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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to provide the tools for a critical study of the use of Scripture by John Henry Newman through an examination of his practice in those texts where he treated of the Incarnation and/or of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This excludes those writings which concern the Incarnation and the Blessed Virgin Mary but are without a use of Scripture.

Yet there was a concern that readers who were interested in the Incarnation and/or the Blessed Virgin might not be interested in Newman's exegesis. Newman was not a biblical scholar, though he wrote on scriptural topics throughout his career. Even if he had been, he carried out his exegesis more than a hundred years ago without the tools of the historical-critical school. At this point, the work of Brevard Childs took on significance for the purpose of this work. Childs concluded, at the end of Part II of Biblical Theology in Crisis, that now is the time for theologians to learn how to read the Fathers and earlier authors such as Luther, Calvin, and Augustine in order to gain the treasures of their exegesis. This type of critical reading requires an approach different from modern exegetical methods: Childs read the Scripture in light of the community's use of revelation. The community accepted certain writings as parts of the canon. Rather than using the sources of the sayings as the authority of Scripture, Childs used the community's use and acceptance as authority.

The justification of the study rests upon the recent crisis in Biblical Theology and, specifically, on the crisis in the methods of exegesis which Brevard Childs and others have shown. During the period in which there was a consensus upon the historical-critical approach, questions concerning the literal sense and the sensus plenior were taken for granted. In other words, the former seemed obvious and the latter seemed irrelevant. Since these conditions favored an assumption that the latest was the best and, in fact, the only form of exegesis of value, and since earlier exeges were unskilled and ignorant of the historical-critical methods, they were ignored. With the crisis, the overextension of these methods was called into question and, as a result, questions about the obviousness of the literal sense and the status of the sensus plenior were once more raised. At the same time, earlier exeges were considered worth examining in light of their own approaches, rather than on the basis of their conforming to the historical-critical methods as a standard.

Suddenly there developed a multiplicity of approaches to exegesis, with practitioners open to using the tools formerly thought peculiar to a particular method.

They found, as Newman in another context put it, that in gaining a new view one did not have to give up the old but had merely to include it within the new. Besides Childs' approach, there was Paul Ricoeur's existentialistic approach, which the former reckoned as equally threatening to his canon-centered method as the historical-critical. David Kelsey followed Ricoeur's approach; Kelsey's purpose was to determine a variety of uses of Scripture in a sample of recent Protestant theologians from which he would be able to compare the sources of authority. Another exegete who helped bring about the crisis was H. D. Gadamer. His dialectic approach has been compared to that of both Augustine and Newman. Leo Strauss had an impact by his recognition that the historical-critical methods do not insure that one can better know what an earlier author meant than that author did. Rather, present understanding may well be less complete than that of an earlier generation. Hans Frei assisted the crisis through his research into the hermeneutical practices of the past several centuries and through his instigating Kelsey and others to accept a complex approach to exegesis.

Jouett Powell is another whom Frei influenced. Powell carried out a two-part study in which he exposed the distortion a reductionistic understanding of Newman effected and in which he described the three uses of Christian discourse—that of inquiry, of the exercise of faith, and of the explication of faith—which he ascertained in Newman's whole body of writing. Thomas Norris practiced what Powell claimed was necessary. He detailed the dialectic approach Newman carried out by means of his principle of analogy. On the one hand, Newman cleared away the doubts and difficulties inquirers and investigators raised, and then he used the evidence he had found either to give meaning or to defend a position. Always, Newman kept the whole in mind.

The phrase "uses of Scripture" in the title of this study has referred to the way exegesists apply the various loci to an understanding of Scripture. These loci include the analogy of faith, Antiquity, the Fathers, Tradition, magisterium, the community and the canon, authority, and rules such as those of St. Vincent of Lerins and the seven notes of development which Newman organized. Tradition, it was shown, is

---

5 Ibid., 482-490; wherein the author treats the criticism of the modern belief in history made by political philosopher Leo Strauss.
the chief source for Newman's use of Scripture. Since his position changed—from the
time of his Evangelicalism through his Anglicanism to his Roman Catholicism—so,
likewise, did his uses of Scripture. Thus it was important to compare the thinking of
Günter Biemer,9 Jaak Seynaeve,10 Jean Stern,11 and Nicholas Lash12 on this rela-
tionship of Newman's life and thought.

In this comparison, Biemer provided the immediate past history of Anglican
thought on tradition; Seynaeve the principles of exegesis Newman professed to hold;
Stern an analysis of The Arians of the Fourth Century—which gave an explanation of
Newman's penchant for analogy, allegory, and a deeper sense; and Lash the limita-
tions of Newman's use of Scripture in An Essay on the Development of Christian
Doctrine, together with a treatment of the Incarnation as the central doctrine in
Newman's theology and the fact that Newman preferred and esteemed the concrete
language of symbol over the formal language of theology in pursuing the meaning
and the explication of Christian discourse, as Powell expressed it.

To separate out the tools of critical analysis, one must begin with the audience,
go on to the authority, determine the genre, specify the ethos, evaluate the meaning,
organize the sources in relation to these, and conclude with the purpose of the text
and the purpose of Newman's use of Scripture in accord with the period of his
development. Though the Incarnation is the central doctrine, the reason behind
Newman's texts on Mary is his own vision of what Vatican Council II called the
"hierarchy of truths": Certain doctrines are necessary and higher in significance in
relation to God and the economy of salvation. Newman always kept this in mind and
indicated that Mary existed only in relation to the Incarnation. By selecting both the
central truth—the Incarnation—and a related truth—Mary, the Mother of God, one
has the opportunity to notice how Newman used Scripture across the "hierarchy of
truths" and thus to recognize the order there is in his practice.

The audience was a constant presence when reading these texts. Jouett Powell
provided a check upon any tendency to simplify the audience. Instead, it became
obvious that in most cases Newman dealt with the individual believer and the need
of the community for an explicitation. A comprehensive review showed that New-
man did not put his audience down, yet he made it a point to follow Socrates' 
approach and let them know that they had not thought the matter through beyond
the superficial level of popular religion. Occasionally, Newman let it be known there
were no women in the audience or that they were not to be taken into account, and,
just as seldom, he let it be known that only Catholics were present. In the first

12 N. Lash, Newman on Development (Shepherdstown, W. Va. 1975); hereafter cited as N. on
Development.
several sermons and in the Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification, the audience obviously comprised persons open to Evangelicalism. In A Letter to Pusey, the audience was multiple: Anglians favorable to Pusey, Anglicans concerned about the Oxford Movement's continuation, Anglicans on the verge of conversion, Catholics newly converted, old-line Catholics, Catholic clerics favorable and unfavorable to Newman, and members of the general unreligious educated class of the time. Later this audience swelled and changed, as Newman's work spread throughout the world. Much more could be said on the audience, but these remarks should be sufficient preparation for the many comments on the audience in Newman's texts as well as in the interpretation of the texts.

The authority switched from sola scriptura, in Newman's earliest writings, to the authority of Scripture and Tradition. Those familiar with the Fathers of the Church will easily realize that almost every position taken by Newman could be traced to them. Indeed, this tracing could have been a second study; but, frequently, in the text and in the interpretation, the tracing has been done. For those instances where a reader might be left to wonder, there are works, such as Hilda Graef's two-volume Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion, where the pertinent passages from the Fathers are listed chronologically and, further on in the works, by theme.\footnote{H. Graef, Mary, A History of Doctrine and Devotion (2 vols.; New York 1963-65).}

Determining the genre of A Letter to Pusey was most complicated, due to the fact that the heart of it is Apocalypse 12 which was shown to be not an historical statement of prophecy but a symbolic statement of recurring consolation in the face of crisis, made during the liturgical celebrations, first in the Jewish service and later in the Christian service. The genre was further complicated by the fact that Newman's \textit{Letter} is a response to Pusey's \textit{Eirenicon}. Newman represents the community of Catholics who are challenged to accept Edward B. Pusey's terms for unity. Some ten years before, the Catholic hierarchy had been restored to England and fellow Catholic H. E. Manning had fomented the challenge in such a way that a reply from them would have been meaningless. Only John Henry Newman was in a position to act for the community. As a friend of Pusey, Newman could write an open letter addressed to many audiences who were then especially receptive in light of his restored reputation, the result of widespread appreciation for his \textit{Apologia}.

The genre of the other works used in this study is usually given within the interpretation. The important point is that in reading Newman it is necessary to find from within the first few paragraphs and the last how he had set up his writing. If this approach proves insufficient, then it is requisite that a life of Newman be checked.

The ethos, taken in the rhetorical sense of the validity of the character of the speaker, was crucial to Newman. For example, the ethos is extremely obvious in his
sermon "Christ, the Son of God made Man." The author appeared as an opponent of the superficial religion of the day and, hence, as one who would make the sacrifices needed to achieve a depth of thought and action which could stand against the tide. It probably would be possible to demonstrate his ethos by devising a continuum of Newman's writings on the basis of his identification with an ever more profound reverence and submission to God's will.

Each interpretation provides the meaning of that text, but Newman wrote the *Apologia* on his meaning. Powell understood that Newman is complex and Charles F. Harrold held this to be the key.¹⁴ Thus the deeper sense is always there. Because this is so, a critical reading of Newman is never a partial thing. As he kept the whole in mind when he did any single thing, so a critical reading of any of his writings demands an awareness of everything he wrote.

This was also the way Newman conducted his selection of passages from Scripture. He used Scripture as a whole, with the reading of the Fathers as his guide and the liturgy as his inspiration. Nicholas Lash put this so well, citing several of Newman's own explanations:

"The divines of the Church are in every age engaged in regulating themselves by Scripture . . . Scripture may be said to be the medium in which the mind of the Church has energised and developed" (*Dev* 7.4.2). In other words, prescinding from criteriological questions, Newman takes it for granted that the process of doctrinal elaboration in the church as a whole is the fruit of its meditation on scripture "by the unconscious growth of ideas suggested by the letter and habitual to the mind" (*Dev* 2.1.3). As so often in the *Essay*, it is implied, rather than explicitly stated, that the guarantee of the faithfulness of this process is the guiding presence of the Spirit, "promised to all Christians . . . to impress the contents of Scripture on their hearts, and to teach them the faith through whatever sources" (*VM* I p 164).¹⁵

Exegesis outside of tradition and development is an empty exercise. And within tradition and development it is a risky thing. Newman knew that the Fathers took chances in their exegesis, but they were secure in keeping the Object, the Triune God, always before them.

Clearly, no one approach to interpretation controls the field. Exegetes are recognizing the value in studying classical authors who have pondered the sacred text. Today, then, seemed an appropriate time to examine Newman's use of Scripture.

The examination of Newman's language provided tools for reading him. Newman used these tools in writing, probably consciously and unconsciously, but his procedures became evident to the investigator. The conscious study of how Newman interpreted Scripture also enabled the researcher to become critical of his methods.

---

¹⁵ Lash, *N. on Development*, 90; Lash uses *Dev* as the abbreviation for Newman's *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* and *VM* to designate *The Via Media*.
Therefore, beyond providing a comprehensive set of Newman's published texts on the Incarnation and the Blessed Virgin Mary where Scripture is used, this dissertation has developed a critical approach to the exegesis of one classical author, John Henry Newman.
SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS II THROUGH VI

Chapters II through VI of the dissertation comprise the analysis of Newman’s use of Scripture in both the major and minor writings on the Incarnation and the Blessed Mary. The order of these chapters is twofold: chronological and substantive, resulting in a division of the texts into those having to do with the Incarnation and those having to do with the Blessed Virgin Mary. The basis of this division is contained in paragraph 11 of the second Vatican Council’s Decree on Ecumenism, where the “hierarchy of truths” is treated.¹ The basis for the chronological order is Newman’s biography: from 1825-1830, he was an Evangelical; from 1830-1845, an Anglican; and from 1845-1890, a Roman Catholic.² Thus one can expect differences in the texts from the three periods.³ Another division of the texts is into major and minor degrees of comprehensiveness, both in the case of the Incarnation and in that of the Blessed Virgin Mary. By major was meant those writings which pertained in large part to the topic and which used Scripture extensively; while by minor was meant those writings which pertained only in small part to the topic and which used Scripture less extensively in relation to the topic.

An outstanding example of comprehensiveness in regard to the Incarnation is the sermon “Christ, the Son of God made Man.” Newman wrote this during his Anglican period. The union of the Fathers, the Creeds, Scripture, and the Analogy of Faith in this sermon is exceptional. There are three other sermons on the Incarnation which possess an almost equal comprehensiveness of loci and doctrine. There are a dozen writings where Newman treated this doctrine less comprehensively and used the loci less completely; the dozen are examined as minor texts.

Two outstanding examples of major texts on the Blessed Virgin Mary are discourses 17 and 18 of the Discourses to Mixed Congregations on the glories of Mary.¹

¹ “Decree on Ecumenism,” in Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, ed. by A. Flannery (Collegeville, Minn. 1975), 462. Paragraph 20 presents the following application: “Our thoughts are concerned first of all with those Christians who openly confess Jesus Christ as God and Lord and as the only Mediator between God and man for the glory of the one God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. We are indeed aware that there exist considerable differences from the doctrine of the Catholic Church even concerning Christ the Word of God made flesh and the work of redemption, and thus concerning the mystery and ministry of the Church and the role of Mary in the work of salvation” (p. 468).


³ E. Benard, A Preface to Newman’s Theology (St. Louis, Mo. 1945), especially xii and the chapter “Biographical Notes,” 3-15.
These texts combine the same *loci* and the same completeness of doctrine in regard to the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption as "Christ, the Son of God made Man" does in regard to the Incarnation. There are eight more writings which relate Mary to the Incarnation and to the Gospel treatment of Christ's early years. These texts are either entire sermons or significant sections from doctrinal writings. They, in accord with the purposes of this dissertation, all include the use of Scripture. Almost none of Newman's voluminous correspondence treats either the Incarnation or the Blessed Virgin Mary through the use of Scripture and, where it does, Newman refers to a sermon for a more complete treatment of Scripture; therefore, with the one exception to be noted, the letters are not included among his major writings.

Thus the minor texts include the letters and sermons and other writings where only a part of the work is on the Blessed Virgin Mary. For convenience, the letters are grouped together chronologically at the end of the minor texts. However, since Newman's *Letter Addressed to the Rev. E. B. Pusey* is of distinct importance, its setting and treatment is given separately, after that of the other major texts on the Blessed Virgin Mary. The *Letter* is Newman's major work on Mary, and, because the use of Scripture in this work is unique, there is a section of this dissertation devoted to showing the relevancy of the apocalyptic today. Also, since the argument that now is the time to read the exegesis of those who antedate the heyday of the historical-critical methods runs throughout the entire dissertation, there is a stress upon the critical aspects of the *Letter*. And since the conclusion is that Newman held to a deeper sense in his use of Scripture, his *Letter to Pusey* was selected as a typical example.

Because a number of writings exhibiting much the same use of Scripture are presented in these chapters, a selection of the most characteristic writings and a collection of the findings will resume the five chapters. This results in the elimination of numerous reviews and paraphrases which were necessary in the original dissertation to situate the uses.

A continuing theme which runs through chapters II through VI is that of Catholic instinct and Catholic idea. Once Newman became a Catholic, he noticed how differently Anglicans and Catholics lived the faith. This, together with his lifelong struggle against Liberalism, which, he held, had permeated the practice of religion in Anglicanism, caused him to look upon his audience in changing ways—from his earliest days as an Evangelical, through and into his Catholic days. Therefore, his use of Scripture varied as he himself developed. The link was the doctrine of the Incarnation. As an Evangelical he stressed Atonement; as an Anglican he stressed the Incarnation; and as a Catholic he found this was not necessary, because the believers took it for granted and because Mary was in "custody of the Incarnation."\(^4\) Repeatedly

\(^4\) *Mixed*, 349 (Discourse XVII, "The Glories of Mary for the Sake of Her Son").
through these chapters, then, the stress upon the Catholic instinct recurs. The fact that in England the Feast of the Annunciation was called Lady Day is symbolical of this instinct.

**Minor Texts on the Incarnation**

A chronological approach to the sermons and works such as *Lectures on Justification* brings these points out, while a closer look at the findings makes this clear. In his April 13, 1830 sermon on the text of 1 John 1:1-3, Newman questioned his relationship to righteousness as he was letting go of Evangelicalism. By his November 15, 1835 sermon, he could preach on "Regenerating Baptism" with an emphasis upon baptism, as he separated himself from the Evangelicals and from the Jewish ritual. Hence, by his July 16, 1837 sermon, he used Scripture to illuminate the sacramental character of reality and the liturgical life of the Church. By April 30, 1843, Newman used a collection of New and Old Testament references to the Shepherd as the basis for his pastoral approach to the Incarnation. Shortly into the sermon, he contrasted John 1:14 and Galatians 4:4 with the symbol of the Shepherd, thus showing Scripture can be abstract as well as most concrete. The former is beyond the audience; the latter is well within its grasp. This use is based on analogy. By it, he could show the value of economy in teaching, which the gap between what we can grasp and what we cannot grasp demands. Both Scripture and Jesus speaking in Scripture accept this limitation; yet, with the simple and concrete they mix the profound and the exalted. This very pattern discloses how ineffable the mystery is.

In his undated sermon "The Mystery of the Holy Trinity," Newman used a number of sources: Scripture, the Fathers, and the Creeds. He used Scripture in relation to this doctrine as an allusion. Just as in the *Lectures on Justification* of 1838, this sermon and those of May 8, 1835, and February 17, 1839, demand both the believer and the Church. Newman used Scripture to provide pastoral care for those who believed but could move on to a deeper faith. This use becomes apologetic, not in an evangelical sense, but in regard to those who already believe.

Finally, in two 1849 sermons, Newman preached in a solidly doctrinal fashion, using Scripture as the basis. As usual, he carried out an analogy and then a dialectic to bring his audience along in anticipation. By the use of the secular and the sacred, he was able to gain the most from his scriptural example and its allusion. Thus, we see how Newman's use of Scripture fitted both his audience and his own development. As he changed, he used a variety of sources which he synthesized on differing bases, moving from Atonement to the Incarnation. In order to catch the Catholic instinct in operation, it is important to move from his writings on the Incarnation to those writings on the Blessed Virgin Mary.
Major Texts on the Incarnation

Though the major writings on the Incarnation would seem to be crucial, the issue of this dissertation is Newman’s use of Scripture, especially in relation to the Incarnation and the Blessed Virgin. The treatment of the minor writings on the Incarnation makes clear what the major writings merely deepen—his move from Atonement to the Incarnation and from Evangelicalism to Anglicanism to Catholicism. Therefore, rather than reviewing “Christ, the Son of God made Man,” it seems more apt to examine “The Mystery of Godliness.” The text for this latter sermon uses Galatians 4:4. Newman contemplated the Incarnation in order to have an answer for those who found it difficult to accept the humanity of Christ and the way humans are born. He considered Christ as the Seed of the woman in Genesis 3:15; he used Scripture to show that Christ’s birth was far removed from the ordinary. Newman’s homiletic purpose in the use of Scripture was evident: Christ is the model of purity, in his birth as in his life. Throughout the sermon, Newman followed the Fathers in their concern for virginity and their respect for motherhood.

His earliest sermon on the Incarnation, by that name also, was preached on the feast of the Nativity, though it is listed as having been given or written on May 9, 1830. The text used was John 1:14. Originally, Scripture references could be brief, because the audience was made up entirely of true believers. In Newman’s day, people doubted; therefore, Creeds were necessary to rebut those who misinterpreted. To clarify the Incarnation, he entered into a discussion of the relation between Adam and Eve and the Son of Man and Mary. In so doing, he united the teachings of the Fathers and the Creed with Scripture. From these sources, his audience, which he considered lacking in sufficient comprehension, could draw on the clear, explicit statements of the Creeds and the liturgy. What was said for this sermon could be said also of a sermon he preached six years later—on April 1, 1836—since he there had to challenge his audience to have a true religion, not the superficial religion then shown in contemporary England.

Similarly, in his May 8, 1835 sermon, he not only recognized this limitation in the audience, but also, more seriously, in the theologians who could not contemplate the doctrine of the Incarnation in Scripture, which in their eyes would have resulted in presumption. Thus, he saw, such scholars ended up by separating the human and the divine. The cause of this anomaly is the practice of stopping at the mere words and eschewing the fuller reality. The conclusion followed; the Anglican Church was faced with infidelity. This sermon was an example of Newman’s distinction between the notional and the real. Each of his sermons was directed towards the real, as was his use of Scripture. Any members in his audience who were limited to a notional religion would convict themselves. Such persons ignored the economy of the God who was willing to use Scripture to enlighten human ignorance.
Minor Texts on the Blessed Virgin Mary

The variety of Newman's uses of Scripture comes through in connecting a number of minor writings on the Blessed Virgin Mary. In his 1834 Epiphany sermon, he used Scripture in an apocalyptic manner. His October 28, 1830 sermon's use of Scripture was unusual for him, since it bore upon a simple moral matter. It was used as an example to clarify a rule of conduct. In his sermon of May 3, 1835, "Bodily Suffering," Newman used Scripture to give examples from his own experience. Though he could have taken texts which developed a position, instead he worked from a position to its exemplification in Scripture.

"The Weapons of the Saints," a sermon from October 29, 1837, showed the paradox of the Magnificat. Newman used Scripture to make concrete the sacramental principle. Believers and the Church would be encouraged by Mary, acting as the symbol of the Church and speaking out in the Magnificat. In "The Gospel Sign addressed to Faith," from November 12, 1837, Newman used Scripture to make clear how the economy of faith was consistent with the Gospel itself. Believers and the community realized the evidence for their faith in Jesus' acts and in the Gospel narratives, but those who either lacked faith or were not seeking faith noticed no sign, according to his view.

For "On Scripture as the Record of Our Lord's Teaching," from his The Via Media of the Anglican Church (1837), Newman selected two texts which bore upon Jesus' relationship with his Mother, at the Temple and at Cana. Only a contemplative approach to these statements would reveal their meaning. The reason he expected such an audience was that he always had a number of uses and users in mind: the believer, the inquirer, and the community. In The Via Media, Newman's uses of Scripture were chiefly instances of examples of certain principles of interpretation he held.

While "The Crucifixion," preached in 1841, exhibited a rare use of an accommodated sense, in "The Mystery of Divine Condescension," Newman contrasted Jesus' condition as his body lay in Mary's arms after the crucifixion with the liturgical prayer Dilectus meus candidus et rubicundus. Thus, he used Scripture and the liturgy to preach in the form of contemplation and prayer. His complete freedom with this form contrasted deeply with the patterned approach of his Anglican days.

Major Texts on the Blessed Virgin Mary

Though An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine revealed Newman's position on Mary just before he became a Catholic, it did not use Scripture to any extent. However, "The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine," sermon 15 in the Oxford University Sermons, gave his position at the end of his Anglican period and used key scriptural verses on Mary (Luke 2:19 and 51), which repeat the fact
that Mary kept these things in her heart, as the basis of a doctrinal sermon. Newman used Scripture as an example of a deeper sense through which the implication of Mary's act would be understood and developed.

“Our Lady in the Gospel” was preached on March 26, 1848, shortly after Newman had left the Anglican Church. This is a pivotal sermon since, though similar to many sermons examined earlier, it provided a different approach than those, due to the different expectations Newman could have of his Catholic audience. He did not have to announce a text, and he could preach on Mary without defensiveness. Newman used Scripture to show the harmony of the elements of the Gospel, by depending upon the insights of the Fathers and the analogy of faith.

“Omnipotence in Bonds” was preached in the University Church in Dublin during his 1854-1857 tenure. Newman used Scripture in this sermon to take his audience from their usual devotional response to the Nativity towards the mystery of the Incarnation, which involved Christ's willing subjection to his parents and to the contingencies of his human nature. Newman's concrete approach enabled him to alert his hearers to the meaning of each event in the narrative. Occasionally, he would even go beyond the ordinary with a hyperbole which seemed merely to extend the obvious to make it evident.

“On the Fitness of the Glories of Mary,” number 18 in his Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations, treated the Assumption of Mary, using an argument of fittingness from Scripture. Newman used Scripture to exemplify the Church’s use of the analogy of faith as a principle of interpretation. Since the argument from fittingness is an example of reasoning, Newman put it within a framework of Scripture, doctrine, and nature and history to form a single whole. Yet, he also used Scripture for its rhetorical value. He avoided the purely devotional, but kept his audience’s pastoral needs in mind.

Bridging the theme of discourses 18 and 17, by reminding the hearers that “Her glories are not only for the sake of her Son, they are for our sakes also,” Newman gave a comprehensiveness to his conclusion which embraced both sermons within the analogy of faith. During the development of this elaborate argument on the Immaculate Conception, he stopped to note that he was in no need of proving this doctrine, since the believers had already received it in accord with the teaching of the Church. Rather, he declared, his purpose had been to show “the beauty and the harmony, in one out of many instances, of the Church’s teaching.” He praised these attributes as suited both to the needs of the inquirer and the believer. The same economy which the sermons had shown in relation to the truths concerning the glories of Mary, Newman had experienced in the Church’s and Mary’s exposure of these truths.

5 Mixed, 374 (Discourse XVIII, “On the Fitness of the Glories of Mary”).
6 Mixed, 356 (Discourse XVII, “The Glories of Mary . . .”).
Newman used the Book of Ecclesiasticus as a demonstration of the harmony of revelation analogous to the harmony of the lower level of creation. In a later section of discourse 17, he used examples to indicate how simply Scripture teaches. In his conclusion, he united tradition and authority to compare the Incarnation and Deipara.

In one of the earliest sermons he ever preached, that of December 25, 1825, Newman had a number of ends in mind: to demonstrate the economy of salvation, to lead his hearers to prayer and contemplation, to provide a moral appreciation of the issue of happiness. He had already developed the pattern for his sermons and their rhetoric: concrete examples to make real and provide insight drawn from his contemplation of Scripture. These elements would become his trademark.

In a sermon preached on February 2, 1831, Newman used Scripture to teach the ways of God so that a moral teaching would be obvious. Next he used it to unite the Hebrew testament with the Christian, through prophecy and its sudden and secret fulfillment. Lastly, he used it to bring out the analogy, in Luke, of the Temple and the Kingdom, so that both the event and its meaning would be united.

His March 25, 1832 sermon, "The Reverence due to the Blessed Virgin Mary," was preached shortly after his move from Evangelicalism to Anglicanism. He used Scripture as a confirmation of his teaching concerning how we come to truth and in an applied sense. In his use of principles of Scripture throughout this sermon, he contrasted Mary's way of sanctification and ours. Her sinlessness freed her from the experience of atonement. This conclusion is an excellent confirmation of the fact that Newman had replaced the Atonement of his Evangelical period with the Incarnation, the chief doctrine which would dominate his Catholic period. A rare use of Scripture in this sermon was the contrast he made of the lectio divina with a scientific analysis of the passage. By contemplation one is in a state where one can attempt to capture the event and its meaning as it was originally experienced.

In his February 26, 1848 sermon "Our Lord's Last Supper and His First," Newman developed an analogy between the Suppers and between Mary and the Apostles. He used Scripture—for the individual believers and especially for the community—to teach that time is reckoned in relation to Jesus' Hour and the responsibilities of each of his followers. This is one of the few examples of Newman's use of Scripture in an accommodated sense. Thus Newman shows us the complete variety of uses of Scripture.
CHAPTER VII

NEWMAN'S EXEGESIS IN HIS "LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE REV. E. B. PUSEY"

Background on the Letter

There are two considerations which make this major text worthy of special treatment: the chief use of Scripture in it is that made of the Apocalypse, as Newman entitled it, and the use of the deeper sense in Scripture. At the present time, there are exegeses who fear that the historical-critical methods have dried up, since their proponents have overworked the Gospels, and that the use of the Book of Revelation (the Apocalypse) would be a fruitful work.¹ Also, others hold that now is the time to study this work.² Newman’s approach in A Letter Addressed to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on Occasion of His Eirenicon³ is an example of one in which he used the lead of the Fathers but added his own interpretation beyond theirs.

In analyzing this Letter, I will first introduce and outline it, then I will examine Newman’s thinking and influences on his thinking there. Afterwards, I will present contemporary thought about apocalyptic literature and exegesis; treat Newman’s views on and use of Scripture, especially the Apocalypse; and, finally, show how Newman’s use of the deeper sense fits the thinking of present-day authors.

Though sermons XVII and XVIII in Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations are among Newman’s major Marian texts (the former on the Immaculate Conception and the latter on the Assumption), nonetheless, his premier text on the Blessed Virgin Mary is his Letter to Pusey. This writing includes the argument on the Immaculate Conception, gives the basis for the Assumption, states the Second Eve title as basis for the doctrine of the Theolokos, and provides both the position of the Fathers and Newman’s own position on invocation and intercession. Thus it is a complete work.

Its structure, which resulted from Newman’s need to reply to Pusey’s Eirenicon, is straightforward:

1. Introductory Remarks;

¹ K. Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic (Naperville, Ill. 1972?), 7-12; hereafter cited as Rediscovery.
³ Hereafter cited in the text as A Letter to Pusey; in footnote references it will be indicated as Diff II (Pusey).
2. Various Statements Introduced into the *Eirenicon*;
3. The Belief of Catholics Concerning the Blessed Virgin, as Distinct from Their Devotion to Her;
4. Belief of Catholics Concerning the Blessed Virgin, as Coloured by Their Devotion to Her;
5. Anglican Misconceptions and Catholic Excesses in Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

*A Letter to Pusey*

The purposes of this dissertation should be stated once more as consideration is focused on the crucial text of Newman on the Blessed Virgin Mary: *A Letter to Pusey*, because from the standpoint of quantity this would not be a major text, but from the standpoint of the purposes it is. The compilation of the texts which combine Newman's writings on the Incarnation and/or the Blessed Virgin Mary and his use of Scripture provides the basis for readers to carry out a critical study of this classical author's exegesis of a most significant theme, and the process of the study develops tools for such a critical reading.

By 1866, when he wrote the *Letter*, Newman had completed the major writings he was to do on the Blessed Virgin. He had written *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* in 1845. As we have seen, this work was pivotal in his understanding of Mary.4 In 1852, he had written Discourses XVII and XVIII; these were his masterful treatments of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. Now, Pusey called him to develop a synthesis of his works on Mary. He had kept an obvious balance in relating the glories of Mary and the fittingness of her glories to Christ. Though the Incarnation was not the theme of these discourses, it was the foundation. On the other hand, in replying to Pusey, Newman was required to accept the issue: Roman Catholics were noted for an excess in Marian devotion which kept them from honoring Christ. This challenge led Newman to form a synthesis of his writings on Mary as Second Eve as the basis of her sanctity and the Immaculate Conception,5 to her dignity (rooted in Apocalypse 12), and for her intercession. Only then did Newman consider the issue of excessive devotion.6

*Outline of the Letter*

Part 1 limits Newman's reply to "the hundred pages . . . devoted to the subject of the Blessed Virgin [which] give . . . a one-sided view of our teaching about her."7 Despite the irritation, Newman seeks to reply in a manner suited to an Eirenicon. In
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5 Diff II (Pusey), 26-50, see especially p. 49.
6 Ibid., 89-118.
7 Ibid., 7.
order to do so, he uses Part 2 to clarify several erroneous references Pusey has made to him.

Part 3 begins with a distinction between devotion and doctrine. Thus Newman concludes his introduction to this part by limiting himself to "the doctrine of the undivided Church... on the subject of her prerogatives." Then he divides this part into three Sections. Section 1 considers the "rudimental teaching of Antiquity." Here the Fathers are searched for their position on Second Eve. From this doctrine he draws a pair of conclusions, one in regard to Mary's sanctity and the other in regard to her dignity. In order to demonstrate the constant testimony to her sanctity, he compares the doctrine of the Second Eve and the Immaculate Conception. Because Pusey had attempted to cast a doubt upon the testimony from Scripture and the Fathers, by quoting those bishops who had recently counselled the Pope not to proclaim the dogma, Newman had to answer this attempt. And his reply had to accept Pusey's demand that the testimony be from the time of the undivided Church. With the analogy uniting Mary's role as Second Eve, her Immaculate Conception, and her sanctity completed, Newman begins the treatment of her dignity with the hypothesis of the victory of "our first parents... in their trial."

The beginning of Part 4 is used as a personal appeal to Pusey to review his own understanding of the Fathers: "Had you happened in your volume to introduce your notice of our teaching about the Blessed Virgin, with a notice of the teaching of the Fathers concerning her, which you follow, ordinary men would have considered that there was not much to choose between you and us." From this introduction, Newman is able to claim that the Anglican and the Roman Catholic positions on true devotion to the Blessed Virgin are practically indistinguishable.

In Part 4 Newman treats the Magnificat. The setting for this is a brief recapitulation of the relation among faith, logic, and theology. Where faith must baffle logic, Newman concludes, "good sense and a large view of truth are the correctives." A first consequence of the revelation of the Incarnation is the increase of our devotion without limit. A second consequence is the distance between Christ and his mother. "He may be called, as in nature, so in grace, our real Father. Mary is only our mother by divine appointment, given us from the Cross." As such Mary can, as Moses did, intercede for us. And she can intercede since to her belongs, as being a creature, a natural claim on our sympathy and familiarity." To clinch this mixture of Mary's
weakness and strength, dependency and intercessory power, Newman quotes the
_Magnificat_ as "her own portrait."\(^{15}\) Touchingly, he recalls for his audience the Coro-
nation of Queen Victoria as a little girl, invested with such vast powers by her office;
he contrasts Mary and her mission. God, in reading our hearts, Newman concludes,
knew how fitting such an intercessor would be. Thus, the prophecy of Isaiah fits the
experience the British had and is a confirmation of both the limitlessness and the
distance Newman found in comparing our beliefs with our devotion.

Shortly after this argument, Newman used John 1:14, "the Word was made
flesh," to demonstrate the relation between Scripture and devotion. Bishop Butler
used the dogma of the Trinity to argue that the fact of revelation is not enough. Over
the generations, believers must use reason to build up an appreciation of the meaning
of the mystery. Only then will they have a devotion towards the relations of God. So
the mystery of the Incarnation clearly stated by John 1:14 would become a source of
devotion as well as of faith. Athanasius was the leader in this approach. For him the
truth is "that man is God, and God is man, that in Mary they meet, and that in this
sense Mary is the centre of all things."\(^{16}\)

In Part 5, Newman did not use Scripture, but he made a distinction which
clarified this last point: "It is the question of her intercession, not of our invocation
of her, not of devotion to her."\(^{17}\) No matter how much Newman admired Mary, he
realized that Mary's intercession is available both for those who do not invoke her as
well as for those who do not have devotion to her. In this remark to Pusey, Newman
was accepting those, like Pusey, whose conscience had been formed in such a way
that they felt unable to invoke her or have devotion to her. This was recognized early
in the _Letter_, where he reminded Pusey that "I am the last man to say that such
violence is in any case lawful, that the claims of conscience are not paramount."\(^{18}\)

Part 5 reviews the unreal gap between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. New-
man is hurt that Pusey had put his own stand towards Mary so much lower than it
really was and had searched for exaggerations among Catholic authors. If Pusey,
Newman states, had exerted the same care he exhibited in studying the bishops'
replies to the Holy See about the Immaculate Conception, to the cataloging of what
Catholics hold in Mary's regard, this gap would not exist.

Therefore, Newman concludes by giving contrasting advice for the two sides:
"May it [Christmas] destroy all bitterness on your side and ours! May it quench all
jealous, sour, proud, fierce antagonism on our side; and dissipate all captious, car-
ping, fastidious refinements of reasoning on yours!"\(^{19}\) Newman admits Catholics

\(^{15}\) Ibid.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., 87.
\(^{17}\) Ibid., 105.
\(^{18}\) Ibid., 4.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., 118.
have placed a block in the way to devotion to the Blessed Virgin by their lack of charity, by their decaying attitudes, by their lack of humility, and by their hostile manner of pursuing peace; but Anglicans have also placed a block by their critical spirit, by their pharisaical approach. A bond of trust would require a new spirit on the part of both, and this is Newman's hope in the face of Pusey's Eirenicon.

Analysis of the "Letter": Its Thought and Influences

With the structure before us, it remains to examine the reasons Newman claimed for writing the Letter to Pusey:

I write afresh nevertheless, and that for three reasons; first, because I wish to contribute to the accurate statement and the full exposition of the argument in question; next, because I may gain a more patient hearing than has sometimes been granted to better men than myself; lastly, because there just now seems a call on me, under my circumstances, to avow plainly what I do and what I do not hold about the Blessed Virgin, that others may know, did they come to stand where I stand, what they would, and what they would not, be bound to hold concerning her.20

We will now examine these three reasons. In the first, Newman wanted to give a complete argument, which would have included his Anglican stand, but he knew that William Ullathorne21 would soon be publishing a treatise on the Blessed Virgin; therefore, he chose to limit his own work to "a mere argument from the Fathers."22 After we have examined the three reasons we will return to Ullathorne's treatise, but for now it will suffice to mention that Ullathorne reviewed the Fathers on the whole issue of the Immaculate Conception. On the other hand, while Newman begins his argument on Apocalypse 12, he seemingly admits that the Fathers were silent on this for a proof of Mary's dignity. If this were the case, he would not be able to give an adequate reply and limit himself to the Fathers. Nonetheless, since he will argue that what he teaches is what was held before the "undivided Church"23 split, he obviously expects to be able to take whatever he needs from what he terms "Antiquity."

Secondly, Newman was aware of the public expectation that, since he had been used for Pusey's purposes in the Eirenicon, he would reply. Only recently had his Apologia and his Dream of Gerontius restored his reputation. Thus, though Pusey was renowned in the Anglican world, Newman knew he would be listened to since he was the one equal of Pusey, and Pusey had taxed the patience of all.

Thirdly, Newman understood the concern Pusey's examples of a false devotion to the Blessed Virgin probably aroused in the hearts of the hearers, and he especially

20 Ibid., 25.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., 55.
worried about those who could decide to follow him into the Roman Catholic Church. They would want to know the limits of doctrine and devotion expected of converts to Catholicism.\textsuperscript{24} Newman passed on to the special argument of Apocalypse 12:

However, it would be out of place to pursue this course of reasoning here; and instead of doing so, I shall take what perhaps you may think a very bold step,—I shall find the doctrine of our Lady's present exaltation in Scripture.

I mean to find it in the vision of the Woman and Child in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse: —now here two objections will be made to me at once; first that such an interpretation is but poorly supported by the Fathers, and secondly that in ascribing such a picture of the Madonna (as it may be called) to the Apostolic age, I am committing an anachronism.\textsuperscript{25}

To return to Ullathorne, we note that Newman, in initiating his interpretation of Apocalypse 12, refers to Ullathorne's work \textit{The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God} at that point (in the original edition) where Apocalypse 12 is cited as a prime scriptural proof for the fall of Satan. In the three instances from Scripture which describe Satan's fall, Ullathorne compares the type with the antitype.\textsuperscript{26} Then he begins a series of applications of types: Satan, Antichrist; Antichrist of the past, of the future; combat in heaven, on earth; Blessed Virgin Mary, Church; struggle of Satan against Jesus and the "woman," struggle of Antichrist against the Church.\textsuperscript{27} Next, Ullathorne posits that types involve two senses: a literal and a figurative, an historical and a prophetical.\textsuperscript{28} Evidently, for him the literal and the historical constitute a coordinated pair of senses. This coordination of senses is common practice in Scripture according to Ullathorne. His conclusion is that the "woman" is open to a pair of interpretations and traditions. In one the "woman" is Mary and in the other the Church. Thus, he can explain why the "woman" can be literally the Blessed Virgin Mary and the mother of the child in one part of Apocalypse 12 and the Church and her members in another part,\textsuperscript{29} and also why the same is true of Satan and Antichrist.

With this solution to the question of the two traditions and interpretations of the "woman," Ullathorne went on to interpret Apocalypse 12 as follows. The great sign is identified by the prophecy of Isaias concerning the Virgin. Nonetheless, he keeps this distinction in mind; he had Mary in conflict with Satan at the very time of the fall. Whereas Mary is glorious as the Mother of the Child, she is the Church in her pain as she brings forth the children.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 25.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 53-54.
\textsuperscript{26} W. Ullathorne, \textit{The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God} (2d rev. ed., Westminster 1905), 69.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 70.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 71.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 71-72.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 72.
In interpreting Apocalypse 12:3-5, Ullathorne first identifies the messianic attribution of Psalm 2 and then remarks that "this allusion to the divinity of the child born of the 'woman' is aimed at the prevailing heresy of the Cerinthians and Ebionites." Unfortunately, he does not tell us what he means by *allusion*, but it appears he uses it in a non-technical sense. He equates the flight into the desert with that into Egypt; however, he has the Church carrying out this first flight into the wilderness.

Finally, Ullathorne comes to the point: the battle and the fate of the angels is a literal description of the fall of Satan and his angels. The reasoning behind this is important—Satan fell but once and because of Christ. Thus the angels are victorious in heaven as the Church is victorious on earth, and both of these victories are one and are Christ's. At this point, Ullathorne joins the fact that verses 12-16 concern the earthly battle and the résumé of the heavenly and earthly battles with the fact that "in both doth Satan stand confronted in his enmity against the Mother of our Lord."

Only after this interpretation does Ullathorne come to the work of the Fathers. St. Ephrem is quoted in relation to the Genesis 3:15 reference, but St. Epiphanius honors the Blessed Virgin as the "Woman" of Apocalypse 12. Then Ullathorne quotes from a sermon on the Creed formerly ascribed to Augustine, with an admission that the work is doubtfully so ascribed. Hence, he puts more stress upon Augustine's commentary on Psalm 142, from which he concludes that he "considered the 'Woman' to be both the Blessed Virgin and the Church." Others upon whom Ullathorne depends for the same interpretations are Ambrose, Primasius, Ambrose Autpert, Aretas, Bernard, and Rupert. He had searched and found these limited examples of a twofold identification. His search was motivated by a hope inspired by the fact that the Immaculate Conception has been usually portrayed under the figure of the Woman clothed with the sun, and because the prophetic vision of the combat between her Son and herself with Satan recalled the preordination of Mary to her role as the Mother of God.

From this review of Ullathorne's work, it becomes obvious why Newman merely refers to it in a footnote at the point where he argues that the Fathers have seeming-
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31 Ibid., 73.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 73-74.
35 Ibid., 74.
36 Ibid., 75-76.
37 Ibid., 76.
38 Ibid., 76-77.
39 Ibid., 77-79.
40 Ibid., 79.
ly been silent on the issue of the identification of the "Woman" in Apocalypse 12. The other reference is to his own Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, where the application of the fifth note of development ("Anticipation of Its Future") is exemplified through four examples: "Resurrection and Relics," "The Virgin Life," "Cultus of Saints and Angels," and, finally, "Office of the Blessed Virgin." These examples supposedly began in the early Church and only as . . . the atmosphere of the Church was, as it were, charged with them from the first, and delivered itself of them from time to time, in this way or that, in various places and persons, as occasion elicited them, testifying the presence of a vast body of thought within it, which one day would take shape and position. 42

This shaping and positioning revealed that, as the fifth note specified, the "later" was already anticipated in the "earlier." Newman compared Eve with Mary on the basis, then, of the relation between Genesis and Apocalypse. This contrast of Eve and Mary is compared with that identification of the serpent and the evil spirit of Genesis and Apocalypse 12. With this contrast and identification, Newman concluded that the "Woman" in both cases was "St. Mary, thus introduced prophetically to our notice immediately on the transgression of Eve." 43 Thus we see Newman's use of the fifth note of his Essay and the review of the Fathers by Ullathorne as ways around the objection that his use of Apocalypse 12 will be anachronistic. 44

To review the objections which Newman finally combines, we find that the silence of the Fathers did not really threaten Newman, because he knew that his audience could accept the fact that the Fathers would search the Scriptures for a proof only if a controversy warranted it and even then they could have missed it. Without controversy, in the first case, and with failure in the search, in the second case, the objection that the Fathers were silent on Apocalypse 12 and Mary's dignity loses its weight. Secondly, Newman does not want to grant that Mary as the "Woman" is an anachronism. He is not "figmenting" that the early Christians represented Mary as a Woman of great dignity. His proof is in the Catacombs. Just as he had argued to the personal experience of the Anglican, and especially the Catholic Anglican, audiences in the objection from the silence of the Fathers, so here he depends upon the personal experiences of his audience. Many of them had been in the

41 Dev, 401-418.
42 Ibid., 400.
43 Ibid., 416.
44 Lash, N. on Development, 97-98; Dev, Section V, on the Fifth Note, begins: "Since, when an idea is living, that is, influential and effective, it is sure to develop according to its own nature, and the tendencies, which are carried out on the long run, may under favourable circumstances show themselves early as well as late, and logic is the same in all ages, instances of a development which is to come, though vague and isolated, may occur from the very first, though a lapse of time be necessary to bring them to perfection" (p. 95).
Catacombs while they were in Rome. And many others had had the testimony of those who were witnesses of these paintings:

As to the second objection which I have supposed, so far from allowing it, I consider that it is built upon a mere imaginary fact, and that the truth of the matter lies in the very contrary direction. The Virgin and Child is not a mere modern idea; on the contrary, it is represented again and again, as every visitor to Rome is aware, in the paintings of the Catacombs. Mary is there drawn with the Divine Infant in her lap, she with hands extended in prayer, He with His hand in the attitude of blessing. No representation can more forcibly convey the doctrine of the high dignity of the Mother, and, I will add, of her influence with her Son. Why should the memory of His time of subjection be so dear to Christians, and so carefully preserved? The only question to be determined, is the precise date of these remarkable monuments of the first age of Christianity. That they belong to the centuries of what Anglicans call the "undivided Church" is certain; but lately investigations have been pursued, which place some of them at an earlier date than any one anticipated as possible. I am not in a position to quote largely from the works of Cavaliere de Rossi, who has thrown so much light upon the subject; but I have his "Imagini Scelte," published in 1863, and they are sufficient for my purpose. In this work he has given us from the Catacombs various representations of the Virgin and Child; the latest of these belong to the early part of the fourth century, but the earliest he believes to be referable to the very age of the Apostles. He comes to this conclusion from the style and the skill of its composition, and from the history, locality, and existing inscriptions of the subterranean in which it is found. However he does not go so far as to insist upon so early a date; yet the utmost concession he makes is to refer the painting to the era of the first Antonines, that is, to a date within half a century of the death of St. John.45

And Newman goes beyond this to picture a Madonna. Newman uses a rhetorical question to do away with the need for proof, but then he grants the need for dating of what can be assumed to be the case. Yet, even here the audience is kept in mind. He expects to be able to bring these paintings within the time when there was an "undivided Church." At the time Newman is writing, de Rossi's latest work became available in England. From the latter's Imagini Scelte, Newman claims a date well within the time of the "undivided Church" and possibly even back to Apostolic times. Nonetheless, he argues that Mary is the Woman of great dignity who was esteemed by the Apostles, so he accepts a date "within half a century of the death of St. John."46 To his audience such a date shows that his claim that the early Church held to Mary's dignity is hardly anachronistic.

45 Diff II (Pusey), 55-56.
46 Ibid., 56. It is noteworthy that the translation which Newman selected for his interpretation of the Apocalypse was the Rheims (1582). In the note given there for "Chapter XII, Ver. I, a 'woman' is the church of God. It may also, by allusion, be applied to our blessed Lady. The church is clothed with the sun, that is, with Christ: she hath the moon, that is, the changeable things of the world, under her feet: and the twelve stars with which she is crowned, are the twelve apostles: she is in labour and pain, whilst she brings forth her children, and Christ in them, in the midst of afflictions
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Therefore, in these two hypothetical objections, Newman is asking his readers not to make unreal demands for proof. The Fathers’ silence is ambivalent. The Apostles’ silence is ambivalent. The Fathers could have done as poorly on Mary as they did on Christ’s divinity. The testimony of the Apostles found expression not in written word, but in the paintings on the walls of the catacombs done by those who learned about Christ and his Mother from them. Instead, then, Newman asks his audience to look at their own experience in the catacombs rather than to the exaggerated experiences Pusey presented.

I consider then, that, as you would use in controversy with Protestants, and fairly, the traditional doctrine of the Church in early times, as an explanation of a particular passage of Scripture, or at least as a suggestion, or as a defence, of the sense which you may wish to put upon it, quite apart from the question whether your interpretation itself is directly traditional, so it is lawful for me, though I have not the positive words of the Fathers on my side, to shelter my own interpretation of the Apostle’s vision in the Apocalypse under the fact of the extant pictures of Mother and Child in the Roman Catacombs. Again, there is another principle of Scripture interpretation which we should hold as well as you, viz., when we speak of a doctrine being contained in Scripture, we do not necessarily mean that it is contained there in direct categorical terms, but that there is no satisfactory way of accounting for the language and expressions of the sacred writers, concerning the subject-matter in question, except to suppose that they held concerning it the opinion which we hold,—that they would not have spoken as they have spoken, unless they held it. For myself I have ever felt the truth of this principle, as regards the Scripture proof of the Holy Trinity; I should not have found out that doctrine in the sacred text without previous traditional teaching; but, when once it is suggested from without, it commends itself as the one true interpretation, from its appositeness,—because no other view of doctrine, which can be ascribed to the inspired writers, so happily solves the obscurities and seeming inconsistencies of their teaching. And now to apply what I have been saying to the passage in the Apocalypse.

The references given there are to Apocalypse 12 and Genesis 49:17. The latter reads: “Let Dan be a snake in the way, a serpent in the path, that biteth the horse’s heels that his rider may fall backward.” The note for this unites verses 16 and 18: “Dan shall judge. This was verified in Samson, who was of the tribe of Dan, and began to deliver Israel, Judges XIII, 5. But as this deliverance was temporal and imperfect, the holy patriarch (ver. 18) aspires after another kind of deliverer saying: “I will look for thy salvation, O Lord.” The note for 3-15 reads: “She shall crush. Ipsa, the woman: so divers of the fathers read this place, conformably to the Latin; others read it ipsum, vix., the seed. The sense is the same; for it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent’s head.”

47 Ibid., 56-57.
It is important to have a defense against this charge since it is obvious that de Rossi was unable to put an exact date on the paintings in the catacombs. Nor is this surprising, since, in our day, G. A. Wellen has presented the results of his examination of the paintings, having found none earlier than the Priscilla Catacomb which he dates at the year 200.48

In the next section, Newman uncovers the limited audience he has in mind as he asks his Anglican readers to compare their approach to Protestants with his, to notice how they agree with him on the use of tradition. Tradition need not be explicit and it can vary in its support from providing an “explanation,” a “suggestion,” or a “defence” of an interpretation. This is so even when the interpretation is not “directly traditional.” Because Anglicans use tradition in such a way, Newman holds that his interpretation, despite the silence of the Fathers, can find protection under the paintings in the catacombs. Hence what could have been an objection has become a help.

But beyond the principles of exegesis Newman customarily employs, we find one he claims is not peculiar to himself but is shared by Anglicans and Catholics. To be contained in Scripture, a doctrine need not be there in “direct categorical terms.” Instead the manner of expression is such that it is intelligible only on the basis of an agreement with the doctrine in question. This is another example of Newman’s exegetical principle of “view.” The “later” is the basis for an understanding of the “earlier.” Only through the later understanding of Tradition does an earlier passage of Scripture become meaningful. Only then do the confusions and seeming contradictions disappear. He uses the apt case of the Trinity to aid the reader to experience what he sees. The many differing relations of the Father, Christ Jesus, and the Spirit become compatible with other statements on God, once the doctrine of the Trinity has been understood. Though the Trinitarian doctrine is not in Scripture in direct categorical terms, it makes the meaning of Scripture clear and consistent.

Thus, Newman has been preparing his Anglican audience for the presence of a proof from Scripture concerning Mary’s dignity, despite the lack of its existence in direct categorical terms. He expects to be able to convince them that what is true of the many passages relating to the Trinity is also true of the passage in Apocalypse 12 in relation to Mary’s dignity. Going from the identification of the “Woman” and the “man-child” to the identification of the person of Mary, Newman developed these several approaches so that the reader would feel justified in accepting the “Woman” as the Church in the direct sense, but the “Woman” as Mary in a deeper sense, in which Mary is truly a person who is also a symbol of the Church through the “Woman.”

If there is an Apostle on whom, a priori, our eyes would be fixed, as likely to teach us about the Blessed Virgin, it is St. John, to whom she was committed by our Lord on the Cross,—with whom, as tradition goes, she lived at Ephesus till she was taken away. This anticipation is confirmed a posteriori: for, as I have said above, one of the earliest and fullest of our informants concerning her dignity, as being the second Eve, is Irenaeus, who came to Lyons from Asia Minor, and had been taught by the immediate disciples of St. John. 40

Before actually making the application of Apocalypse 12, Newman adds a pair of reasons for accepting the passage as obviously directed to Mary and her dignity. Assuming that John the Apostle is the author, Newman asks his audience to recall the two relationships between Mary and John: 1) at the Cross where Christ gave her into John’s care, and 2) at Ephesus where the two lived until Mary’s departure. Succinctly, Newman joins the passage in the Apocalypse with the redemptive mystery. We can expect John to be at the origin of a tradition which passed through his disciples (Polycarp) to Irenaeus; therefore, in Irenaeus we read the Apostolic teaching of Mary’s dignity. Newman begins his explanation of the Apostle’s vision, which is as follows:

“A great sign appeared in heaven: A woman clothed with the Sun, and the Moon under her feet; and on her head a crown of twelve stars. And being with child, she cried travailing in birth, and was in pain to be delivered. And there was seen another sign in heaven; and behold a great red dragon .... And the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered, that, when she should be delivered, he might devour her son. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with an iron rod; and her son was taken up to God and to His throne. And the woman fled into the wilderness.” Now I do not deny of course, that under the image of the Woman, the Church is signified; but what I would maintain is this, that the Holy Apostle would not have spoken of the Church under this particular image, unless there had existed a blessed Virgin Mary, who was exalted on high, and the object of veneration to all the faithful. 50

Newman’s Use of Scripture in the Letter

Newman now applies his exegesis to the passage—Apocalypse 12:1-6. He does this in an interesting way, by using the traditional interpretation of the Woman as the Church. 51 This enables him to remind his audience that John had used a noble symbol for the Church, but that women in general would not have been such a symbol; only a specific woman who had a great dignity, and a dignity which was

49 Diff II (Pusey), 57.
50 Ibid., 57-58.
51 Ibid., 58.
fully and universally appreciated and esteemed, could be meant. The Woman would not have meaning as the Church, unless there were a Blessed Virgin Mary who had such an accepted dignity.

Here, Newman's principle of interpreting the earlier by the later prepares the way for his deeper sense. Whereas the Woman in a direct sense is the Church, the Woman in a fuller sense is the one who gives meaning to the symbol of the Church.\textsuperscript{52} The very text has a twofold, but single meaning. The Woman is at once the symbol of the whole and the one who is the symbol. Thus, Newman's sacramental principle comes into effect. The true reality, for him, is a sacramental reality. Beneath the appearances is a deeper, unchanging truth which is holy. Through this sacramental approach, Newman is able to recognize that the fact that the Church is directly signified is no more significant than the reality of the symbol.

Newman next secures the feasibility of identifying the "Woman" and Mary by identifying the "man-child" and her Son. He does this in a casual manner by assuming that all can admit the second identity and then putting the burden of disproving the first identity upon the reader. Yet he removes the limitations of this approach, by admitting that he has merely accepted the obvious surface meaning of the allusions. At a less obvious level, the symbols are representatives of the Church and the children of the Church. But once again Newman returns to the meaning of the symbol in itself rather than in reference to something else. Granted that the symbol means the Church and the children of the Church, these have their own meanings also. And what they mean in themselves is as legitimately inferred concerning the "Woman" as the "man-child"; so that what the one is, the other is. Thus Newman's second approach to the symbol from his exegetical principle of sacrament has justified his attestation that Mary is a person as much as her Son is a person. What is true of the one is true of the other.

No one doubts that the "man-child" spoken of is an allusion to our Lord: why then is not "the Woman" an allusion to His Mother? This surely is the obvious sense of the words; of course they have a further sense also, which is the scope of the image; doubtless the Child represents the children of the Church, and doubtless the Woman represents the Church; this, I grant, is the real or direct sense, but what is the sense of the symbol under which that real sense is conveyed? Who are the Woman and the Child? I answer, they are not personifications but Persons. This is true of the Child, therefore it is true of the Woman.

But again: not only Mother and Child, but a serpent is introduced into the vision. Such a meeting of man, woman, and serpent has not been found in Scripture, since the beginning of Scripture, and now it is found in its end. Moreover, in the passage in the Apocalypse as if to supply, before Scripture came to an end, what was wanting in its beginning, we are told, and for the first time, that the serpent in Paradise was the evil spirit. If the dragon of St. John is the same as the serpent of

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
Moses, and the man-child is "the seed of the woman," why is not the woman herself she, whose seed the man-child is? And, if the first woman is not an allegory, why is the second? If the first woman is Eve, why is not the second Mary?53

Before continuing the second approach to symbol, Newman adds another basis for claiming that Mary is a person; he reminds the reader that beyond the "Woman" and the "man-child" there is a serpent in the vision. Immediately Newman's principle of the unity of the Old and the New Testament comes into play. The same three, "woman-child-serpent," were in the beginning and now in the end. Again his principle of interpreting the earlier by the later is used; the serpent was unnamed at the beginning. The identification of the dragon as the serpent of Genesis 3:15 is done by the inspired author of the Apocalypse; therefore, Newman knew that he followed an interpretation revealed in the Holy Scripture. And, just as the principle of analogy was used to equate "the Woman" and Mary, the "man-child" and her Son, so the principle was used in equating the "dragon" and the "serpent." Keeping this concern for the existence of a real person under the symbol, Newman argues by analogy beyond allegory both for Eve, the first woman, and Mary, the second. Eve, for Newman, was a person; the Second Eve, Mary, is no less.

Once again, Newman returns to the question of person versus personification. The "Woman" is at the very center of the Apocalypse. This very prominence of the symbol Newman recognizes as telling against personification. The "Woman" overpowers what as a personification it would personify. Regardless of Newman's preference for the Alexandrian School, he can claim that Scripture is seldom allegorical. Occasionally, the use of figurative images can be found, and of metaphors, but Scripture is not in the habit of using either abstractions or generalizations. And in these latter, personalization is not at all as frequent in Scripture as in classical writing. Seldom have such personifications of abstract ideas been found in Scripture. Though some of the Fathers have personified such ideas, Scripture seldom does. Instead, Scripture is concerned to use types. Newman goes through the outstanding examples in the prophets before he alludes to the fact that the Apocalypse itself is not an allegory. Rather than being an allegory, the Apocalypse came out of Jewish ritual.54 Thus Newman shared the position that the Apocalypse is structured for an audience in need of symbols for their continued salvation. Hence, he gives several examples of types of salvation under his sacramental principle. And then, to secure this interpretation of Scripture and, specifically, the apocalyptic as typological, Newman recounts the typology of the parables. The sacramental character of the parables is founded on real events which could take place. In these various ways, Newman shows that the custom of Scripture is not towards personification but towards typology.

53 Ibid., 58-59.
54 Ibid., 60.
But Newman accepts the need to face up to the use of personification in the sapiential books. Though personification seemed to be used for wisdom, in fact, interpreters tried to identify it with the Lord, as Newman had it. This seemed to be the real sense of wisdom, until this attribution appeared to make Christ’s divinity vulnerable to the attack of the Arians. Only then did the interpreters change the attribution from Christ. Later, the inadequacy of a mere personification of wisdom caused the interpreters, Newman discerned, to apply the description to Mary. Thus he continued his argument against the mere personification of the “Woman” as Mary.

But this is not all. The image of the woman, according to general Scripture usage, is too bold and prominent for a mere personification. Scripture is not fond of allegories. We have indeed frequent figures there, as when the sacred writers speak of the arm or sword of the Lord; and so too when they speak of Jerusalem or Samaria in the feminine; or of the Church as a bride or as a vine; but they are not much given to dressing up abstract ideas or generalizations in personal attributes. This is the classical rather than the Scriptural style. Xenophon places Hercules between Virtue and Vice, represented as women; Aeschylus introduces into his drama Force and Violence; Virgil gives personality to public rumour or Fame, and Plautus to Poverty. So on monuments done in the classical style, we see virtues, vices, rivers, renown, death, and the like, turned into human figures of men and women. Certainly I do not deny there are some instances of this method in Scripture, but I say that such poetical compositions are strikingly unlike its usual method. Thus, we at once feel the difference from Scripture, when we betake ourselves to the Pastor of Hermas, and find the Church a woman; to St. Methodius, and find Virtue a woman; and to St. Gregory’s poem, and find Virginity again a woman. Scripture deals with types rather than personifications. Israel stands for the chosen people, David for Christ, Jerusalem for heaven. Consider the remarkable representations, dramatic I may call them, in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea: predictions, threatenings, and promises are acted out by those Prophets. Ezekiel is commanded to shave his head, and to divide and scatter his hair; and Ahias tears his garment, and gives ten out of twelve parts of it to Jeroboam. So too the structure of the imagery in the Apocalypse is not a mere allegorical creation, but is founded on the Jewish ritual. In like manner our Lord’s bodily cures are visible types of the power of His grace upon the soul; and His prophecy of the last day is conveyed under that of the fall of Jerusalem. Even His parables are not simply ideal, but relations of occurrences, which did or might take place, under which was conveyed a spiritual meaning. The description of Wisdom in the Proverbs and other sacred books, has brought out the instinct of commentators in this respect. They felt that Wisdom could not be a mere personification, and they determined that it was our Lord: and the later-written of these books, by their own more definite language, warranted that interpretation. Then, when it was found that the Arians used it in derogation of our Lord’s divinity, still, unable to tolerate the notion of a mere allegory, commentators applied the description to the Blessed Virgin.

55 Ibid., 59-60.
Now that we have analyzed Newman’s argument against personification in general, let us examine the specific examples he has chosen. Newman can admit a number of instances of Scripture using figures, and he gives the obvious and well-known examples of God’s power being presented under the figure of either an arm or a sword; of the use of the feminine to present Jerusalem and Samaria as figures of these two groups of people; and of the use of the figures of bride and vine to represent the Church. However, Newman denies a frequent use of personification for either abstract ideas or generalizations. Whereas he could cite an endless number of classical personifications of abstractions and generalizations, he holds this is not the situation with the Scripture.

In his first example he selected Hercules, an instance of Xenophon’s use of personification. Next he selected Aeschylus for a double example of personification. From the Aeneid, he selected the most famous example of Rumor. He also quoted Plautus for a brief, but pithy example of the personification of Poverty.

“Vices, rivers, renown, death, and the like” are expressed in the form of personifications. On the other hand, Newman found few instances of such a practice in Scripture, while in the Fathers he can find a number of cases. In the visions, the Pastor of Hermas personifies the Church as a woman; in Gregory of Nazianzen’s poetry, virginity is personified as a woman; and in Methodius of Olympus’ Banquet, Virtue is so personified. Rather than personification in Scripture, Newman finds types. Three such stand out for him—Israel, David, and Jerusalem: types of the people of God, Christ, and heaven. Again, he notes the historical grounding of the prophetic teachings. The very acts of Jeremiah, Ezechiel, and Hosea tell the future, the dangers, and the promises. These become types which sacramentally signify what they represent. For example, Ezechiel cuts his hair to represent the destruction and
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56 Xenophon’s Memorabilia, II. 1. 21-34, in which Socrates tells Aristippus how Prodicus received his work on Virtue and Vice in “On Heracles.” Heracles came to the point of his youth where he had to decide between the path of vice and virtue. As he sat pondering, two outstanding women appeared to him. Each in turn told him what he should expect if he were to follow her. When Virtue finished, Socrates admonished Aristippus to ponder likewise.

57 Aeschylus’ The Eumenides, 518ff., where Athene argues with the chorus over the judgment of Orestes for matricide. Fear protects Justice. Thus the vote, which is even, preserves the Greeks from violence. Yet the chorus is at first deaf to this, and calls upon Violence to do away with Orestes. Gradually Athene’s eloquence brings the chorus to accept Persuasion in place of Violence, and the new and the old religions can continue to exist side by side.

58 Virgil, Aeneid 4, 173, where the famous description of Rumor spreading the story of Dido and Aeneas is told.

59 Plautus, Stichus, Act 1, Scene 3, line 178, where Gelasimus complains of life in a cruel, hard world, but then admits that Poverty teaches every art.

60 Vision I of the Pastor of Hermas; Gregory of Nazianzen: Caminum Liber I, 37, col. 523; Methodius of Olympus, Le Banquet (Paris 1963); Ezechial 5:1-3 and 3 Kings 11:30.
exile of Jerusalem and the chosen people, while Ahias, by tearing his new cloak into twelve pieces and giving ten to Jeroboam, represents how Solomon would have his kingdom decimated and given, finally, to Jeroboam.  

From these many examples, Newman prepared the audience to understand his meaning in claiming that the Apocalypse is not a mere fashioning of John’s imagination. In fact, the symbols and the “structure of the imagery” are rooted concretely in the ritual of the Jewish people. André Feuillet alerts us to the fact that “most of the great visions of the Apocalypse have some sort of liturgical flavor to them, which is due basically to the essentially eschatological orientation characteristic of the Christian liturgy,” while Austin Farrer claims “St. John does not see the scriptures in what seems to us to be their ‘own’ pattern, he sees them artificially arranged in the Jewish sacred calendar, with its feasts and its lessons.”

Carrying the historical and real foundation of typology farther, Newman interprets sacramentally Christ’s cures of physical maladies. Even the apocalyptic warning, Newman holds, is given by Christ under the type of Jerusalem’s fall. In this line of analysis, Newman continues with Christ’s parables. Usually they refer to a historical event or to something which could as easily be such.

Coming back then to the Apocalyptic vision, I ask: If the Woman ought to be some real person? Who can it be whom the Apostle saw, and intends, and delineates, but that same Great Mother to whom the chapters in the Proverbs are accommodated? And let it be observed, moreover, that in this passage, from the allusion made in it to the history of the fall, Mary may be said still to be represented under the character of the Second Eve.

Newman is now ready to apply this to the vision in Apocalypse 12. As he does so, he is careful to contrast this real person with the “Great Mother” of the sapiential books, in order that the reader will not be justified in holding that he overlooked a contrary example, since clearly this “Great Mother” is taken in an accommodated sense. The true “Great Mother” is identified with her “whom the Apostle saw, and intends, and delineates.” Newman uses three verbs to indicate how he takes the vision. John did not see a church, but a person. Having seen Mary in the vision, John intended to prophesy about Mary. In order to make the vision and the prophecy intelligible to others, John described her role in salvation. This role, Newman underlined, was that of the Second Eve. She is not an accommodation, nor a personification, nor an allegory, but a true person who is a symbol of the Church and a Mother. Granted that Mary is the meaning of the symbol of the Woman, she is in a fuller sense the Mother.

61 Diff 11 (Pusey), 60.
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I make a farther remark: it is sometimes asked, Why do not the sacred writers mention our Lady's greatness? I answer, she was, or may have been alive, when the Apostles and Evangelists wrote;—there was just one book of Scripture certainly written after her death, and that book does (so to say) canonize and crown her.

But if all this be so, if it is really the Blessed Virgin whom Scripture represents as clothed with the sun, crowned with the stars of heaven, and with the moon as her footstool, what height of glory may we not attribute to her? And what are we to say of those who, through ignorance, run counter to the voice of Scripture, to the testimony of the Fathers, to the traditions of East and West, and speak and act contemptuously towards her whom her Lord delighteth to honour?

Having identified Mary as the “Woman,” Newman returns to the issue of silence once more. The Scripture seemed silent on Mary, as did the Apostles and the Fathers, but one writer broke this silence, John. The other writers of the Gospels and the Epistles did not glorify Mary, because she was probably living as they wrote; but the Apocalypse was “certainly written after her death.”

Thus Newman can conclude, as he did, that it is the Blessed Virgin Mary who is clothed with the sun and hence worthy of all praise due to her dignity. Only those who are ignorant would withhold such praise from her whose dignity is attested to by Scripture.

Literature on the Use of the Apocalypse for Exegesis

The issue of the timeliness of the present study of the use of Apocalypse 12 by Newman in A Letter to Pusey occurs due to the opposition of Rudolph Bultmann to the apocalyptic. Despite the renewed interest in the apocalyptic in our day, the question of the timeliness of this study must face the conclusions of Bultmann’s History and Eschatology which the majority of the Bultmannians accept. After stating this challenge and presenting the responses of Harold Rowley and Klaus Koch, we will consider the specific status of the Apocalypse with André Feuillet, Claus Westerman, Adela Collins, and John Gager to ascertain the value of a study of the Apocalypse and particularly the use of Apocalypse 12.

Bultmann arrived at his conclusion on the irrelevancy of the apocalyptic for our times by a study of the variety of ways both history and eschatology have been understood from Greek and Jewish times to the present. In the process of seeking the Jewish understanding of eschatology at the time of Christ, he considered chiefly the “Son of Man” and the fact that the threatening signs of the prophets became an integral part of the apocalyptic. Thus, whereas the early Christian community united Christ’s apocalyptic understanding and the Jewish apocalyptic, it did not

66 Ibid.
67 R. Bultmann, History and Eschatology (New York 1957), 32-34.
consider itself historical. Instead, just as the end depended upon God's judgment, so did the unity achieved result from this judgment, rather than from man's historical efforts. Hence the apocalyptic had neither an historical nor a future value. Because such a view not only contrasted sharply with Wolfhart Pannenberg's stress in *Revelation as History* upon the historical and the future, but also with the general position of Bultmann in his eschatological works, Bultmann was required to demonstrate that his own position was in accord with Scripture; therefore he went to Paul and John for backing for his conclusion that there was no expectation of the apocalyptic among the early believers. Eventually, then, he concluded his position on the assumed fact that "the conception of the eschatological event as happening in the present is still more radically unfolded in John." Thus his challenge is that in place of the apocalyptic all ages have lived a non-historical, realized eschatology as contrasted with Pannenberg's historical, future apocalyptic. We shall find Pannenberg's position more in accord with the spirit of Newman's.

In 1963, Rowley published *The Relevance of the Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to Revelation*. He distinguished two groups of biblical scholars—those who held that only Daniel and Revelation have any value in the Bible and those who held that everything in the Bible was of value except Daniel and Revelation. His own balanced approach is most clear in his concluding chapter: "The Enduring Message of the Apocalyptic." Here he emphasized the necessity of studying Daniel and Revelation as wholes rather than as sources of gems from a few verses. Once these books are studied as wholes, the spiritual message is evident. The apocalyptic is neither everything nor nothing; rather it is a very important way of appraising the life of the Christian community, yet not the only way.

Within a decade after Rowley's work, a follower of Bultmann dared to write *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. As a follower of Bultmann, Koch appeared somewhat as an outcast in asking for a reopening of the study of the apocalyptic; hence, he wrote his work as something to be questioned. His thesis was that the apocalyptic had not really been studied by historians and theologians in the fashion other writings of the Bible had been studied, and that, with the deadend of the form-critical approach to the Gospels facing scholars who had overworked these writings, it was time to use the same approach for Revelation. In the process of convincing these biblical scholars, Koch presented not only the positions of Pannenberg and Bultmann, but also those of the German and English frontrunners in the renewed study of the apocalyptic: Ernst Kaseman, H. H. Rowley, O. Plöger, and D.
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S. Russell. Koch complained that the English were far ahead of the Germans in entering this rediscovered field.

Now that we have indicated the controversy associated with the renewed interest in the apocalyptic, it is important to review the changing approaches to the interpretation and exegesis of the Apocalypse from the beginning. For this, no author is better than Feuillet, who provides the following list:

1) millenary exegesis—Hippolytus
2) recapitulation theory—St. Augustine
3) the history of the universe—Middle Ages
4) the eschatological system and the application of the data of the Apocalypse to contemporary events—16th century
5) documentary and comparative methods—19th and 20th centuries.71

In recent times, R. H. Charles belongs to the eschatological school; Ernest Allo, to the recapitulation; Hermann Gunkel, F. Boll, and Alfred Loisy, to a mythological interpretation; Ernst Lohmeyer, to the traditiongeschichtliche school and the eschatological. M. E. Boismard differs from the documentary school in that he finds a single author; however, he holds that the Apocalypse was a combined work written at two separate times. Both J. Bonsirven and Lucien Cerfaux follow the recapitulation school. Dom Guiu M. Camps is one of the more recent authors in the eschatological school.72

Since Feuillet antedated Raymond Brown's two-volume interpretation of John's Gospel, it is fitting to put Brown's interpretation here since it is most recent. Brown treats eschatology in several places, and usually the realized eschatology of John's Gospel is contrasted with the future eschatology of the Apocalypse; nonetheless, he does not find these in opposition but in complement to one another. And Brown is not alone in this approach, since Bernard Le Frois in 1954, claimed:

Despite the fact that the spiritual or ideal interpretation of the Apocalypse, elaborated chiefly by Father Allo, O.P., has gained many adherents in the past forty years, there is an ever increasing number of authors who, along the lines of the earliest Church Fathers, prefer to give an eschatological interpretation to the greater part of that prophetic book of the New Testament.73

Feuillet has one significant conclusion. He expects that an understanding of the fact that the Book of Revelation or Apocalypse uses symbolic language will become better understood and prepare readers for a fuller appreciation of its richness. Also he expects an understanding of its crisis origins will remove the temptation to treat it
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as a prophecy. Instead, the reader will be open to the dramatic qualities of the poetry through which theological truths are exposed.74

Feuillet preceded Koch and recognized the importance of an exegesis of the Apocalypse which grows out of the latest biblical studies, in order to avoid the harmful errors and mistaken paths of interpretation which occur when exegetes forget the context and form of the writings they are interpreting. Thus he warns that the literary genre is that of poetry; the language is symbolical rather than historical. Therefore the message, as Rowley had earlier noted, is not that of a definite prophecy of certain events, but a message of hope to those who are in a time of crisis.

To continue our concern with the literary genre of the Apocalypse, we will review Westermann's *Beginning and End in the Bible*, which is basically a critique of Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* which correctly noticed the contrast between Jewish and pagan sources in the Apocalypse. However, though Westermann is indebted to Gunkel for this original work, he must nonetheless criticize Gunkel for the incompleteness of his work, since the latter's assumption that the correspondence between eschatological and primal time was present in Babylonian tradition ignored the question of why there was such a correspondence. Moreover, this shunted question was such, due to the very structure of Gunkel's work, whose goal was not to relate "creation and chaos in the primal time (Gen. 1) and what is said about them in the end time (Rev. 12), but rather to demonstrate that what is said about them in both instances goes back to Babylonian mythology."75 Westermann approaches an answer to the shunted question in an original fashion. Instead of breaking Genesis and Apocalypse into fragments, he examines Genesis 1-11 and all of Apocalypse together as units. In doing so, Westermann corrects Gunkel's basis for understanding time and history, and he denies the battle motif of Genesis. The reason Gunkel failed to notice this, Westermann claims, is that Gunkel followed a methodology of the history of traditions without the use of a methodology of form criticism, and hence he failed to situate the texts "in their *Sitz im Leben.*"76

This led Westermann to his correction, as he searched for the similarities and contrasts of beginning and end time. He found it in the fact that these times are beyond historical time. From here he moved to relate these to the "center of the Bible's message."77 The salvation of the few becomes universal. Therefore the importance of Genesis and Apocalypse is not in the quiet beginning and the combative end, but in the very universality of the saving action.78

Another author who is important for understanding the literary genre of the Apocalypse and who is most contemporary, having written in the mid-seventies, is

76 Ibid., 30.
77 Ibid., 33.
78 Ibid., 37-39.
Adela Collins. In her *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*, she returns to the once-common mythological approach to Apocalypse. She introduces her work with a review similar to that of Feuillet:

1) Recapitulation theory,
2) Sources theory,
3) Literary unity without Recapitulation,
4) Revival of the Recapitulation Theory.79

For her own purposes, she selects the Recapitulation theory as the basis of a complex approach to the Apocalypse. She, like Feuillet, finds the literary genre to be that of poetry:

In the course of this study it will be shown that the images of Revelation are best understood as poetic expressions of human experiences and hopes. They are not easy to link with a specific sequence of historical events of the past or future. Various visions and different formulations of the same experience or hope are juxtaposed. It would thus seem that the book is not intended to provide an eschatological timetable. It should rather be read as a poetic interpretation of human experience in which ancient patterns of conflict are used to illuminate the deeper significance of currently experienced conflict.80

It is not surprising that she accepted much of A. M. Farrer’s *A Rebirth of Images* and Günther Bornkamm’s *Komposition* as a starting point for her own interpretation. Through this rhythmic approach, she is able to discover a pattern which repeats itself throughout. For our purposes, her stress upon Apocalypse 12, despite her emphasis upon mythology, is significant. The pattern she finds is a movement “from visions of persecution/threat to those of salvation/victory” which reaches its high point in chapter 12, which is not only the structural center of the work but also the place in which the total recurrent pattern is telescopically carried out.81 Thus, she argues that “the following elements of the pattern are present in Revelation 12”:

a. Threat (vss. 3-4)
b. Combat-Victory (vss. 7-9)
c. Salvation (vss. 5-6)
d. Victory Shout (vss. 10-12).82

Though Collins is deeply indebted to Gunkel for her Babylonian interpretation of the combat, she applies a source approach to Revelation 12 which points to a Christian redaction of two Jewish apocalyptic sources. This contrasts with those interpretations which Le Frois cataloged as limited to pagan myths.

Just as Collins published, John J. Gager came out with *Kingdom and Community* which reviewed the relation between millenarianism and community.

80 Ibid., 3.
81 Ibid., xv.
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History provided him, except in the case of the Apocalypse, with a series of failures from all examples of millenarianism, even where there had been some form of fulfillment, whether through "sacraments, meditation, asceticism, and mystical visions." However, these attainments are usually individual rather than communal. Moreover in communal expressions the goal has been equality, whether of sexes or slaves and free. Gager concluded that the Apocalypse was "beyond these modes of apprehending the future . . . as an expression of apocalyptic mythology." Thus once again we have the positive affirmation similar to Pannenberg's but with the earlier mythological stress of Gunkel. In order to understand the message one must grasp the whole and the structure as well as the *Sitz im leben*: "a situation in which believers had experienced suffering and death at the hands of Rome." Against this background, Gager interpreted the myth in an analogy with what he termed psychoanalysis, a form of transcendence of time by both the myth and the hearers of the myth. Thus the threats posed to believers were beyond the momentary persecution. The myth provided them with a successive pattern of symbols of victory/hope and oppression/despair. These reached their climax in chapters 21:1 through 22:5, where the fruits of their struggle and death were crowned with glory. We notice that Collins and Gager came to the similar pattern separately, and, later we will find, that a commentator on Newman, Dominic J. Unger, came to the same conclusion about glory. What, then, are the uses of the apocalyptic? Gager agreed with Farrer, as Collins did, that the liturgical use of the Apocalypse could well prepare believers for the crisis at stake. In our analysis of Newman we will find that he also held this to be one of the obvious uses of the Apocalypse.

From this review of authors, the conclusion is readily drawn that the Apocalypse is in the literary genre of the apocalyptic, which means that, rather than being an historical statement of prophecy, it is a symbolic statement of recurring consolation in the face of crisis, made during the liturgical celebrations—first in the Jewish service and later in the Christian service.

*Newman's Views on the Use of Scripture, the Apocalypse*

With the question of the genre cared for, it is possible to examine the *Letter to Pusey* for Newman's comments, first on Mary's sanctity and secondly on her dignity. The former, sanctity, was an inference from which the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was drawn. In fact, this inference was most important, because in his

---
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Eirenicon Pusey was asking for a re-reception of the dogma. Since a number of Roman Catholic bishops had replied in the negative about the fittingness of the proclamation of the dogma, and since neither the Anglican nor the Orthodox branches had been asked, Pusey was concerned to have the dogma considered for reception once again. By showing that this dogma was contained in the very sanctity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Newman was most adroitly answering Pusey's extended argument. On the other hand, the latter issue, her dignity, was not so obviously an immediate inference. Instead of a forthright presentation, Newman was required to develop a series of comparisons which would demonstrate the different bases for dignity of our predecessors. He began with what our respect for Eve would have been if she had not sinned, and he continued with examples of others of our illustrious forebears whom we still honor with great respect. The important comparison was with the saints and Christ; they are worthy of dignity now for what they were while they were on earth. Yet the reason for these comparisons is that they lead us to ask if Mary is to be honored now because she had an integral part to play in our redemption? If this is the case, he argued, we should reconsider her position while she was on earth, since such a condition will surely continue on into the future. And that position should be able to be found in the Scriptures, otherwise we would have only our meditative suppositions upon which to ground ourselves.

Nonetheless, Newman knew that the scriptural foundation was not as explicit as he could have wanted, so he fell back upon a presupposition: there is a marked difference between a Protestant and a Catholic interpretation of Scripture. The audience he had in mind was of the Catholic party of Anglicanism, and, in order to convince them that Mary's dignity is found in Scripture, Newman reminds them that worldly people are not prepared to read the Word of God in a way where they can grasp "her historical position in the gospels." Then he went beyond the worldly people and the typical Catholics to those devoted Catholic scholars whom he contrasted with the usual Protestant scholars. Whereas the Protestant scholars were outstanding in considering "abstract doctrines"—and he listed a pair of these, Catholic scholars were noteworthy for a contemplative approach. Since, as we shall see in reviewing the principles of his exegesis, Newman approached Scripture as a religious book, he was attuned to this difference. But he found a second characteristic in the approach of Catholics to Scripture. Not only were their scholars contemplative rather than abstract, but they were matched by a Catholic audience which was open to conclusions, despite their inability to derive these themselves.

Thus, with the scholars' assistance, typical Catholics were prepared to find a less abstract and more concrete mental understanding of what revelation made available for them. Moreover, both teachers and learners made themselves docile to the teach-

---
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ings and experienced these as in accord with the truth of the matter. This openness to conclusions is part of the “Catholic instinct”\textsuperscript{89} Newman found among those to whom he had been joined. In this, Newman seemed to be basing his assumption upon two of his principles of exegesis: “holiness first” and “view.”\textsuperscript{90} By the former, Newman considered the Bible to be a holy book and a cause of moral and spiritual value; therefore, beyond the importance of scholarly study was the meaning and the use of that meaning for one’s life. By the latter (“view”), he meant that just as a hypothesis prepared one’s mind to determine facts, so a “view” prepared one’s mind to be attentive to what is significant and relevant. By “view” he meant, then, that one can only discover what one’s mental attitude has prepared one to recognize once one has found it. From these combined principles, Newman distinguished Anglican and Catholic exegesis.\textsuperscript{91}

Because he would complete his treatment of Mary’s sanctity and dignity with a brief, cogent presentation of Mary as Theotokos, Newman now took the “very bold step” of promising to ground Mary’s glory in Scripture, in Apocalypse 12. Hence, he walked with the recent proclamation of the Immaculate Conception on the one hand and the old tradition of the Council of Ephesus’ proclamation of Mary as Theotokos on the other. Between these, he took a step on his own, but a step which he held was helpful because no passage of Scripture gave greater glory and dignity to woman than Apocalypse 12. And yet, as he would show, this symbol of dignity received its reason for being from Mary. Adela Collins recognized this stress upon dignity where she remarked:

A second striking feature of Revelation 12 is the fact that the woman is described as a Queen of Heaven. In spite of all the partial parallels from Old Testament figures of speech which can and have been collected, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the image portrayed in 12:1 is that of a high-goddess, a cosmic queen conceived in astral categories: the moon is a mere footstool for her; the circle of heaven, the zodiac, her crown; and the mighty sun, her garment. Such language is the ultimate in exaltation.\textsuperscript{92}

Newman joined the line of those commentators who are contemplative in their approach, and he expected that he would be understood by those possessed of a Catholic instinct.

\textit{Literature on Newman’s Use of Apocalypse 12}

A context for understanding the use of Apocalypse 12 in Newman was largely seen where we examined the general principles of Newman’s exegesis and his own
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application of these principles to Apocalypse 12 as it is found in his Letter to Pusey.93 Jaak Seynaeve held that a typological meaning without a fuller sense is the proper understanding of Apocalypse 12, as the following indicates: "Also, the typological and the deeper sense just spoken of as two definite kinds of the spiritual or mystical meaning are not always clearly distinguished. Nor do we perfectly see when the allegory enters the province of the literal or that of the deeper sense."94 After describing the characteristics of the exegete, Seynaeve returned to the question of the sensus plenior, asking whether Newman remained constant in his teaching of this sense.95 Though Seynaeve indicated there were reasons to think so, he pointed out that, on the contrary, as a theological meaning the sensus plenior has validity only for the believer, and, during much of the time after his conversion, Newman was concerned with the Liberal who did not believe.96

Two authors who faced the difficulty of the senses of Scripture which Newman considered in the use of Apocalypse 12 are Roland Murphy and Dominic Unger. Murphy's "An Allusion to Mary in the Apocalypse," which appeared in Theological Studies 10 (1949), will be analyzed and followed by a review of Unger's reply which appeared in the next year.

R. Murphy was taken by Newman's reply to Pusey, especially with the allusion to Mary in Apocalypse 12 from which Newman argued to the dignity owed her as the Woman, yet Murphy did not accept the chief argument, as he saw it, for Newman's position: "The particular symbol of a Woman was chosen because of Mary, her exalted position and her relations with St. John."97 After claiming that Genesis 3:15 is really not adequately shown to be related to Apocalypse 12, Murphy attacked the chief argument "that the choice of the Woman-symbol is necessarily due to Mary."98 Newman seemed to assume that the Trinity can be proven in Scripture from those passages which only make sense if the Trinity is meant and that this necessary dependency upon a certain interpretation, as seen in this doctrine, can be generalized into a scriptural principle of which the present was a case. Yet Murphy was unable to determine any necessary connection between this symbol and Mary; instead he related the symbol to the marriage symbol of the Old and New Testaments.99 The complication for Murphy consisted in the fact that the symbol must represent the Old and

93 See text above (section corresponding to nn. 64-71) and the Introduction published here.
94 Seynaeve, Newman's Doctrine, 342.
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97 R. Murphy, "An Allusion to Mary in the Apocalypse," Theological Studies 10 (1949): 567. In a personal conversation in 1979, Fr. Murphy confessed that he thought Fr. Unger had the better argument.
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New Testaments in differing parts of Apocalypse 12, but he explained that the symbol has been interpreted in both a general and a specific manner in the past\textsuperscript{100}; hence, there could be no necessity in assuming it must be applied specifically to Mary.

Thus, Murphy was ready to search for an argument to bolster Newman’s assumption that there was an allusion to Mary in the symbol. He found this rooted in the stress upon the birth of the Messiah, on the one hand, and upon the painful birth, on the other, from which instances he was prepared to move from the obvious truth of the birth of Jesus to the compassionate birth of the Church by Mary.\textsuperscript{101}

To this Murphy added the analogy of chapter 11, where the two witnesses are taken—not in literary detail, but symbolically—to express the “power of the Church.”\textsuperscript{102} In like manner, Newman had arranged his “general symbolism of Woman versus Dragon”\textsuperscript{103} as a way to use Mary as the object of the allusion behind the Jewish race and the Christian Church for which she stood as the personification, while in relation to Christ she was a person.\textsuperscript{104} In conclusion, Murphy could go no further than granting the Woman is only an allusion for Newman in Apocalypse 12; yet he seemed to hope this would strengthen the basis for the Assumption. Nevertheless, he decided instead to root this in “her glorious privilege of Mother of God.”\textsuperscript{105}

Unger seemingly took time out from his own historical review of authors on Apocalypse 12 to criticize Murphy’s denial of a scriptural sense to Mary as Woman in Newman’s treatment of Apocalypse 12 in the \textit{Letter to Pusey}. Though Murphy had footnoted the fact that he had not read Seynaeve’s 1949 article, Unger had.\textsuperscript{106} Thus, Unger was in a position to contrast them, though he did not.

Since Unger was not concerned with the accuracy of Newman’s exegesis but with what this exegesis involved, he began with Murphy’s correct reading of Newman’s distinction of “the real or direct sense and the sense attached to the symbol.”\textsuperscript{107} Here Unger added the fact that the term “allusion” must be taken in Newman’s usage not in Murphy’s. Having corrected both Newman and Murphy on the source of the symbol—not John, but God, Unger immediately came to Newman’s issue of whether Mary was a mere personification or not, and he came to a denial of—
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personification because Mary could be understood as woman "without a figure of speech."108

This grammatical solution to the issue freed Unger to concentrate on the question of whether allusion is used by Newman as a scriptural sense in other places than here. Whereas Seynaeve, whom Unger cited here, was most cautious in handling the figurative and the sensus plenior, Unger used the same writings and posited explicitly that Newman accepted the fuller sense as well as an identity of the figurative and "the spiritual, mystical, typical."109 Beyond this, Unger strongly asserted that Newman held to the sensus plenior, even in those cases where the human author of the Scripture was not aware of it and even when later commentators are not aware of it without the aid of tradition.110

From this general stand on the senses of Scripture, Unger continued to the specifics of "allusion" in a scriptural sense.111 Unger depended upon Newman's Discussions and Arguments to equate implicitness and allusion; however, it is important to understand what Unger meant by the fact "that Scripture contains many doctrines implicitly, namely, these doctrines are truly the inspired word of God, which can be used as solid Scriptural arguments for doctrines of faith as well as practices."112 Such are often spoken of as "alluded to."113 Though the reader might doubt it from the reference, Unger had no hesitation; he demonstrated this by quoting the following passage from Newman:

They (Moses, Prophets, Job) are the writings of men who had already been introduced into a knowledge of the unseen world and society of Angels, and who reported what they had seen and heard; and they are full of allusions to a system, a course of things, which was ever before their minds, which they felt both too awful and too familiar to them to be described minutely, which we do not know, and which these allusions, such as they are, but partially disclose .... These remarks surely suffice on this subject, viz., to show that the impression we gain from Scripture need not be any criterion or any measure of its true and full sense; that solemn and important truths may be silently taken for granted, or alluded to in a half sentence, or spoken of indeed, yet in such unadorned language that we fancy we see through it, and see nothing—peculiarities of Scripture which result from what is the peculiar character of its teaching, simplicity and depth.114

From this starting point, Unger went on to list four cases Newman held were examples of true scriptural sense:
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1) from one literal passage to another;¹¹⁵
2) in a mere figurative or allegorical passage;¹¹⁶
3) in a figurative passage ("Newman speaks of an allusion to the basic object, namely, to an historic fact that serves as an image for the figure")¹¹⁷
4) in a typical passage from the basic object to the typical object.¹¹⁸

Yet, in each of these four examples which he thinks he can find in Newman, Unger is careful to admit the uncertainty of the scriptural sense—whether due to the difficulty of determining what kind of prophecy was meant, the omission of the term "allusion," a lack of formal intention to specify the allusion, or, finally, the possibility that the "mere figurative sense" is treated as the typical figurative sense."¹¹⁹

For all of these doubts, Unger nonetheless held that "it is at least possible, if not probable because of Newman's almost consistent use of 'allusion' for a true Scriptural Sense, that by 'allusion' in this case [Apocalypse 12] he means a true Scriptural Sense."¹²⁰ Because his doubts remained, Unger was forced to examine the context as a basis for claiming a Marian allusion as a true scriptural sense in Apocalypse 12. Newman, rather than moving from the object to the symbolic sense moves from the obvious symbolic sense to the object, in which he is really interested.¹²¹ This was highlighted when Unger noted that for Newman the man-child is actually Christ, in himself and as a representative of Christians, after which both "the Mother and her Child are put on a level here by him."¹²²

Next, Unger argued that the whole treatment of Apocalypse 12 was aimed at proving that Scripture taught that Mary had an outstanding dignity, that proof was needed when a point of doctrine was at question, and that such was the case when Pusey impugned her exalted position.¹²³

Even Murphy's disparaging remarks about the use of Genesis 3 were used by Unger to show that "allusion" is to be found in the parallelism with Apocalypse 12 and that Newman was sure of the analogy between the first and the last books of the Bible in themselves and in identifying "the Woman of Genesis [as] . . . 'the Woman' of the Apocalypse, because the Serpent and the Dragon are the same . . . and 'her seed' and the 'man-child' are the same, as is obvious."¹²⁴ And what can be said of these can be said of the Second Eve in the comparisons made between the fall and
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the restoration of man, as shown in the common teachings of the Fathers which related to the Immaculate Conception. And just as Mary was taken in a true scriptural sense in Genesis 3, so she was in Apocalypse 12, since the latter was the prophetic fulfillment for the former.\textsuperscript{125} To clinch this argument, Unger quoted the parallel passage in Newman's \textit{Essay} where this is compendiously covered.\textsuperscript{126}

Satisfied with his proof that "allusion" is a true scriptural sense, Unger took up the second question: Whether Mary not only is exalted in a general sense but also in her specific existence, body and soul? By gathering the many references in which Newman spoke of Mary "at her Son's right hand," Unger prepared his argument pertaining to her crowning; he concluded that "according to Newman's mind Mary is alluded to in Apocalypse 12 as contained therein in a truly biblical sense, intended so by the sacred writer, namely, as the basic object of a Newman-symbolic sense; and she is pictured as living surrounded by the glory, in body and soul, of her Divine Son."\textsuperscript{127}

In the introduction to this study, a variety of recent theologians and Scripture scholars were presented who question the hegemony of the historical-critical approach, as well as a number who are aware of the oversimplification of those who assume that the historical-literal sense is, or can be made to be, obvious. In either case, the \textit{Letter to Pusey} has seemed the best example of Newman's use of the deeper sense, of the mystical sense.

As was noted in the protracted review of Seynaeve's work, he held that Newman followed the Alexandrian school in the use of the mystical sense. Henri de Lubac's \textit{The Sources of Revelation} (1968) has a chapter on "Spiritual Understanding" which is much in line with Newman's insistence upon the limitations of the historical-literal sense. In order to apply the insights of both these authors to Newman's use of the deeper or mystical sense in the \textit{Letter}, we will begin by sketching an outline of the accepted meaning of this sense from Raymond Brown's article on "Hermeneutics"; then we will examine the difficulties \\textit{Le Frois} found in earlier interpretations of Apocalypse 12 and conclude with Lash's analysis of the resulting questions.

Probably the most direct way to appreciate the meaning of the symbolic sense is to examine Brown's definitions of the \textit{deeper sense} (what he calls the \textit{sensus plenior}) and the \textit{typical sense}. For him, the \textit{sensus plenior} is:

\begin{quote}
... the \textit{deeper meaning}, intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author, that is seen to exist in the words of Scripture when they are studied in the light of further revelation or of development in the understanding of revelation.\textsuperscript{128}
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
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The typical sense is the deeper meaning that the things (persons, places and events) of Scripture possess because, according to the intention of the divine author, they foreshadow future things.\textsuperscript{129}

The deeper sense holds to the meaning of the words themselves; but there are two meanings, and the later or deeper sense is understandable due to what comes later. Thus, the light for the fuller understanding does not come from the words themselves, but from what a person, place, or event stands for as a type.

Why are such senses of Scripture necessary? There are great limitations if only the "historical" sense is used. For instance, Aristide Serra treated "La Donna di Apocalisse 12" by using Psalms 2 and 110 (109) with John 19:25-27.\textsuperscript{130} By the former, he was able to show that the Messianic psalms provided a link between the "symbolic' version of the paschal mystery of Christ . . . [and] the 'historical' version in the fourth Gospel."\textsuperscript{131} Thus, the one who was taken to the throne was the Messiah and the son of Mary; therefore, she who was the mother of Jesus became "‘mother of all those who believe in him."\textsuperscript{132} In conclusion, Serra claimed:

... the Mariologists have gained insight. Those who support this approach do not intend to substitute it for the ecclesiological one, but do want to affirm that:

a. Directly, the Woman clothed with the Sun is a figure of Church community of both Testaments.

b. Indirectly, the author of Revelation almost ‘‘insinuated’’ that he meant Mary too, inasmuch as she is an eminent part of the Church. We are dealing, there, with a "‘mariological extension."

Another demonstration of the need for the deeper sense is found in Tyconius, a fourth-century exegete famous for an extremely influential interpretation of the Apocalypse and likewise known for his "seven rules of interpretation." While Serra’s very recent attempt to solve the difficulties of Apocalypse 12 provides one example of the need for more than a mere literal interpretation of Scripture, a far older attempt is probably even more convincing. Le Frois devoted some pages to explicating the rules of Tyconius, especially his fourth rule:

The Holy Spirit often encloses the genus in the species and the species in the genus. To wit, while speaking of the species he passes over to the genus in such a way that the transition is not immediately apparent, but in the transition he makes use of such words which fit both (genus and species), until gradually he goes beyond the limit of the species and the transition is apparent, since what began with the species fits (now) only the genus; and in the same way he leaves the genus and returns to the species.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., 618.
\textsuperscript{130} A. Serra, "La Donna di Apocalisse 12," Riparazione Mariana 61, no. 6 (1976): 211-216.
\textsuperscript{131} A. Serra, typed lectures from the Marian Library Institute (Dayton, Ohio, July 1977).
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., 101.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 91-92.
\textsuperscript{134} Cited in B. Le Frois, The Woman Clothed with the Sun (Rome 1954), 22; hereafter cited as The Woman.
Le Frois noted that a number of later commentators have used this rule as the basis for an interpretation of Apocalypse 12; however, and this is the surprise, when Tyconius comes to apply it, he seems not to follow his own rule. "The above lines . . . speak of genus and species with regard to the apocalyptic image, whereas in the explanation of his fourth rule, Tyconius has clearly in mind the mysteries contained under the image." Though Le Frois recognizes that this might be an interpolation, since other authors do use the rule as Tyconius gave it, he does not go into the question he raised. Yet for our purposes this is crucial.

If we begin with Tyconius, call on the help of studies of exegetes of the Middle Ages made by de Lubac and Barré, and finally come to Newman, we will find that the similarities and the differences are most important. Tyconius seemingly grasps the fact that not only is he moving from the physical Christ to the mystical Christ, but he is also recounting the meanings which underlie the persons and the events. He is going from his fourth rule to a symbolic sense for each. In the Middle Ages we find that this same rule is extended one step farther: from generaliter to specialiter to specialissime, in which the application comes all the way down to Mary from the Old and New Testament Church. With Newman we find a twist to this rule which is similar to what Le Frois assumed was an interpolation. Newman agrees that the usual interpretation of the "Woman" as the Church is correct, but that the really important truth is that what makes the "Woman" a fit symbol is the meaning of the symbol which is Mary. Thus we have the species giving meaning to the genus. Just as Eve, if she had not sinned, would have given glory to all women and been truly the mother of all the living and hence the name for all women, so Mary, as the source of physical life for Christ and source of life for the Church, becomes the meaning for all who have such life. Thus we see that Serra's interpretation, following the modern critical methods, is in accord with the gradually changing use of Tyconius's rule. Newman followed this exegetical development, but he joined it with the symbolic sense and achieved a unique interpretation.

Once we have come this far we can gain insight from Nicholas Lash's careful critique of Newman's "mystical sense."140
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Once abandon the principle that ‘un énoncé ... ne peut pas avoir deux sens différents’ ... and that, as a result, ‘Le “sens plenier” ne fait que prolonger et approfondir le sens littéral’, and the application of the principle ‘that the earlier is to be interpreted by the later’ releases the ‘allegorical’ or ‘spiritual’ interpretation of scripture from its necessary control by the text on which it purports to ‘comment’.\textsuperscript{141}

Despite his disagreement with Newman’s use of “view,” “antecedent probability,” and “earlier by the later,” Lash found that Newman’s view that earlier “tended towards” the later possesses

... an insight of considerable interest: the ‘deep’ writer ‘has something before him which he aims at, and, while he cannot help including much in his meaning which he does not aim at, he does aim at one thing, not at another’ ... . Newman here comes close to a distinction, indispensable for the attempt to understand doctrinal pronouncements in their historical context, between what is ‘stated’ and what is ‘formally affirmed’ ... for example, that Christians who receive the decrees of Chalcedon interpret the christology of the new testament in their light—not, indeed, as a principle of scientific exegesis but as a matter of religious fact.\textsuperscript{142}

Lash puts these in context by noting that Newman was willing to take the terms as his adversaries took them, while he also wanted to keep the doctrine of the Church and the results of Scripture study in focus. Without a deeper sense, Lash can find no way for Newman to balance all of these factors.\textsuperscript{143}
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\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., 104.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 93. This is the appropriate place to summarize those parts of Jean Stern’s \textit{Bible et Tradition chez Newman} (Paris 1967) in which he gives his insights into Newman’s exegetical methods and principles. Stern’s work differs from Biemer’s in its stress upon the person of Newman. It differs from Seynaeve’s in its stress upon the place of tradition in Newman’s Anglican days. And it offers help on Newman’s use of the allegorical method as well as his understanding of the literal sense. Stern argues that “Allegory” is taken in a very broad sense by Newman (p. 39). In fact, wherever a text exceeds the sense which the obvious meaning of the word implies we have an allegorical use (p.40). Stern finds that the need for this method comes from the extraordinary ideas the Bible expresses as well as from the fact that this style enables what is of the heart also to be expressed (p.40).

Also, Stern notes that even if Newman had had the opportunity to use the present critical methods of scriptural analysis, he would have been reluctant since, \textit{Par eux-memes}, they do not allow the reader to get to the deep sense of a text (p. 51). In considering this issue, Stern begins his helpful defining of the literal sense in Newman by recognizing that an excessive dependency upon the exact literal meaning leads to absurdity (p. 51). He continues this under his treatment of Newman’s changed position on the rule of faith as shown in his \textit{Essay} (p.166). Stern realizes that Seynaeve missed the point on occasion when Newman is critical of the literal sense, because Newman is defining literal as \textit{historicisme}, as Blondel will later do (p. 166). Finally, Stern informs us that “by the allegorical interpretation is not involved a denial of a direct and primary meaning, but the principle that Scripture is a deep book and that its author speaks under the veil of the literal text things beyond and beside what is said in the letter, and which it really means so that they may read argumentatively” (p.167, n. 76).
Brown notes that Newman is not alone in finding a basis for a symbolic sense\textsuperscript{144}; that, in fact, not only do A. G. Hebert and L. Vischer\textsuperscript{145} argue for such interpretations, but that many modern interpreters are also more than a little dissatisfied with the limitations of the historical-critical approach. Thus Brown appears to remain open to the reasoning of P. Benoit, J. Coppens, W. Eichrodt, G. von Rad, and, C. Westermann who have all tried to revive typology in their studies of the Old and New Testaments as a unity.\textsuperscript{146} And, similar to Lash's criticism of Newman, Brown finds that B. Vawter and O. Cullmann are worried that these trends might hinder the movement towards the continued primacy of the literal sense.\textsuperscript{147}

In this difficult debate, the Marian use of Apocalypse 12 by Newman opens the spiritual sense to an important insight, through his pluralistic exegetical methods. Newman was aware that the genre of this work was twofold: the poetic and the apocalyptic. In such a genre, the symbolic becomes the literal; the historical is timeless; and the generic and specific meanings go beyond the limits of mere logical categories. Coupled with this insight derived from the pluralistic genre is Newman's assumption that the setting is liturgical, which makes it both an earthly and a heavenly Jerusalem within which the symbols carry their meanings. Taking all of these factors into account, we can well understand why "the Woman" is at the center for Newman; she is the eschatological Church, as it will be at the ultimate point in time and as it is, in fact, now.\textsuperscript{148}

The Church Militant, Suffering, and Triumphant are a single reality. Thus, Henri de Lubac and Louis Bouyer provide us with the proper reality as symbolized by the Woman, Mary, who gives a present meaning to a variety of temporal forms of existence. Rather than stressing—as Le Frois did—the individual and the collective, Newman stressed the meaning of the symbol beyond the thing symbolized. And, in the same way, rather than stressing the generic and the special—as medieval exe-

\textsuperscript{144} R. Brown, \textit{The \"Sensus Plenior\" of Sacred Scripture} (diss., St. Mary's Univ., Baltimore 1955), 92, 96-97; hereafter cited as \textit{Sensus Plenior}.

\textsuperscript{145} Brown, "Hermeneutics," 2:613. Further on (p. 620), Brown writes: "When Church documents cite Scripture positively, we must distinguish as to whether the document is giving an authoritative exegesis of Scripture or simply using Scripture to illustrate its argument. The bull \textit{Ineffabilis Deus} on the Immaculate Conception recalls Gn 3:15, and the bull \textit{Munificentissimus Deus} on the Assumption recalls Ap 12. Are the respective Popes dogmatically affirming that these texts of Scripture refer in their literal sense to the Marian doctrines? . . . Or do the citations imply no more than that reflections on these scriptural verses aided theologians in understanding the Marian doctrines and thus guided the Church to take a dogmatic position? In the view of many scholars the last possibility is the correct one. In particular, Pius XII seems to claim no more than that the dogma of the Assumption receives support from Scripture."

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 614-615.

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., 615.

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 614-616: discussion of "more-than-literal exegesis."
gesis did, Newman united these in one pluralistic meaning. Hence, what had been types became realities, by his spiritual sense. What would be a debatable sensus plenior in our day became for Newman a literal sense, because he understood the unique set of factors which all came together in the use of the symbol in Apocalypse 12.

One of Newman’s biographers, Bouyer, gave Mary the following title: “the eschatological icon of the Church.”¹⁴⁹ In accord with this contribution from Bouyer, we conclude with a hopeful note from De Lubac: “The Bible will be enjoyed and understood anew because a healthy spiritual exegesis will once more rise on the foundations of a tested science.”¹⁵⁰

Consequences of the Letter

The Letter to Pusey was Newman’s final major writing on the Incarnation and the Blessed Virgin. This synthesis joined the arguments of the Essay and his sermons. In each case, Newman depended upon Antiquity, but also on the analogy of faith and the conspiratio, as well as Scripture. Nonetheless, he was willing to change the position of the Fathers. He was willing to change his position on devotion. He was careful to acknowledge the limits of Mary, but he was also careful to avoid Arianism. The very balance of his sources makes it difficult to fault Newman, but, as Lash noted, Newman ignored the critique developed by the Reformers. His own balance may have convinced him that it was better to try to achieve a synthesis with such loci as he found than to add a new locus of pluralism. Newman did not deny that those with different tempers and outlooks would disagree, but, as he reminded his readers in 1850 (writing of himself in the third person), “it has not been his practice to engage in controversy with those who have felt it their duty to criticise what at any time he has written.”¹⁵¹

This description fits the movement toward the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception most aptly, and the long letters of Newman to his Anglican friends

¹⁴⁹ L. Bouyer, Le culte de la Mère de Dieu (Chevetogne 1950), 33, cited by R. Laurentin in Court traité sur la Vierge Marie (Paris 1968), 111. Laurentin notes that this title suggested the title given to Mary in chapter eight of Lumen Gentium—“Mary, the sign of hope and solace given to the pilgrim people of God” (par. 5).
¹⁵⁰ De Lubac, The Sources, 71. R. Brown explained this spiritual exegesis well: “With regard to the sensus plenior and the authoritative teaching of the Church, it is true that the name is not mentioned in any official documents ... however ... The Holy Father, after speaking of the literal sense, remarks that in addition God ordained ‘what was said and done’ in the Bible to take on a spiritual significance. Thus God intended a spiritual sense of words unknown to the human author” (Sensus Plenior, 138).
¹⁵¹ Diff I, xiv.
bear out the terms of his prophecies regarding it. Secondly, the following adaptation of a quotation from Newman captures the meaning of his use of Scripture closely: "Scripture, rather than being used, uses the minds of Christians."152

Newman's sermon "The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine" provides a clear illustration of this thinking. Newman selected John 1:1 and others of his favorite incarnational texts which he held we should not "handle by the rules of art at our own will, but [as] august tokens of most simple, ineffable, adorable facts, [each] embraced, enshrined according to its measure in the believing mind."153 If this process is taken seriously, it will explain the habit the Fathers of the Church had in using single words or particular sentences fearlessly.

Value of Newman's Exegesis in the Letter

Though the introduction to this dissertation examined the conflict which faces the historical-critical method today, it is indeed timely to ask the question Jean Stern raised: Of what value are Newman's methods and principles of exegesis in an age of historical-critical methods? Jean Stern's own answer is found in his treatment of the Christian exegete, and his picture of the Christian exegete can be gathered from his treatment of Newman. In chapter 3 of Bible et Tradition chez Newman, Stern documents Newman's move from a position where the Bible is the sole rule of faith to one where the Bible and Tradition unite as a rule of faith. In chapter 4, Stern places this new understanding within an important study made by Newman, The Arians of the Fourth Century, one chapter of which details the Alexandrian form of interpretation with which Newman identified and from which he gained a deeper appreciation of the Fathers. From them, Newman perfected an approach to Scripture which went beyond the literal. This approach assumed a person aided by grace and possessed of a moral rectitude which opened an understanding of the Word of God far beyond that available to the non-believer. Nonetheless, Newman would continue to hold that the Bible contained all religious truth, but that the achieving of this truth demanded a person prepared to discover it. Antiquity or the Fathers, Tradition, and a Christian heart and mind were prerequisites. No amount of scientific assistance and no mere historicism would suffice. However, the difficulties in interpretation uncovered by such approaches would have to be answered. Thus Stern showed that Newman, then as now, provided a protection against exaggerating the value of both the scientific methods and a literal sense which seemed open to all, regardless of their faith and view.

152 OUS, 317. Newman noted "that the doctrine may rather be said to use the minds of Christians, than to be used by them."
153 OUS, Sermon XV, 26(3).
Jean Stern, with others mentioned in various places in this study, furnished a justification for studying John Henry Newman's somewhat surprising exegetical methods and principles, in face of the past popularity of the historical-critical methods and the fact that Newman did not follow a technical order in his use of Scripture. Finally, as was stressed before but is considered important enough to stress again, Stern documented the changes in Newman's thinking with regard to Scripture and Tradition throughout his lifetime, as well as his rediscovery of the lectio divina, a practice which will become ever more important as the laity in the Church today search for ways of benefitting from Scripture for other than academic reasons.

CONCLUSION AND SYNTHESIS

Conclusion

Newman's use of Scripture can be recognized to be that of the rhetorician. For this reason, it is not surprising that the hermeneutical study of his writings has not been carried out to nearly the extent that studies of his rhetoric have been. Nonetheless the work of J. L. Powell on Newman's uses of Christian discourse provides a guide to a synthesis: Newman considered a variety of audiences—originally the Evangelical, then the Anglican, and finally the Catholic. Because this point has already been made for a large number of his writings, here only typical examples of each will be given.

In one of his earliest sermons, "Religious Joy," Newman already set his style of structuring his writings. He used Scripture for a number of ends in this Christmas Day sermon of 1825: to demonstrate the economy of salvation, to lead his hearers to prayer and contemplation, and to provide a moral appreciation for the nature of happiness. This use of concrete examples to make real an insight from his contemplation of Scripture would become his trademark. At that time, his audience was prepared to hear an Evangelical slant. In his 1832 sermon "Reverence Due to the Virgin Mary," Newman continued his style, but took into account that many of his hearers were Anglicans with a Catholic tendency. In his 1848 sermon "Our Lady in the Gospel," Newman combined the style and insights of his earlier periods with his awareness of the Catholic instinct and idea to produce a typically Catholic sermon for a Catholic audience, using Scripture accordingly.

Yet, without provocation, Newman was polemical in two of his major sermons: Discourses XVII and XVIII. In them he decided to contrast the Protestant approach to the Blessed Virgin with the Catholic. His exegesis changed from a tex-

154 PPS, 8:244-255.
155 Mixed, 342-359 (Discourse XVII) and 360-376 (Discourse XVIII).
tual analysis of a given text to a freer approach in which tradition, the analogy of faith, and the history of the doctrine entered into his understanding and presentation. Again, his audience was one developed according to a Catholic instinct, a fact which allowed him to take risks similar to those found in the writings of the Fathers. Keeping the Object always in mind, the Tradition on Mary uppermost—with no concern for stressing the Atonement and in a friendly atmosphere in relation to the Incarnation, Newman was able to extend his interpretations to a deeper sense, using analogy and fittingness in his arguments. This exegesis had its roots in the last of his Oxford University Sermons (Discourse XV). The development of his exegetical approach is apparent in *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, although there Mary was presented merely as an example rather than as the point at issue. But its flowering is seen in his *Letter to Pusey*. There Newman demonstrated an exegesis which took into account everything previously developed, along with an awareness of the following aspects of doctrine: the biblical, the patristic, the ecclesiological, the liturgical, and the ecumenical. As a result of his awareness of all these aspects, Newman was prepared to use his understandings of the audience and the intellectual milieu for his homiletic purposes. In this way, he could answer Edward Pusey’s attack upon the Marian position of the Catholic Church. Responding to the attack, Newman took three points into account: a need for an accurate statement and full expression of the argument, a sensitivity to the openness of his audience beyond anything a Catholic in the past could have expected, and a position showing those interested in joining the Catholic Church the limits of the Marian position.

To persuade an ecumenical audience, Newman captured the significance of the “eschatological icon.” When Mary stands clothed with the Sun, the brightness overpowers her; but, from our perspective, we can lift our gaze since she limits its brilliance as she lets us realize how great this brilliance truly is. We, can, due to her, gaze at the Sun of Justice without being blinded. As an apocalyptic woman she stands on the verge of heaven and earth, of time and eternity. For us on our pilgrim way, she offers the hope that salvation is possible. Newman moves from the story of the Fall to the state behind the Fall; he lets us know how things would have been if Adam and Eve had remained faithful as Mary was faithful. He recognizes that those who lived in earlier apocalyptic times looked to her as Mother and as the way to Christ her Son. This bold view protects believers from Satan; therefore, what might seem to be too much to hold about her is really not. In fact historically, Newman witnessed, Catholics have believed in the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption without difficulty.

*Synthesis*

Exactly how, then, did Newman use Scripture? One of the most common uses he made was to express an analogy. Things were shown to be related and to give us
the basis for moving from the known to the unknown. Newman depended upon the biblical background of his audience so he could build upon an allusion to some reality of their lives. Thus, he used Scripture to show the relation between types in the Old Testament and the New Testament. As he went into this, he—as his Letter to Pusey made clear—went on to the still deeper sense. Overall, he depended upon a spiritual sense, because he considered Scripture not as a mere text but as Word of God. Thus he used Scripture for doctrinal, moral, rhetorical, apologetic, and contemplative purposes.

Often, too, he used Scripture to show the harmony of natural religion, of moral demands and happiness, of principles and pastoral concerns. Finally, he used Scripture even in an accommodated sense and occasionally with hyperbole. Yet always he kept the literal sense as his starting point, because he knew that before analogy and allusion there was the basic communication words provide in their surface meaning. Though he used Scripture, as this summary makes obvious, in the way the Fathers of the Church used it, as a lectio divina, yet he was certainly aware of the impact of German hermeneutics and of positions of English thinkers such as Benjamin Jowett upon his audience. Nonetheless, he was against the overemphasis upon the critical methods. All of his uses fitted his eschatological view of reality and prepared him for developing his own approach to Mary through Apocalypse 12.

Although the works of Seynaeve, Biemer, Stern, Powell, Murphy, and Unger were helpful in examining Newman’s use of Scripture in the various texts on the Incarnation and the Blessed Virgin Mary, their greatest value was apparent when studying the major focus of this dissertation—A Letter to Pusey. In that pursuit, the work on principles, the variety of uses, the difference between an allusion and a direct reference, and the relation between Tradition and Scripture—as well as the relation of the spiritual sense and the deeper sense—were predominant. The relation between matters presented in the Introduction to this study (as published here) and the body of the full dissertation is more evident in Chapter VII (here and in the original text) than in the summary of chapters II through VI of the original work (which precedes it here).

David Kelsey recognized the significance of Tradition in reading Scripture. Tradition is both a theological concept and a process,¹⁵⁶ and Scripture is “that set of writings whose proper use serves as the occasion by God’s grace for his presence, as [Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians] both agree that it is permissible to call the complex comprised by the dialectic between the proper use of scripture and gracious presence of God by the name ‘tradition.’”¹⁵⁷ Newman’s own position evolved in this regard, showing the need for a proper use of Scripture in view of the

¹⁵⁶ D. Kelsey, The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology (Philadelphia 1975), 95.
¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 96.
inquirer, the believer, and the community, as J. Powell noted. Thus, in each stage of development in Newman's use of Scripture, it was necessary to recall how he held a position of sola scriptura, of Scripture and Tradition, or of Tradition and Scripture in the Catholic understanding. As Kelsey asserted, Catholic theologians "equate 'tradition' with the magisterium taken as an 'organ' in the Church."\textsuperscript{158} Likewise, Jean Stern noted the importance of grace for a proper use of Scripture, and thus the need of grace for ascertaining the deeper sense. For this reason, the issue of what Newman termed "Catholic instinct" is central to the thesis of this dissertation.

Newman always had qualms over those pushing him farther than he was prepared to go. Often, in reflecting upon the bibliography of this dissertation, I found myself wanting to be more definite on what an individual author held and how this applied more directly to Newman's texts than I could be. In reading the various authors, I felt their inabilities and shortcomings to be sure, but I was thankful they had gone as far as they had. This feeling kept me open to questioning Newman's use of Scripture, as it should the readers of this study.

\section*{EPILOGUE}

The Image of Mary in Newman: The Apocalyptic Woman

Newman gave his synthesis on the Blessed Virgin Mary in \textit{A Letter to Pusey}, and in searching there we find two bases for his image of her: the New Eve and Queen Victoria. Victoria had been crowned in 1839 as a young maiden. Newman, thirty-eight at the time, saw her as a little thing about to take on enormous responsibilities, an act done in light of her office and not in that of her person. Later, he would see Mary in the opposite position: her person superceded her office. In like manner, when he considered the species/genus issue, Mary would be the reason for the Church to be seen in the light of what she was, rather than her being seen in view of what the Church was. In accord with the usual conception, Victoria was great due to the greatness of the British Empire, not due to her own person. As we have noted, Mary was always sinless, as Eve was before the Fall and as the human race would be after Christ's coming; hence, Mary—as the New Eve—was an exemplar of redemption. Eve, in her office before the Fall, was the mother of all; however, Eve lacked the sanctity to go with her office. Mary, in her dignity and sanctity, was equal to the office of the Mother of All, in a spiritual and faith-filled sense. Uniting the image of Queen Victoria and Eve, we come to Newman's view of the Woman Clothed with the Sun: an apocalyptic Woman—a woman directed towards the future and towards heaven, rather than towards the past and towards earth. Such an eschatological icon

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 115, n. 11.
had many facets: that of the Second Eve, of Queen Victoria, and of the Ideal Woman.

Therefore, the movement towards victory and the victory shout took on added significance in the imagination of Newman. For him, who lived with the angels and with an invisible world which was clearer than the visible world, the three levels of the Apocalypse were different than they are for us. For him, the battle between the angels in heaven and the flight of the Woman into the desert were at least as obvious as the birth and death of the Son of God. "The Second Spring," Newman's most famous sermon, gives us a clue to the way in which he could go beyond temporal existence to the eternal. Mary had returned to England in 1850 and so had the Church. Mary's return had already been promised some three hundred years before by Philip Neri. In this joint return, the prejudices of Newman's fellow citizens melted into insignificance against the heat of the Sun and the brilliance of the Woman Clothed with the Sun. Such an image, considered against the heresy Newman explicated in *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, revealed the true dignity and sanctity of Christ, the Sun clothing his Mother.