In 2019, the canonisation of John Henry Newman – an Anglican clergyman, an English thinker, a convert to Catholicism and a cardinal – took place. This article is an attempt to present selected ecclesiological themes in the thought of the new saint of the Catholic Church. It was also necessary to ask a question about the validity of ecclesiological diagnoses for contemporary Christianity.

2019 was associated with John Henry Newman for at least two reasons. Firstly, Pope Francis on 13 October last year, almost ten years after the beatification by Benedict XVI, canonized this English intellectual and convert to Catholicism. Secondly, in 2019, a decade passed after the current Pope announced the *Anglicanorum coetibus* apostolic constitution. It allowed the spiritual sons of John Henry Newman to convert to the Catholic Church when leaving the Church of England. However, despite these significant anniversaries and canonizations, it is difficult to notice a greater interest in the person and heritage of this 19th century cardinal in Polish theological literature. Translated works of Newman¹ and several studies of his thought are available.² The dates of these publications, however, indicate that there is little interest in John Henry Newman’s thought at the

---


beginning of the 21st century in Poland. English literature, on the other hand, abounds in studies devoted to the thought of this former preacher of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church in the suburbs of Oxford.3

It is impossible to present in this short article all the topics raised by John Henry Newman in the Anglican and Catholic parts of his life. The aim of this text is therefore to present selected ecclesiological themes in the writings of the new Catholic saint. The topic of the Church was one of the most frequently raised problems in the writings of the Anglican, and then Roman Catholic priest. This text will consist of three parts. At the beginning, the ecclesial context of Newman’s life will be presented – first from the Anglican and then from the Catholic perspective. In the second point, selected ecclesiological motifs raised by John Henry Newman in the context of announcing two dogmas: about the immaculate conception of Mary and about papal infallibility will be presented. Finally, an attempt will be made to theologically assess the position of the former Anglican in the context of the challenges facing the Catholic Church in the second decade of the 21st century. In other words, the question must be asked: does John Henry Newman still have something to say to contemporary Catholicism, or does he belong only to the beautiful past of the Church of the Victorian era?

Of course, the thought of this author can be dealt with by theologians from various theological fields. However, dogmatic theologians are particularly called upon to do so because John Henry Newman was primarily seeking the truth about the Church of Jesus Christ. This question about the Church, which the Master of Nazareth wanted to exist, is answered, above all, by two closely related areas: dogmatic and fundamental theology.

ECCLESIAL CONTEXT OF NEWMAN’S LIFE

John Henry Newman divided his life into two equal parts: Anglican (1801–1845) and Catholic (1845–1890). Thus, his life spanned almost the entire nineteenth century. It is difficult to understand Newman’s intellectual and spiritual search and the formation of his thought, ignoring the ecclesial context of the community from which he came, that is, the Church of England. It should be noted that ecclesiological thought, and therefore a certain self-definition of Anglicanism, remains an original and unprecedented phenomenon on the map of post-reformation theology. Anglicans themselves speak of themselves as Catholic and reformed, so they do not want to see the origin of their denomination in the 16th century.

Reformation movement. The Anglican theologian Mark Chapman pointed out that in the time of John Henry Newman many Anglican theologians looked at the British Reformation as a story that never happened. So the origins of the Church of England were not linked to Henry VIII’s decision on the act of supremacy. According to Michael Ramsey – the late Archbishop of Canterbury – royal supremacy did not mean that the English ruler became a source of Revelation or a doctrinal authority. Despite this, King Henry VIII, and most of all his successors, imposed a certain ecclesiastical style of power and doctrine, which the faithful had to accept.

Aidan Nichols noted that such a point of view becomes justified if one considers a certain “pre-history of the Reformation” in England. It consists, among others, of: the anti-papal law present in England already in the Middle Ages, the phenomenon of lollards criticizing the celibacy of the Latin clergy and Martin Luther’s ideas permeating from the continent to the British islands.

The tension between what is Catholic and what is reformed can be seen in the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican religion. According to the nineteenth article,

> [...] the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the 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.

For Anglicanism, what the Church under the leadership of Peter’s successor has lost, among other things, is Communion given in one form, the liturgy celebrated in Latin and the doctrine of Purgatory. The Church of England therefore wants to be a community whose faith is based solely on Scripture. Anglicanism has not proclaimed any new dogmas, but only recognises those developed in the first millennium of Christianity. At the same time, there is no one in Anglicanism who would at least resemble the role of Peter’s successor in the Catholic Church. This is neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor the British monarch. At the same time, it should be said that Anglican ecclesiology does not speak of one Church, one faith and one discipline. Anglicanism is more of a family of Church communities than an institutional and doctrinal monolith.

---

In the Anglican period of John Henry Newman’s life, clear symptoms of a crisis in the Church of England already started to appear. This crisis manifested itself in the question of what Anglicanism actually is? Is it a state Church whose purpose is to “serve” the religious needs of the subordinates of the British monarch? Is it perhaps called upon to carry out missionary activity? This last question was raised more and more loudly in the face of colonisation forming an empire “over which the sun never sets.” The final question was: is the Church of England just a liturgical-ceremonial museum or a community leading to salvation? These and similar questions came to be answered by an Anglican preacher from Oxford, who initially did so in the spirit of the apology of his spiritual homeland, that is Anglicanism.\(^8\) Gradually, however – and especially after reading the writings of the Fathers of the Church – John Henry Newman became convinced that the Church of England could not be the true Church wanted by Jesus Christ. John Henry Newman’s times as an Anglican were marked by questions about the identity of the Church of England in the face of the spreading liberalism. It was precisely the conformism towards this ideology that he spoke of from the pulpit of the Marian Church in Oxford:

\[
[...]
\]

people living in a given epoch are very rarely able to avoid the poison that prevails in their times. The real danger, however, lies in the conviction of our security, which is only due to the fact that we do not go as far as others and even protest against the extreme principles and intentions to which they refer.\(^9\)

The Anglican context of John Henry Newman’s life therefore can be contained in two expressions: first, the Church of England’s search for its own identity, the second one being liberalism.

On the Catholic side, the 19\(^{th}\) century was, above all, a time of intense observation of the papacy and of two events which, on both the Catholic and Protestant sides, influenced the theological perception of Peter’s successors. Firstly, in 1854 Pius IX announced the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. Secondly, in the years 1869–1870 the First Vatican Council was held. This council, first in three centuries after Trent, proclaimed the dogma of infallibility of the Pope. The dogmatic definition of the Pope was a reaction of the Church to many social and cultural changes resulting from the French revolution. Such effects include the liberalisation of entire societies. Before the Council, a survey


was conducted among bishops and only eight out of forty-seven believed that the Pope’s infallibility should be proclaimed as a dogmatic definition.\(^{10}\) The Council fathers agreed, however, that the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Church as proclaimed by the bishops in conjunction with the Bishop of Rome should be confirmed in the face of their contemporary world. For converts from Anglicanism, such as Henry Manning, reservations about papal infallibility meant obscuring the unambiguous Catholic doctrine. In other words, such ultramontanism was not only a certain theological path within Catholicism, but Catholicism \textit{per se}.

The Catholic Church, to which John Henry Newman converted, was a community which in the 19\(^{th}\) century adopted two dogmatic definitions: about the immaculate conception and, after stormy discussions, about papal infallibility. We can say, therefore, that the times of two converts from Anglicanism: Manning and Newman are a period of great discussion about the place and role of the papacy. Paradoxically, the discussion about these issues was at the same time the proverbial “bone of contention” on the theological grounds between Anglicanism and Catholicism.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF MARY AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY – THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL MEANING OF THE DOGMAS

John Henry Newman, the convert, also took a stand regarding these ecclesiologically important events. It should be mentioned that not only Catholics, but above all his former Anglican friends from the Oxford Movement, as well as others, were waiting for the voice of this converted Anglican. John Henry Newman openly defended his decision to convert to the Catholic Church:

\begin{quote}
From the time that I became a Catholic, of course I have no further history of my religious opinions to narrate. In saying this, I do not mean to say that my mind has been idle, or that I have given up thinking on theological subjects; but that I have had no changes to record, and have had no anxiety of heart whatever […]. Nor had I any trouble about receiving those additional articles, which are not found in the Anglican Creed.\(^{11}\)
\end{quote}

If the former Anglican Newman had no trouble accepting the new truths of the faith, then what arguments were in favour of accepting them? For, according


to Anglicans, the announcement of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary by the Pope alone, and not by the Council (collectively), is a significant problem in accepting and understanding this truth of the Catholic faith.\textsuperscript{12} The way this dogma is proclaimed affects, therefore, the vision of Catholic ecclesiology, and, moreover, the Pope becomes a figure who, on a one hand, can proclaim as dogma something that has so far been the subject of theological discussions.

Explaining the genesis of this Marian dogma John Henry Newman reached for biblical and patristic texts. In 1842 he arrived at Littlemore, where he began to write one of his life works, that is \textit{An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine}. He wrote the first pages as an Anglican and finished the work as a Catholic.\textsuperscript{13} John Henry Newman referred to the image of Mary as the second Eve. According to him, ancient Church writers Justin and Iraeneus showed that [Blessed Virgin Mary] not only had an office, but bore a part, and was a voluntary agent, in the actual process of redemption, as Eve had been instrumental and responsible in Adam’s fall. They taught that, as the first woman might have foiled the Tempter and did not, so, if Mary had been disobedient or unbelieving on Gabriel’s message, the Divine Economy would have been frustrated.\textsuperscript{14}

It became clear to John Henry Newman that after defining the role and position of Eve in man’s disobedience to God, it is necessary to point out the state and role of Mary in the economy of salvation.\textsuperscript{15} Commenting on the petitions of the Litany of Loreto, the convert argued for immaculate conception. He stated that Mary was the child of Adam and Eve, but as if from before the fall.\textsuperscript{16} The dogma of Mary’s immaculate conception was therefore for Newman not the result of a papal whim or his personal piety, but had a strong biblical and patristic argumentation. Importantly, John Henry Newman wrote about the immaculate conception some ten years before this truth was dogmaticised. He did not therefore justify Pius IX’s decision, but preceded it in his theology. In other words, it was not dogma that required the creation of arguments, but the arguments demanded the dogmatisation of immaculate conception.


\textsuperscript{13} This work is actually unfinished. This is evidenced by the rows of dots separating the ending written later. See W. Ostrowski, Książka z Littlemore, in: J.H. Newman, \textit{O rozwoju doktryny chrześcijańskiej}..., p. 5.


John Henry Newman wrote that the word “dogma” in his times had decidedly pejorative associations, since

[…] it is a familiar charge against the Catholic Church in the mouths of her opponents, that she imposes on her children as matters of faith, not only such dogmas as have an intimate bearing on moral conduct and character, but a great number of doctrines which none but professed theologians can understand, and which in consequence do but oppress the mind, and are the perpetual fuel of controversy.\textsuperscript{17}

One such dogma that affected the image of the Catholic Church was that of papal infallibility. In his letter to Duke of Norfolk, John Henry Newman argued in favour of papal infallibility, pointing out that it does not apply to every papal decision. He wrote in the form of rhetorical questions:

Was St. Peter infallible on that occasion at Antioch when St. Paul withstood him? was St. Victor infallible when he separated from his communion the Asiatic Churches? or Liberius when in like manner he excommunicated Athanasius? And, to come to later times, was Gregory XIII., when he had a medal struck in honour of the Bartholomew massacre? […] or Urban VIII. when he persecuted Galileo?\textsuperscript{18}

According to the convert, the Catholic doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope does not assume the absence of error or bad discernment in every papal decision. Infallibility concerns matters of faith and morals, and its criterion is, according to Newman, the ecclesial context of the Pope’s decision.

Commenting on the dogmatisation of the truth about the infallibility of the Pope, the former Anglican rightly pointed out that popes have always acted in unity with the Church, but in different ways in different centuries. Peter’s successor acted on some occasions before the rest of the hierarchy, sometimes after it, and sometimes at the same time, but he always spoke as the voice of the whole Church. According to John Henry Newman, the First Vatican Council defined that the Pope “is not only the head and organ in the sense of an instrument and a servant, that he has not only the right of protest and veto, that he is not only a co-operative force in judgments on faith, but rather the source of all this.”\textsuperscript{19}

On the basis of John Henry Newman’s position on the two dogmas proclaimed during his lifetime, a characteristic current in his ecclesiology can be outlined. One of his favourite themes was papacy, but not in the eyes of a historian or even an ecumenical theologian. Newman’s theology of the papacy had a significant impact on his perception of the Church. It is worth remembering that the future cardinal was critical of the papacy before his conversion, and afterwards he did not see the Pope as the absolute ruler of the doctrine of the Church. By defending papal infallibility, he could at the same time write without violating his conscience:

If I were to reduce religion to a toast after lunch (although this is certainly not the case), I would drink to the Pope, of course, but, if I may, first to Conscience and then to the Pope.”

This is an important remark when one considers the unquestionable reluctance of Anglicanism (including the modern one) towards the dogma of papal infallibility and the last two dogmatic truths about the Mother of Christ.

THE ATTEMPT OF THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

In 2005, when Benedict XVI was installed as the Bishop of Rome in the Lateran Cathedral, he briefly described the Pope’s position and his tasks in the Church. According to him,

[…] the Pope is not an absolute ruler whose thought and will are law. On the contrary: the Pope’s service is a guarantee of obedience to Christ and His word. The Pope is not supposed to proclaim his own ideas, but he must constantly unite himself and the Church in obedience to God’s Word, in the face of all attempts at adaptation or dilution and all forms of opportunism. […] The Pope is aware that in making momentous decisions, he is bound up with the great community of faith of all times, with binding the interpretations, formulated gradually at successive stages of the Church’s pilgrimage. His authority is therefore not above the word of God, but serves it […]

21 This dislike in the time of John Henry Newman was evidenced by a letter from William Gladstone, the former Liberal Prime Minister of England, who, after the adoption of the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, accused Catholics in England of disloyalty to the Bishop of Rome. The reason for the letter and the criticism it contained was the former Prime Minister’s misunderstanding of the teaching of the First Vatican Council.
These words of Benedict XVI correspond with the theology of the papacy drawn up earlier by the Catholic pen of John Henry Newman. According to the Anglican convert as well as the current retired Pope, looking at the Church and the Pope in terms of a corporation or business does not make it possible to grasp the whole theological specificity of the office of Peter’s successor in the Church.

The doctrine of relativism, which assumes non-existence or incomprehensibility of truth, is an example of such corporative approach to the Church and Peter’s successor. In such view the pope is not the guardian of truth, not even its owner, but its creator. The consequence of such assumption is incessant discussion about doctrine as well as perceiving the Pope as the one who can change everything. At present, the greatest expectations of the papacy in this sense are concentrated around the moral teaching of the Church. The question that John Henry Newman posed – can the Pope freely dispose of the Church’s teaching? – is asked, albeit in a slightly different form, also by non-Catholics. The first spiritual homeland of the Oxford preacher also posed a similar problem: is the moral teaching up to now unchanged and must it be the same everywhere? Anglicanism, which is a family of Church communities, has answered both questions negatively. An example of the reception of such an answer are the decisions made in the Anglican Communion on the ordination of women to the deaconate, presbyterate and episcopate23 and on the blessing of same-sex couples.24 We should note, however, the contemporary interest of Anglicans in the ministry of Peter’s successor. One example is the recent ecclesiological document of the Roman Catholic-Anglican dialogue entitled Walking together on the Way.25 James Hawkey noted that Anglicanism does not exclude primacy itself, as it were, per se, but asks about the place of Peter’s successor within the college of Bishops.26 For it is difficult to find in Anglicanism a person whose ministry resembles the office of Peter’s successor, a person who can be finally appealed to. Primacy known from the Catholic Church has been replaced in the Anglican practice of Church life by democratic structures which, after all, decide on doctrinal issues, such as the sacrament of Holy Orders given to women.

---


The contemporary interest in synodality on the Catholic side raises the question of the Pope’s role in conveying the revealed truth. Ultimately, this question boils down to a discussion on two dimensions of the Church: universal and local. Indirectly, it evokes the loud discussion that took place years ago between Walter Kasper and Joseph Ratzinger. For Kasper, the universal Church is the sum of the local churches, and for Ratzinger, it is in the local Churches that the universality of the Church community manifests itself. In other words, “The universal Church is before the local Churches, which are being established as concrete realisations of the universal Church.”27 Taking the opposite perspective may result in a kind of “Anglicanisation” of Catholicism. In this perspective, doctrinal or moral decisions will not be settled at the universal level, but will fall within the competence of local episcopates. As a result, traditional morality will apply in one part of the world, and in the other part, as a result of decisions made by some episcopates, morality will be adapted to the requirements of modern times. According to Joseph Ratzinger, however,

[…] the bishops now have to watch over the fulfilment of Jesus’ mandate to win disciples for Him from all nations and to carry the Gospel to the ends of the earth. […] they have a duty to act in such a way that the Church does not become a kind of association of local Churches existing side by side, but preserves its universality and unity.28

Following John Henry Newman, Joseph Ratzinger pointed out that no collegiate body in the Church votes on matters of truth, but acknowledges unity in the faith.29 This was apparent, for example, during the dispute with Arianism. The fight against Arianism for the truth about the Son of God was ultimately also a dispute about the credibility of the Church. She confesses the faith that Jesus was truly the Son of God not because the supporters of His divinity won the theological discussions on the subject but because He really was a true God and a true man.

Incidentally, it should be mentioned that there were efforts to compare Newman’s ecclesiology, including his defence of the dogma of the Pope’s infallibility, with Charles Darwin’s biology-based investigations. Certain truths about the Pope and the Church were supposed to be the result of a long doctrinal evolution. As Louis Bouyer pointed out, such an analogy was intended to discredit the work of John Henry Newman through, on the one hand, the apology of theological evolutionism and, on the other, the defence of biological evolutionism. These accusations, however, clash with the facts, because in his ecclesiology Newman drew

28 Ibidem, p. 31.
on Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. According to Louis Bouyer Newman, “does not neglect to recall that the Church does not proclaim dogma without reasons. The Church does so by being forced to oppose heretics.”30 Such contemporary “secular” heresies are the liberalism of Newman’s time and the relativism of Benedict XVI’s time. While ancient heretics dealt with God, contemporary heretics want to forget about Him as soon as possible. This results in a new outlook on the Church and the papacy. Liberalism and relativism want to create a contemporary secular ecclesiology, in which democracy will replace the concept of primacy, while infallibility will be granted to every human being.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

At this point it is necessary to return to the problem posed at the beginning: what selected themes can be found in John Henry Newman’s ecclesiology? Initially, it was necessary to point out a certain ecclesiastical context for the life of this new Catholic saint. On the Anglican side, liberalism was gaining in popularity during the Victorian era. The Anglicans themselves asked the question about the identity of their Church community. The future cardinal was growing and maturing theologically in such a climate. On the Catholic side, the 19th century was a time of ecclesiological discussions, culminating in the dogma of papal infallibility. Pius IX’s announcement of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary also says much about the papacy.

John Henry Newman, who was a witness of these two dogmas being announced, dealt with them in turn. Paradoxically, the truth about the Mother of Christ allowed the Pope to be portrayed not as the creator of Revelation, the doctrinal ruler, but as the guardian of the truth that the Church must have matured to understand. At the same time, Newman, the convert defended the dogma of infallibility, linking it to the mystery of the whole Church. The Pope is infallible in teaching the Church, but at the same time he himself is part of the Church. In Newman’s ecclesiology, the Pope is the lector of Revelation, not its creator. This was expressed by the future cardinal when he used a well-known anecdote about proposing the toasts for the Pope and conscience, or actually: for conscience and the Pope. This tale about toasts is not out of date nowadays either. Newman’s defence of the papacy has nothing to do with the ultramontanism of his time. Also today the proper understanding of the Pope’s role in the Church may be

jeopardised by placing the Pope above the Church, and thus attributing to Peter’s successor prerogatives concerning the revealed truth. The ecclesiology of the convert from Anglicanism may thus be of help in interpreting the true image of the Church of Christ.

John Henry Newman and his theology prove, however, impossible to be confined to church reliquaries or museums. That would be to the detriment not of Newman, but of those who would lock his thought in theological storehouses. The problems faced by Newman and those faced by modern Catholics and Anglicans are extremely similar. Liberalism and relativism want to see the Church and the Papacy in a distorted mirror. On the one hand, the democratisation of the Church should supposedly be the remedy for the problems of modern times, and on the other hand, this remedy should be the Pope’s misunderstood infallibility, giving Peter’s successors the right to change doctrinal and moral teaching. In view of these postulates, John Henry Newman’s work, and especially his ecclesiology, may be an aid in the correct theological understanding of the Church and her mission in the world at the beginning of the 21st century.
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**SELECTED ASPECTS OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN’S THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH**

**Summary**

John Henry Newman is one of the most famous person on the Catholic and Anglican Church. In his works he was writing on the both theological position. In the article author showed selected aspects of John Henry Newman’s theology of the Church, so-called ecclesiology. For understanding Newman’s theological position very important are his personal history in the Church of England, situation in the Catholic Church and two dogmas proclaimed during the life of this new Catholic saint. In the last part of the article the ecclesiology of John Henry Newman is rereading in the light of modern problems in the Catholic and Anglican theology.
JOHNA HENRY’EGO NEWMANA WYBRANE WĄTKI EKLEZIOLOGICZNE

Streszczenie


Słowa kluczowe: Newman, eklezjologia, teologia, papiestwo