I. TITLE

John Henry Newman’s Conception of the Schola Theologorum and the Ecclesial Vocation of Theology

II. THE PROBLEM

In 1874, John Henry Newman (1801-1890) penned his Letter to the Duke of Norfolk as a response to Prime Minister William Gladstone’s (1809-1898) published attacks on the newly-defined doctrine of papal infallibility. Gladstone argued that the definition promulgated by the dogmatic constitution, Pastor Aeternus (1870) would necessarily entail the “renunciation of moral and mental freedom” and provoke “civil disloyalty” among English Catholics.\(^1\) In his rejoinder, Newman took up Gladstone’s

---

\(^1\) Gladstone’s article, “Ritual and Ritualism,” was published in an October 1874 edition of the Contemporary Review 24 (1874): 663-81. It dealt primarily with controversies over ritualism in Anglicanism, but the controversy gave Gladstone the opportunity to decry “the effort to Romanise the Church and people of England.” Later in the article, he gestured to the conversion of long time political associate, Lord Ripon, to Roman Catholicism in September 1874 and wrote, “no one can become her [the Roman Church’s] convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy seat of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.” John Henry Newman, Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, ed. C. S. Dessain, et.al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961-2006) 27:122, n. 3.

charges one by one, allaying fears and correcting misunderstandings. By this he hoped to put the best possible face on the new dogma and mitigate ongoing neo-ultramontane interpretations advanced by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892).²

Most intriguing in Newman’s apologetic for the Vatican Council was his appeal to the ongoing interpretive work of what he called the *schola theologorum*—his own coined term for theologians in communal and collaborative endeavor—arguing that they alone would establish the true and final sense of the council’s definition. In his dedicatory remarks, Newman wrote,

> I deeply grieve that Mr. Gladstone has felt it his duty to speak with such extraordinary severity of our Religion and of ourselves. I consider he has committed himself to a representation of ecclesiastical documents which will not hold, and to a view of our position in the country which we have neither deserved nor can be patient under. None but the *Schola Theologorum* is competent to determine the force of Papal and Synodal utterances, and the exact interpretation of them is a work of time. But so much may be safely said of the decrees which

---

² A pastoral letter, promulgated by Archbishop Manning on 13 October 1870 indicates how little his views on papal infallibility had changed despite the council’s apparent mitigation of the Neo-Ultramontane position on the dogma. Manning includes under the umbrella of infallibility “all legislative or judicial acts, so far as they are inseparably connected with [the pope’s] doctrinal authority; as, for instance all judgments, sentences, and decisions which contain the motives of such acts as derived from faith and morals.” Manning continued, “Under this will come laws of discipline, canonization of Saints, approbation of religious Orders, of devotions, and the like; all of which intrinsically contain the truths and principles of faith, morals, and piety.” Henry Edward Manning, *The Vatican Council and its Definitions: A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy* (London, 1870) 89-90. Distressed that such a broad interpretation of *Pastor Aeternus* would leave little if anything outside the scope of the pope’s infallible prerogative, Newman penned a letter to Lady Simeon, a prominent member of Manning’s diocese, regarding her own expressed concerns. He wrote, “The archbishop only does what he has done all along—he ever has exaggerated things, and ever has acted toward individuals in a way which they felt to be unfeeling ... And now, as I think most cruelly, he is fearfully exaggerating what has been done at the Council...Therefore, I say confidently, you may dismiss all such exaggerations from your mind, though it is a cruel penance to know that the Bishop where you are, puts them forth. It is an enormous tyranny.” John Henry Newman, *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. C. S. Dessain, *et.al.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961-2006), 24:230.
have lately been promulgated, and of the faithful who have received them, that
Mr. Gladstone's account, both of them and of us, is neither trustworthy nor
charitable.³

While the specific nomenclature *schola theologorum* appears only infrequently
and comparatively late in the writings of Newman’s Roman Catholic career, his
conception of theology as a distinct ecclesial *munus* (“office”) within the church is
evident from his earliest writings as an Anglican Tractarian.⁴ A sensitive reading of that
Anglican work reveals how, from his use of the theological “schools” of Antioch and
Alexandria in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833) to his ecclesiological account of
theology in the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837) to the
collaborative theological work of the so-called “Oxford Movement” itself, Newman’s
conception of “theology” as an ecclesial function remains more or less constant but
achieves special florescence in his latter discussions of the *schola theologorum*. The
dissertation proposed here will make use of this fundamental insight to trace his
deployment of the concept and thereby thicken what are presently “thin” and contested
accounts of his thinking in this critical area.

---
⁴ In this proposal I use “Oxford Movement” and “Tractarianism” interchangeably to describe the
movement of certain High Church members Oxford theological faculty who from 1833 organized to
resource the Church of England in its early Christian and catholic heritage. Among the many initiatives of
the movement, publication of the ninety *Tracts for the Times* proved to be its central and most enduring
legacy. Because all the tracts excepting those authored by Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882), were
published under the name “Members of the Faculty”, the movement came to be called “Tractarianism” and
its authors and adherents were popularly described as “Puseyites” or “Tractarians”. I have adopted the latter
nomenclature here.
Thesis

My own proposed way into this project will be to examine afresh Newman’s conception of the office of theology as it appears contextually in his writings, beginning in the 1830s and continuing into the 1870s. I will treat both lexical and conceptual witnesses in the corpus of his work, attempting to account for potential sources and developments in his thought. Most importantly, I will explore Newman’s Anglican-Tractarian period as his early attempt to realize a local manifestation of the schola theologorum at the University of Oxford and argue that this experience, for good and for ill, grounds his later reflections as a Roman Catholic.

I propose to argue that beginning in 1833 and continuing to his last writings on the topic in 1877, John Henry Newman developed a coherent conception of theology as a distinct ecclesial office, proposing that its proper role was both hermeneutical and prophetic. My account of Newman’s conception of the schola theologorum reveals how he imagined the work of theologians to be a collaborative, communal interpretation of witnesses to divine revelation (scripture, sacred tradition, church practice, and the sensus fidelium). This grounded his belief that theology regulated “the whole church system” speaking in a “prophetic” mode, sometimes establishing, sometime clarifying, and sometimes even rectifying definitions of the magisterium.  

---

III. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THE CURRENT STATUS QUESTIONES

The present state of scholarly research suggests that the time is particularly ripe for a full treatment of Newman’s conception of the *schola theologorum* and his understanding of the ecclesial vocation of theology. The bare absence of such inquiry against the insuperable mountain of studies touching Newman’s life and thought would seem a *prima facie* justification for such a project, but even where the subject is passively treated as a discrete part of his theological method or in reflections on his theory of doctrinal development, those treatments have to the present been narrowly focused on the writings of his Roman Catholic period and lack proper historical contextualization and integration.\(^6\) As such, the present *status questiones* is underdeveloped and overly susceptible to tendentious and partisan uses of the most extreme sort.\(^7\) Lacking a specific historical touchstone in the connection between Newman’s Catholic reflection and his Anglican-Tractarian practice, interpreters have tended toward two equal and opposite errors. Progressive interpreters have tended to view Newman’s conception through the lens of the contemporary disjunct between church and academy. Exaggerating Newman’s

---

\(^6\) That this is a genuine lacuna in Newman studies is clear from a perusal of studies in foreign language works as well as in English. The most exhaustive treatment of Newman’s Anglican ecclesiology (or as he puts it, ecclesiologies) to date is that of Alain Thomasset, *L’Ecclésiologie De John Henry Newman Anglican (1816-1845)*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 197 (Leuven: Peters, 2006). Though Thomasset conducts a thorough examination of Newman’s *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church* in particular, he does so only to further his exploration of a developing ecclesiology in Newman from “Calvinist” to “Anglo-catholic” to a gradually emerging “Roman” theory. In his treatment of Newman and tradition, Günter Biemer can speak of “the teaching church” with reference to the apostles, bishops, councils, and the papacy, but has nothing to say about theologians. *Überlieferung und Offenbarung: die Lehre von der Tradition nach John Henry Newman* (Freiburg: Herder, 1961).

The two most important treatments of Newman’s theology and his understanding of doctrinal development, Jan-Hendrik Walgrave’s, *Newman, Le Developpement du Dogme* (Tournai-Paris: Casterman, 1957) and Nicholas Lash’s *Newman on Development: The Search for an Explanation in History* (Shepherdstown, WV: Patmos, 1975) contain little if any mention of theologians or the schola theologorum as an generative force for dogmatic progress.

\(^7\) Garry Wills’ deployment of Newman’s *schola theologorum* is noteworthy here for the way he exhausts the form, but it is important to note the clear continuity between his own view and those of more reputable expositors. See his *Papal Sin: Structures of Deceit* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 261-274.
concern for the independence of the theologian and positing a dissident role vis-à-vis the magisterium, these accounts sit uneasily with Newman’s own lifelong hostility toward secularism and theological liberalism.8 On the other hand, a preoccupation with Newman’s rejection of modernism and zeal for ecclesial authority has led conservative interpreters to suppress Newman’s emphasis on theology as a distinct munus and thereby risk removal of the very features that make his “prophetic office” prophetic.9 Finally, the majority treatments of the schola theologorum have largely appeared before the recently achieved “revisionist” consensus in Oxford Movement studies and thus do not reflect an adequate appreciation of its centrality to Newman’s Tractarian project.

Newman Studies: The Current Field

The field of Newman studies has always witnessed a diverse and politicized scholarship. This is due in large part to the circumstances of his conversion from Anglicanism to Roman Catholicism at the midpoint of his life and the shadow cast by his own autobiographical account of that pilgrimage in the Apologia Pro Vita Sua (1864). Barely a decade after Newman’s death, the modernist Catholic George Tyrrell (1861-1909) lamented in his own day the manner in which, “Theologians of every colour, black, white, and grey, have tried to appropriate Newman, and to forbid any interpretation of his

---

8 I have in mind here the work of Paul Misner and successors, John Boyle and Amelia Flemming whose work is treated below. See Paul Misner, Papacy and Development: Newman and the Primacy of the Pope (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976); John Boyle, “Church Teaching Authority: Problems and Prospects” in Church Teaching Authority: Historical and Theological Studies (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995); and Amelia Flemming, “The Role of the Theologian, Donum Veritatis, and Newman” Irish Theological Quarterly 69 (2004).

teaching but their own.”10 Prior to Vatican II, Roman Catholic authors tended to lionize Newman as a champion convert to their cause, emphasizing the radical nature of the break with Anglicanism and treating events prior to 1840 as unfortunate “preliminaries.”11 Catholic biographers since the Second Vatican Council have tended to treat his Anglican career much more positively, but largely with the proviso that these years represent an attractive way of being Catholic rather than authentically Anglican.12 Non-Catholic authors, mostly (but not exclusively) of Anglican extraction, have likewise focused for partisan reasons either positively or negatively on Newman’s Tractarian career, either celebrating his memory as the font of Anglican renewal or castigating him as a self-deceived false prophet.13

These general partisan tendencies likewise distill into treatments of the salient features of Newman’s intellectual contribution and into passive treatments of his conception of the schola theologorum since the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). For

---


11 In this vein, the chief exemplar is the early biography written by Wilfrid Ward, The Life of John Henry Newman Based on His Private Journals and Correspondence 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1912. There Ward treats the entire course of Newman’s Anglican career in a bare 78 out of a total 537 pages!


post-conciliar Catholics of a progressive disposition, Newman is John XXIII-ahead-of-time, and he is portrayed as a principal steward of the Catholic flame through the dark and repressive “Ultamontane revival” with its representative “Pian” papacies.14

Paul Misner’s contemporary treatment of Newman’s *schola theologorum* in relation to his views on papal primacy is by far the most subtle and thorough treatment available in the scholarly discussion, but he does not escape these tendencies. By limiting his analysis to semantic occurrences of “*schola theologorum*” or near semantic parallels, Misner’s treatment is narrowly focused on Newman’s Catholic writings of the 1860s and 1870s and he is able to explicate Newman’s concept of the theological office in a bare sixteen pages, noting its function as a mechanism of restraint, reigning in an otherwise ungoverned conception of papal power. He praises Newman as a pioneer who “opened the door in principle to the thoroughgoing revision of ecclesiology which is now underway with the aid of the whole modern instrumentarium of historical and theological scholarship.”15 Misner concludes by praising Newman for the way that he “laboriously and delicately introduc[ed] an element of ‘Constitution’ beside that of ‘Rule’ into his ecclesiology, recover[ing] the balance that had been so seriously threatened in the

---

14 This division has proved to be particularly stark in the uses made of Newman among Roman Catholic theologians as they have reflected on the “ecclesial role of the theologian” following upon the promulgation of 1968 encyclical, *Humani Vitae*. Traditionalist Catholics have long insisted on the infallible teaching authority of the pope as he gives voice to the Church’s “ordinary magisterium.” Because the contents of “ordinary magisterial” teaching are not precisely delineated as when the pope solemnly defines an infallible dogma, questions have been raised with regard to the propriety and limits of faithful dissent among theologians. Coupled with the well-publicized critique of papal infallibility in the work of Hans Küng and the censure of several prominent Roman Catholic theologians in the intervening decades, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued its 1990 instruction, *Donum veritatis: On the Ecclesial Role of the Theologian* (Vatican City: Librerea Editrice Vaticana, 1990). Responses to the instruction by theologians and national bishops conferences are manifold and a listing of them is beyond the scope of this proposal, but mention must be made here of the deployment of Newman in service, both to the traditionalist and progressive causes.

Ultramontane revival.”16 While there is much to appreciate in these observations, Misner’s work remains a study in prospect without the necessary benefit of retrospect. He is able to say much about the present implementation of Newman’s thought but he lacks the critical historical-theological perspective that comes with an adequate appreciation of Newman’s own attempted implementation of his vision as an Anglican.

Catholics of a more traditional cast likewise recognize Newman as “Father of the Second Vatican Council,” but envision his paternity functioning to establish a “true [i.e. “conservative”] understanding of the Council, free from [“progressive”] distortions and exaggerations.”17 In this vein, Avery Cardinal Dulles limited his focus to the same writings as does Misner, but explores them so as to emphasize the singular unsuitability of Newman’s conception to the present context. He writes,

Theologians, many of whom are laypeople, do not constitute anything like the medieval schola theologorum. We do not commonly think of theologians as judges of orthodoxy, as was common in the late Middle Ages, but rather as explorers whose hypotheses need to be critically assessed by the hierarchical magisterium. As for the Pope and the bishops, we expect them to be guardians of revealed truth and not to yield to considerations of expediency. We connect the priestly office with the public liturgy rather than, as Newman did, with private

16 Ibid.
17 In this vein see Ian Ker, “The Father of Vatican II,” 7. Elsewhere Ker specifically deploys Newman in defense of Benedict XVI’s programmatic restriction of conciliar reception and interpretation: “If there has been one keynote of Benedict XVI’s pontificate, it has been ‘the hermeneutic’, or interpretation, ‘of continuity’. By that the Pope means that the post-Vatican II Church needs to be understood in continuity, rather than disruption, with the Church of the past. It is not that the Pope denies the significance of the achievements of the Second Vatican Council but that he insists that that Council did not somehow cancel out all the other Councils or constitute so radical a disruption as to be equivalent to a revolution. It is above all in this respect that I am sure that the Pope will see the beatification of Newman as being of great importance for the Church.” See his “Newman can lead us out of our post-Vatican II turmoil.” The Catholic Herald (10 July 2009). Online: http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/.
devotions. While Newman correctly identified different tendencies in the Church, his division of powers among bishops, theologians, and laity is not easily assimilable today. His position, moreover, can scarcely be reconciled with the Second Vatican Council, which taught that bishops ‘in an eminent and visible way, take on the functions of Christ himself as Teacher, Shepherd, and High Priest and act in his person’ (Lumen Gentium 21).  

As with the work of Misner, there is much to consider in Dulles’ cautionary approach to the difference between historical and contemporary implications of Newman’s thought, but his account falls prey to identical weaknesses. By failing to attend to Newman’s own practical deployment of his thinking in the 1830s, Dulles is left with skepticism as to how Newman’s concept of the schola theologorum might work in the present. He thereby removes the necessary hermeneutical distance between Newman’s “prophetical” office of theology and the regal office of the magisterium and domesticates the genuinely prophetic role of Newman’s theological munus. In Dulles’ account, Newman’s schola theologorum is reduced to a kind of “court prophesy” where the magisterium speaks only from itself, to itself.

Oxford Movement Studies: The Current Field

The last decade has witnessed a remarkable shift in the interpretation of Tractarianism. Whereas traditional accounts of the movement’s history tended either toward uncritical approbation of the Oxford Movement as a divinely appointed “revival”

---

of catholic and apostolic Christianity or toward its strident repudiation as an illicit compromise with Roman Catholicism bordering on apostasy, recent scholarship has been far more judicious. Close attention to large-scale socio-political dynamics in Europe and studies of under-examined biographical eccentricities among individual Tractarians have given rise to a newfound sensitivity to important theological differences that existed between the Oxford Movement and the old High Church party of the Church of England. This, in turn, has led to greater clarity when describing the precise continuities and discontinuities existing between the Oxford Movement and prior incarnations of Anglicanism.

In his study of early nineteenth-century English society, J.C.D. Clark treats the Oxford Movement as a direct consequence of a dissolution of the eighteenth-century hierarchical theo-political consensus in favor of a modern political liberalism and egalitarianism. The prodigious historical work of Peter Nockles, rooted in the research of his published Oxford thesis, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* is self-consciously indebted in Clark’s revisionist portrait and treats the Oxford Movement as part of a general revival in Anglican high

---


20 A helpful survey of this revisionist work is available in Kenneth Hylson-Smith’s monograph, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

churchmanship emerging after the French Revolution. While Nockles recognizes certain valid claims made by Tractarianism on Anglican history, he deploys a hermeneutic of discontinuity to highlight the selective and tenuous character of those claims and argues that they represent a fundamental revision of the received Protestant self-understanding of the Church of England. Whereas prior Anglicanism represented a thoroughly Protestant via media between Roman Catholicism and Puritanism, Nockles demonstrates how, under the sway of Newman and departed collaborator, Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836), the Tractarians recast the Anglican via media as a third way between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism as such. This observation has added crucial texture to contemporary study of the Oxford Movement and has enabled Nockles to successfully account for the progressive “parting of the ways” between the Tractarians and onetime-sympathetic traditional high churchmen.

Following closely in the wake of Nockles’ influential dissertation, Anglican theologian Paul Avis has pressed Nockles’ case further, making use of the latter author’s conclusions to defend as essential the Protestant character of the Church of England and deny continuities between the Oxford Movement and historic Anglicanism altogether. Appearing in 1989 and republished with extensive revision and expansion in 2002, Avis’ case represents a stridently partisan account of Tractarianism that treats Newman’s

---


secession to Roman Catholicism in 1845 as both self-evidently necessary and as *prima facie* validation of the emergent conceptions of the movement as an aberration. On his account, both Tractarianism and the Anglo-Catholic “Ritualism” that followed represent a wholly constructed theological identity that must be interpreted according to a hermeneutic of *apostasis*.24

The work of Clark and Nockles has been of incomparable benefit to the field of Oxford Movement studies and their basic account of Tractarianism has achieved near-hegemonic status. That being said, there remains a question of how we are to inflect their observed differences between Tractarian Anglo-Catholicism and traditional high churchmanship. While Nockles’ hermeneutic of discontinuity stands uncontested, Avis’ narrative of apostasy is not a necessary corollary. Rather, a properly-thickened account of Newman’s conception of the *schola theologorum* allows us to appreciate the self-conscious nature of his constructed *via media*.

Newman, Froude, and their fellow Tractarians recognized in the parliamentary reforms of 1828-1832 the waning influence of the monarchy as a vital center of theological gravity for the Church of England. With this came the specter of the church’s official disestablishment. It becomes natural by light of Newman’s latter reflections on the *schola theologorum* to interpret the writings and activities of the Tractarians as the attempt of theologians corporately to rehabilitate the Anglicanism’s flagging theological *raison d’etre* by applying, clarifying, and even rectifying its historical self-

---

understanding. Far from being apostate, these activities of hermeneutical recovery can be better understood as a self-conscious prophetic critique of sectarian tendencies of the Church of England and as the attempt to restablish Anglicanism in its own catholic inheritance.

IV. ORIENTATION, METHODOLOGY, AND SCOPE

As the above survey of the scholarly field suggests, both Newman and the Oxford Movement arise from a history that leaves many ragged edges for the would-be historian and expositor. George Tyrrell himself recognized this and suggested that Newman’s own work validates divergent claims to his mantle:

Intransigents will not readily admit that the progressives have good right to appeal to his principles; nor the progressives that his sympathies were entirely opposed to them; nor the twilight moderates that he had nothing whatever in common with them either in one respect or the other.

Contrasting Newman’s “spirit and method” with “the very substance and letter of [his] doctrine,” Tyrrell decries attempts in his own day to impose the latter on the world as “a rigid rule of correct judgment.” Mocking those who were already campaigning to have Newman declared a Doctor of the Church, he urged, “It is the man, not the Cardinal, that

---

25 The five years from 1828-1833 brought with them a kind of perfect storm for Anglicanism. Evangelicalism had both produced Methodism and revitalized other non-conforming sects in the growing urban population centers. Coupled with the growing unrest among Irish Catholics, this produced an overwhelming wave of religious dissent resulting in the 1828 repeal of the seventeenth century Test and Corporation Acts. Passage of the Roman Catholic Relief Act followed the next year. These laws had precluded non-Anglicans from holding public office and thereby from participating in parliamentary decisions concerning the Church of England—including decisions related to the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer. The effect of their repeal was soon made clear by Parliament’s passage of the 1833 Irish Church Temporalities Bill, suppressing two archbishoprics and eight bishoprics in the Church of Ireland.

we would fain preserve in our midst; the living Newman, not the poor “Clothes-Screen” in marble, senile and decrepit, that solicits our tears on the Brompton Road.”27 Bewailing this trend, he lamented, “His synthesis, now obsolete, has been canonised at the expense of his synthetic spirit.”28 On the other hand, Tyrrell has little patience for those who would cast off all commitment to historical traces in order to use Newman as a wax-nose. Recognizing that Newman indeed “forged one or two weapons against [Latitudinarians] which have since (whether fairly or unfairly) been actually turned to their service,” he reminded interpreters of Newman’s direct and lifelong combat against Latitudinarianism. Here he warned, “Many to-day justly call Martin Luther ‘father’ whom Luther would have burnt.”29

While remaining aloof from Tyrrell’s skepticism regarding the possibility of an adequate theological analysis of Newman (something I will attempt in the proposed dissertation), I am persuaded by Tyrrell’s proposal that we undertake studies of Newman with an eye toward capturing his “spirit and method.” Tyrrell commends what has in our own era been called a “post-critical” disposition to the subject, suggesting that the ideal expositor of Newman is one “who, having passed from the ardour of discipleship to the stage of cool-headed comprehension, could unite the advantages of the inside and the outside standpoint.”30

27 Ibid., x.
28 Ibid., ix.
29 Ibid., xv.


Methodology

While numerous contemporary interpreters have noted Newman’s developed conception of the schola theologorum in his later writings as a Roman Catholic, I will argue how those analyses have largely been restricted to direct semantic references so that critical conceptual parallels in the earlier Anglican-Tractarian writings have gone unacknowledged. Whether rooted in a now-discredited confidence in the power of theological lexicography to account for conceptual development or simply the result of a desire to narrow the scope of an otherwise unwieldy inquiry (the two concerns are mutually supportive), the restriction of Newman’s conception of the schola theologorum to his explicit uses of the term invariably results in a too-narrow and thin description.31

31 Theological lexicography was originally the child of Herman Cremer who first published his Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität in 1867. This work went through ten editions between 1867 and 1915 and the entire project was revamped by Gerhard Kittel and later Gerhard Friedrich beginning in 1932. This work was translated into English by Geoffrey Bromiley as the nearly-ubiquitous Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. G Kittel and G. Friedrich, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76). Cremer’s original task was flawed, but still rooted in scientific lexicography. Under Kittel’s direction, however, the work came to include not only “external” lexicography but “internal” lexicography as well. Internal lexicography, however, is not lexicography at all, but the study of concepts on the basis of the terms used to express them.

However reasonable this may seem at first blush, the method does not support the claims made for it. As the subsequent linguistic work (more properly called “semiotics”) of Ferdinand de Saussure demonstrates, words do not refer to things or concepts except in contextual discourse. See his Course in General Linguistics, trans. R. Harris (Peru, IL: Open Court, 1986). As Shakespeare bears witness, apart from its contextual deployment (by someone, to someone, with reference to someone), the lexeme “rose” would by any other name smell as sweet (Romeo & Juliet, Act 2, scene 2). Because words cannot of themselves bear conceptual freight, a too narrow focus on semantic parallels can lead either to what James Barr has called an “illegitimate totality transfer”—loading a word with a multiplicity of meanings possible for that word or to an overdependence on semantic parallels to the exclusion of conceptual parallels, rooted in discursive context, with or without the use of a given terminology. For a fuller discussion see Barr’s Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961) or the more recent work of Moisés Silva, Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).

The overdependence on theological lexicography is not the sole domain of biblical studies, of course, and the search for semantic parallels is a feature of much historical-theological work where the account of conceptual development is a key value. Whether we want to lay blame for this at the feet of a hegemonic enthusiasm for such methods in the theological education of a generation ago or in the ease by which a limited focus on semantic parallels can help to circumvent contextual reading in an overlarge corpus, however, the general critique holds.
My proposed methodological alternative is to develop a “thick description” of Newman’s conception of the *schola theologorum*. Rooted in the work of ordinary language theorist, Gilbert Ryle, “thick description” means sufficiently accounting for an action so as not to lose its intentionality.\(^\text{32}\) Put differently, a description is sufficiently thick when it allows us to appreciate everything a locutionary actor is doing in the execution of a communicative action. Thin description of an action—Ryle uses the example of a man writing his name—would be a minimal account only: “The man is inscribing the seven letters of his surname on a sheet of paper.”\(^\text{33}\) Such an account is thin because it omits the context necessary to discern the intended communicative action. Once we appropriately thicken the account—in Ryle’s example, the man as identified as “a statesmen” and the sheet of paper “a drafted peace-treaty”—a thickened description of the action is made possible: “[The statesman] is bringing a war to a close by inscribing the seven letters of his surname.”\(^\text{34}\)

Thin descriptions are easy enough to identify because of the way that they undersell the full intentionality of an actor and I make the case that the present *status questiones* is an exemplar: Newman intends more than his sum-total lexical uses of *schola theologorum* reveal. To thicken the account, therefore, I propose to begin with the accounts of Misner, Boyle, and Flemming above and bring these mature reflections of the Catholic Newman into creative dialogue with the writings and activities of Newman the Anglican-Tractarian. I argue that by attending to conceptual parallels as well as semantic


\(^{33}\) “The Thinking of Thoughts: What is ‘le Penseur’ Doing,” 496.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.
parallels, the Oxford Movement itself can be viewed as an attempted instantiation of Newman’s *schola theologorum*, and its hermeneutical and prophetic work thus becomes an early exemplar of the conception he describes as a Catholic. The bare similitude of his Anglican activities to his latter Catholic reflections would seem to warrant such a move, but this connection gains considerable explanatory power when we consider how Newman himself republished *The Arians of the Fourth Century* in new edition in 1871 and republished his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* in 1877 with an important “Preface to the Third Edition” that brought his prophetical *munus* of the church into direct dialogue with his thoughts on the *schola theologorum*. By providing this necessary context, Newman’s understanding of the ecclesial vocation of the theologian is thickened.

Sufficiency can be an asymptotic goal when attempting thick description and a proposed thick description must always be open to additional thickening. While I cannot yet venture the claim that this proposed dialogue between Newman’s Catholic writings and his activities as an Anglican-Tractarian exhaust his intentionality, I am confident that this reading of the former by light of the latter and vice–versa will yield a thicker portrait

---

35 “Here is a theologian, as part of a recognized community of theologians, serving the cause of the faithful by determining the force of a synodal utterance and advocating a rectified interpretation of it by reflection on its historical and ecclesial situation,” as I have argued elsewhere. See my “Development by Rectification,” 207.

36 In his preface Newman wrote, “I say, then, Theology is the fundamental and regulating principle of the whole Church system. It is commensurate with Revelation, and Revelation is the initial and essential idea of Christianity. It is the formal cause, the expression, of the Prophetical Office, and as being such, has created both the Regal Office and the Sacerdotal. And it has in a certain sense a power of jurisdiction over those offices, as being its own creations, theologians being ever in request and in employment in keeping within bounds both the political and popular elements in the Church’s constitution,—elements which are far more congenial than itself to the human mind, are far more liable to excess and corruption, and are ever struggling to liberate themselves from those restraints which are in truth necessary for their well-being.” *The Via Media of the Anglican Church, Volume 1: Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1877), xlvii-xlviilii.
of Newman’s mature conception of the *schola theologorum* and a more suggestive account of Newman’s intentions as a Tractarian than presently exists.\(^{37}\)

**Sources**

Very few primary sources remain unpublished, so this dissertation will largely be dependent on sources gleaned from library and internet venues. One principle exception to this is the “Rules for the Theological Society,” dated 1835, which has generously been made available to me by the Principal and Chapter of Pusey House, Oxford. This document provides critical insight into the foundation, function, and workings of the Oxford “schola” on the ground.

Standardized and critical editions of Newman’s publications are accessible in almost any adequate theological library, but a study such as the one proposed here depends on access to these works in their multiple editions as they first appear in Newman’s Anglican period and then re-appear with revisions in his Catholic period. The advent of book digitization, made popularly available in the last half-decade through sites like Google Books and the Internet Archive, opens the possibility of access to these works in their multiple editions. Access to these works is greatly assisted by the late Father Vincent Blehl, S.J., who published an exhaustive bibliography of Newman’s publication as part of his work as postulator for Newman’s canonization.\(^{38}\)

Finally, the recently-completed 31-volume Oxford University Press edition of Newman’s *Letters and Diaries* will be a primary window into his life and thought.

---

\(^{37}\) In my research, the only article that makes this connection is my own “Development in the Service of Rectification: John Henry Newman’s Conception of the *Schola Theologorum*” in *Authority, Dogma, and History: The Role of the Oxford Movement Converts in the Papal Infallibility Debates*, ed. K. Parker and M.J.G. Pahls (Bethesda, MD: Academica, 2009), 195-212.

Supplemented by recorded correspondence of his interlocutors as it is published in the exhaustive biographies of the era, we are often able to access both sides of a given conversation.39

V. PROPOSED CHAPTERS

Chapter 1: Literature Review

Very little has been written on Newman’s conception of the schola theologorum and those tend to focus solely on his writings as a Roman Catholic. On the other hand, recent studies of the Oxford Movement have tended to focus on the historical viability of Newman’s via media hypothesis. Whether partially critical (Nockles) or roundly critical (Avis, Turner), these interpreters focus on the comparative merits of the Tractarian claim on Anglican history and heritage and neglect the possibility that the Oxford Movement was deliberately and justifiably constructive in its intention. Newman and Froude were at least partially self-aware of their constructive intentions and the former was especially (though not exclusively) forthright about the Tractarian proposals being a “paper religion.” This chapter will survey the recent literature on the Oxford Movement, on Newman’s conception of the theologian’s office, with a view toward a new interpretation of Nockles’ conclusions as they are the most evenhanded and well-established.

Chapter 2: The schola theologorum in Newman’s corpus

References to the schola theologorum appear in Newman’s writings from the 1860s and the concept finds its fullest development there, but the concept itself goes back to the 1830s beginning with his Arians of the Fourth Century and his Lectures on the

Prophetical Office of the Church. This chapter will trace his concept synchronically and will explore possible sources for the concept. Crucial here will be my attempt to supplement the work of Misner, Boyle, and Flemming with an exploration of the possible sources for Newman’s connection of the Oxford faculty with the faculty of Paris and beyond that to the scholae of Alexandria and Antioch.

Chapter 3: The Oxford Schola on the Ground.

This chapter will explore the diachronic life of the Oxford Movement as a schola theologorum. Here I will explore the inception of the Movement as a movement, its self-conscious promotion in the recruitment of adherents, and its official voice in the Tracts. The Hampden Controversy will loom large as a counter narrative and I will engage Nockles directly in his reliance on that two-year controversy to deny the Tractarian claim to speak for the university as a whole. While I concede that the Tractarian claim was not firmly established, I will argue that the struggle to construct an ideal unanimity flowed from Newman’s beliefs about the proper function of a university faculty and his desire to construct a new theological identity for Anglicanism beyond its close identification with the monarchy. I will also be engaged in original work on the “theological society,” founded by Newman and Edward Bouverie Pusey, making use of the unpublished constitution and bylaws of the society. A number of the Tracts for the Times sprang directly from these meetings and I will argue for its importance as a venue purposed to encourage scholarly collaboration and faculty cohesion.
Chapter 4: Tract 90 as an Attempt to Reconstruct and Redefine the Church of England

According to Nockles, *Tract 90* was the pivotal episode in Newman’s Oxford and Anglican career, and the one on which his final journey partly hinged. This chapter will first treat the development Newman’s conception of the possibilities and limitations of Anglicanism in the 1830’s, noting his emergent doubts about the practical viability of his “paper religion” and growing concerns that Anglicanism must disclaim its “Donatism” and embrace an authentic catholicity. Here I will engage *Tract 90* as Newman composed it, in critical dialogue with Anglican history and practice. I will argue that the work represents an attempt to construct possible space for that catholicity as part of his larger intention to redefine and rectify sectarian impulses inherent in the Articles. Critical here will be an evaluation of Newman’s use of history and precedent, his attention to the hermeneutics of collaborative confessional works, and his attention to church practice as a guide to the reception of the Articles.

Chapter 5: The Schola Theologorum and the Development of Doctrine

Granting that the Oxford Movement was self-consciously working to reconstruct and redefine the theological identity of the Church of England, it is important to see the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* as more than a constructed justification for Newman’s departure for the Roman Communion. Indeed, the development of doctrine was an emergent feature in his thought as an Anglican and I will argue that, for Newman, the Oxford faculty was an active, self-conscious instrument of development. This figures directly in his reflections before and after 1845. Along the way I will weigh the comparative strengths and weaknesses of Alain Thomasset’s proposal that Newman
undergoes a fundamental shift from an “Anglo-catholic” to a “Roman” ecclesiology in this period.40

Chapter 6: The Schola Theologorum in Newman’s Early Catholic Period

This chapter will trace Newman’s reflections in his early Catholic period from his exchange with Cardinal Giovanni Perrone (1794-1876) on the theory of doctrinal development41 to his 1859 On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine. Newman believed that the schola theologorum served the cause of the consenting faithful by clarifying a dogma’s proper interpretation in dialogue with the faithful who assent to and accept it. However, for Roman Catholics seeking to establish the exclusive prerogatives of the pope, this contention proved highly controversial. Both Newman’s correspondence with Perrone and his daring references to the consultation of the faithful published in a May 1859 issue of the Rambler brought Newman into sharp conflict with established Catholic theologians and Newman was forced to moderate his views to bring them in line.42

Such controversies make it necessary to posit the distinction—ever present in Newman—between his public and private views. This chapter will argue that while Newman’s private views evince little modification by late 1871, his hard-won experience

42 The episode which was provoked by the May 1859 article has been chronicled in the introduction to On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine, ed. J. Coulson (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1961).
of controversy as a Tractarian led him to exercise public discretion in a new ecclesial context.

Chapter 7: The Schola Theologorum in Newman’s Later Catholic Period

This chapter will trace Newman’s reflections in his later Catholic from the First Vatican Council to the end of his life. Critical here will be his dependence on the *schola theologorum* to secure the position of English Catholics against the charges of Gladstone and others. Critical as well will be the examination of Newman’s dialogue between 1864 and 1876 with his friend, Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882) as Pusey sought rapprochement between Anglicans and Catholics in his *Eirenicon*.43 Finally, I will explore Newman’s 1873 *Idea of a University* examining his ideal placement of theology in the context of a university curriculum44

This later period witnesses the cooling of Newman’s controversial standing in the Roman Communion, some interesting reversions to controversial postures of his earlier Catholic and Tractarian periods, and some wistful musings on what happens when theology does not have its own way. While Newman maintained a strong sense of the independence of theology—what he called mental “elbowroom” in faith and thought—he gained a pronounced, pastoral appreciation for human limitation:

> Once more, … there must be great care taken to avoid scandal, or shocking the popular mind, or unsettling the weak; the association between truth and

---


error being so strong in particular minds that it is impossible to weed them of
the error without rooting up the wheat with it.45

Epilogue: The Ecclesial Vocation of the Individual Theologian in Newman

Because Newman’s Tractarian experience was that of a “prophet without honor,”
how do the consent of the faithful and the voice of the magisterium come to play in
Newman’s thought? If theologians corporately are accountable to revelation, to tradition,
to history, and to the sensus fidelium in their naming of (or promulgation of) doctrinal
development, can we say that their role is “prophetic” vis-à-vis the magisterium? Given
that the Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church were delivered as lectures on
ecclesiology, how might this give theologians a place at the ecclesial table? What might
this mean if the theologian names “false developments” or “false prophesies”? Would
Newman recognize or affirm the legitimacy of a schola theologorum dominated by lay
theologians?

---

45 John Henry Newman, The Idea of a University, Defined and Illustrated (London: Longmans,
Green, and Co., 1921), 74.
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Dynamic Programming is used to solve the word break II problem; the idea is to store and re-use the partial results. Let result[j-1] contain all the valid sentences that can be formed with a substring of string s of length jj. Then the valid sentences, for s and length ll, can be found out by checking if the substring, s[j : l], is present in the dictionary and appending this word to all the sentences in result [j-1]. String s. result[9] = [â€œcookies andâ€, â€œcookie sandâ€]. In the following problem titled Exponentiation II from the CSES problemset, Problem I was given three integers a, b, c and had to calculate the value of (a^b)^c modulo 1000000007 for each test case. I would write the exponentiation function and it gave correct answers for the provided test cases but WA for overall test cases. My function is as follows: ll exp(ll x,ll n){ if(n == 0) return 1; if(n == 1) return x; if(n%2 == 0) return exp((x*x)%mod,n/2); if(n%2 == 1) return (x*exp((x*x)%mod,n/2))%mod If you strip down any combat system in any setting, you'll find a system of choices. In generic fantasy, the author can choose to make a 'unit' don armor, ride a horse, use a sword, dagger, mace, spear or a combination thereof. If on horseback, they can charge or circle around. If on foot, they can form a battle line or attempt to rush into a weak flank. In a WWII setting, an army can advance steadily behind a rolling artillery barrage, dig in behind machine-gun posts and trenches. The PROBLEM Cycle Purpose Figure 4 shows the PROBLEM Cycle in graphic form. Its goals are the following: ? ? Process Describe the context of the problem or opportunity in biological, social, economic, and other terms. Articulate the reasons for action: describe different perspectives of the problems or opportunities that should be or are proposed to be acted on.Â Design Cycle Figure 4. the PROBLEM Cycle of the Lkcision Protocol, Version 2.0. You should prepare the following products: Products ? * ? Chapter 19: Problem (II). Slowly walking towards the lobby, all three of them tried to make no noise at any cost. As they reached the end, all three of them stuck to the wall, while Mark slowly peeked into the lobby. He found 6 zombies in the lobby. “There are six zombies there right now. Denton, you stay here while I and Mona will go take care of them.” while nodding towards Mona. Denton stood there nodding, understanding the gravity of the situation.