but there were other issues of equal concern to him in the latter half of 1841. However, becoming evident was the first sign of doubt in Newman, for he also wrote to Wilberforce, "…I have no call at present to go to the Church of Rome; but I am not confident I may have some day."[1627] These were prophetic words. The conversion of Newman to Roman Catholicism on the 8 October 1845[1628] was, in effect a consequence of a number of episodes throughout his life, not the least of these being the publication and apparent rejection of *Tract 90*. However, there was no evidence to suggest that *Tract 90* was the prime catalyst for Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism. Evidence has demonstrated that the negative response to *Tract 90* was one of the many issues confronting him towards the end of 1841. Despite the contention by George Herring that Newman's conversion was not a catastrophe, rather the Oxford Movement at large continued to grow after Newman left the Church of England, he has missed the point.[1629] Newman's conversion did mean that the greatest Anglican mind of the nineteenth century was effectively taken from the Church of England. This was the "catastrophe" to which Richard Church referred.[1630] It was fitting that the intellectual driving force behind the Oxford Movement[1631] wrote the first and the last Tract. *Tract 1* was the clarion call to the Church of England to return to the "true grounds" on which its authority was built, "…OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT."[1632] *Tract 90* was effectively a synthesis of Newman's work. In this, it represented what the *Tracts for the Times* were: a series of documents that contained a principle of unity centred on Catholic Truth and *The Book of Common*

[1627] Ibid.
[1628] Newman, *Apologia*. 212.
[1629] Herring, *What Was the Oxford Movement?* 65*f*.
[1630] Church, *The Oxford Movement.* 226.
[1631] Ibid., 226-7.
[1632] Newman, *Tract 1*. Paragraph 6.

Prayer.[1633] The doctrinal integrity and continuity in the *Tracts for the Times* had not been previously, nor has it been since, repeated in such a systematic method within the Church of England. In this, they remain a series of unique documents, one which concluded with the ultimate reflection of Newman's consistency, integrity and single-mindedness in his intellectual quest to establish the National Church as the Catholic Church in England, *Tract 90*.

[1633] Cooper, "The Tracts for the Times", *Australasian Catholic Record*. 347. Also see: Newman, *Tract 90*. Introduction. Paragraph 3.