

Credo ut Intelligam

A Graduate Journal of Theology

Department of Theological Studies
Saint Louis University



SAINT LOUIS
UNIVERSITY

Credo ut Intelligam

2008-2009 • VOLUME 2

Articles:

Beyond Ideology and Utopia: Towards a Post-Critical Historical Theology
Rev. Michael Pahls 1—8

**The Oxford Movement's Influence upon German American Protestantism:
Newman and Nevin**
Noël Pretila 9—26

Reconciling Condemnation and Heteronomy in Athanasius
Chris Schroeder, S.J. 27—35

Review:

Magisterium: Teacher and Guardian of The Faith
By Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J.
Glenn B. Siniscalchi 36—37

Calls for Papers and Reviews 38

Notes on Contributors 39

EDITORS:

**George Faithful
Erick Moser
Michael Shea**

DEPARTMENTAL SPONSOR:

David Meconi, S.J., Ph.D.

Requirements and Policies for Journal Submissions

1. Articles may still be considered if they have already been published or are currently being considered for publication elsewhere.
2. Articles will be blind-reviewed; the name of the author and other identifying features should therefore not appear anywhere in the submission.
3. Articles should normally be no longer than 12-18 pages in length, double spaced, including all footnotes, though longer articles may sometimes be considered.
4. Articles should be formatted with double spacing (12 point font) while the footnotes should be in single-spaced format.
5. Footnotes and references should follow guidelines found in the Chicago Manual of Style.
6. All journal submissions should be emailed to George Faithful: georgefaithful@gmail.com
7. Journal staff reserves editorial control over all journal contents. Alterations on the level of content, however, will not be made without the contributor's consent. This does not apply to more minor changes having to do with formatting, style etc.
8. All contributors maintain copy rites for their own work.

**Department of Theological Studies
Saint Louis University
2008-2009 • VOLUME 2**

Beyond Ideology and Utopia: Towards a Post-Critical Historical Theology

Rev. Michael J. G. Pahls

“Christianity appeals to history, and to history it must go.” This aphorism, attributed to the late Oxford biblical scholar, George Caird, aptly summarizes the inescapable duty of the Christian theologian to engage the chronicles of public and personal memory.¹ One might, of course, write-off Caird’s sentiments as the quaint protestations of a man caught-up in the enthusiasms of modernist historiography. This assessment would be premature, however, for Caird’s statement represents as much a *theological* claim as an historical claim. In the creedal faith of catholic Christianity, it is not simply that Jesus Christ was crucified, but that he was “Crucified under Pontius Pilate.” The insertion of the Roman Procurator’s name into the Apostolic Symbol commits Christianity to a public-historical specificity that cannot be sacrificed without a simultaneous forfeiture of Christian baptismal identity.²

Once the theological stakes for history are made clear, the question must still be answered as to precisely what one means by “history” and what one may predicate of history after the postmodern turn. Is there yet hope for the establishment of a common memory that is not a mere expression of local knowledge or of the will to power? If so, how might one commence with such a project in an appropriately chastened manner, adopting a style that is self-consciously humbled by the hermeneutic of suspicion while yet remaining aloof to the cynicism and despair of an insistent nihilism. In what remains, I will explore the implications of post-critical history, drawn principally from the reflections of the French philosopher, Paul Ricoeur. I will then turn to consider Ricoeur’s particular value to the task of historical theology, perhaps raising the stakes of his purely philosophical wager in a consideration Christian theological doctrines of the resurrection and of Pentecost.

¹ Attributed to Caird by N.T. Wright, “Jesus and the Identity of God,” *Ex Auditu* 14 (1998): 42–56. Cited 22 October, 2005. Online: http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_JIG.htm.

² Here I refer to the traditional place of the Creed in the initiatory rite of Christian Baptism. Prior to the application of water, the baptizand is required to affirm the Creed as a self-implicating affirmation of the faith that claims her. The baptizand is then named by and with the Triune name, symbolically clothing her with a new identity. Thus, the Pilate clause situates the baptizand in relationship to God, to the community, to the self, and to the world. In affirming the Creed, the Christian says, “This is my history, this is my community’s history, and this is the world’s history.”

History as Metaphor and Narrative

Paul Ricoeur's account of history begins with the basic lacuna between *chronos* and *kairos* – between time as the experience of things with no memory or expectation and time as experienced by “ensouled humanity,” possessing the consciousness of past and future and an awareness of the potential relations between them in the present. In this, Ricoeur is building on the thought of Martin Heidegger who described human “being” as uniquely a “being-in-time.” Heidegger, as will be recalled, spoke of human reckoning with time in terms of *caring*.³ On the basis of this unique care for time, Ricoeur suggests that all human existence and all human identity possesses a narrative character.⁴ We make sense of the unique experience of human being in the world by telling stories about ourselves and about others. Reflection on how this is done takes up significant portions of Ricoeur's corpus.

In his collection of studies titled *The Rule of Metaphor*, Ricoeur traces out a theory of how metaphor “works” as a discursive phenomenon.⁵ He argues that metaphor is a creative discourse in which the one naming the similitude creates resemblances where they were previously unthought. By this constructive act, one “unleashes the power that certain fictions have to describe reality.”⁶ By the construction of metaphors, then, new possibilities are opened for human understanding.

Projecting beyond this observation Ricoeur argues in his three-volume *Time and Narrative* that narrative works in a similar manner.⁷ In the case of history in particular, the narrator draws upon the various *traces* of past – the raw data of persons, places, and events that comprise the objects of historical inquiry

³ *Being and Time* (trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson; New York: Harper and Row, 1962) §41, 235-41.

⁴ See particularly the Ricoeur's discussion of “The First Aporia of Temporality: Narrative Identity” in *Time and Narrative: Volume 3* (trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988) 244-49 and his studies of “Personal Identity and Narrative Identity” and “The Self and Narrative Identity” in *Oneself as Another* (trans. Kathleen Blamey; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992), 113-68.

⁵ (trans. Robert Czerny, et.al.; Toronto: University of Toronto, 1975). See especially study three (pp. 65-100) in which he moves from metaphor as a misapplied lexeme to metaphorical discourse.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁷ *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative* were composed successively and intended to be read as a pair as Ricoeur himself continually maintains. *Time and Narrative I: Volume 1*, ix.

– to creatively imagine their temporal emplotment.⁸ Far from the naïve conception of history as an immediate description of “what happened,” he argues that history consists in the imaginative configuration of otherwise random “nows,” and in the otherwise random encounters between nows.

By moving to historical narrative from metaphor, Ricoeur successfully transcends the traditional dichotomies of historiography as art or as science. On one hand, Ricoeur is quite willing to concede that the past is a “limiting-idea” and that it remains inaccessible as an immediate thing-in-itself. Because of this, history can never pretend at being a purely empirical or scientific mode of discourse. On the other hand, he believes that it is still valid to speak of the reality of the historical past in a manner that obliges the historian to do critical justice to the *traces* – what we may call the “souvenirs” in the American sense – that exist in the present as tangible testimony to the “something” that once took place. Ricoeur writes,

This predominance of the positive side of the limiting-idea is evident in that it is the past *such as* it was that moves historians to provide historical configurations and that is behind their endless rectifications, as they touch up the painting. This is what I wanted to suggest when I spoke of the historian’s *inexhaustible debt* with respect to the past. The past is thus a guiding-concept as much as a limiting-concept.⁹

In this manner, Ricoeur conceives of historical narration as a mediating concept between “scientific history” that naively conceives its discipline as pure description and a “historical fiction” that makes intercourse between narrative and a real past only incidental. The historian thus remains accountable – inexhaustibly so – to the souvenirs that call for and critique his or her perpetual and creative redescriptions of the past.

History as Ideology and Utopia

To engage in the task of narrating history, one must find a way to critically mediate the persistent ideologies and utopian hopes of the historical past. The themes of ideology and utopia dominate Ricoeur’s writings and he takes great pains to overcome the purely negative connotations associated with both. With regard to the former, he wants to do justice to the constitutive role of what he terms the “fundamental symbolism” of ideology. Societies and individuals rely on foundational stories to provide internal communal coherence and external correspondence to the world. Ricoeur observes that these constitutive narratives seem to be fundamental to human being in the world and he rejects the notion that they are ultimately dispensable or inherently malignant.

⁸ Ricoeur describes this as imaginative process as “configuration” and describes as being close to metaphor in that it represents a “synthesis of the heterogeneous.” Ibid.

⁹ *The Reality of the Historical Past* (Milwaukee, Wisc.: Marquette University Press, 1984), 4.

Rather, turning to an observation made in his much earlier work, he argues that human beings possess an “only-human” and thus “fallible” freedom that, while retaining a certain integrity as freedom, is also prone to fall into the distortion and abuse of freedom.¹⁰ Thus ideology is first constructive and positive and only becomes a force for malignancy in its *distortion*.¹¹ Ideology narrates an idealized picture that meets “the requirements of authority’s claim.”¹² At its best, the over-predication or “surplus-value” of ideology reminds the community of its constituting identity and summons it to the better angels of its nature. The distortion of ideology occurs, however, when this same feature functions to conceal ignoble interests and prop-up illegitimate power structures. Ideology may thus motivate a society to achieve possible good or it may function only to “fill the credibility gap” in a depraved system of authority.¹³

It is because of this susceptibility to distortion that ideology always remains in tension with the embodied hope and faith of “utopia.” Whereas ideology establishes a community by rooting it in its constituting narratives, utopia becomes the symbolic imaginary of the marginalized, setting forth a prophetic alter-narrative –presently “elsewhere” – that subverts the powers who would domesticate it for corrupted interests. Utopian visions appear as critique when the prevailing distortions of ideology begin to compound. Ricoeur thus writes, “It is always from the point of view of a nascent utopia that we may speak of a dying ideology.”¹⁴

The paradox that emerges from this construal is all too clear: utopia remains only another imaginative possibility of being in the world and is itself subject to fallibility and distortion.¹⁵ It is here that historical narrative (and in Ricoeur’s thinking, fictional narratives as well) can serve as the priestly mediator between regal ideology and prophetic utopia. It does this, not as the Actonian “moral arbiter,” standing in a privileged space outside of the social game, but as a critical-yet-vested narrator of the “‘true’ stories of the past [as they] expose the potentialities of the present.”¹⁶ Ricoeur writes that the historian must proceed beyond a sterile description of what happened and finally venture

¹⁰ Thus Ricoeur writes, “Man is the Joy of Yes in the sadness of the finite. This ‘mixture’ has appeared to us as the progressive manifestation of the fault that makes of man, mediator of the reality outside of himself, a fragile mediation for himself.” *Fallible Man: Philosophy of the Will* (trans. Charles Kelbley; Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1965), 215.

¹¹ Thus Ricoeur writes, “Logically if not temporally the constitutive function of ideology must precede its distortive function. We could not understand what distortion meant if there were not something to be distorted, something that was of the same symbolic nature.” *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (ed. George H. Taylor; New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.) 182.

¹² *Ibid.*, 183.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 180. Here, Ricoeur’s description of ideology and utopia tends to resemble Thomas Kuhn’s narration of “scientific revolutions,” Gaston Bachelard’s conception of “epistemological ruptures” and Georges Canguilhem’s notion of the “displacement” and “transformation” of concepts that Foucault makes use of in his *Archaeology of Knowledge*.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 181. Hence the Marxist paradox, popularly portrayed by George Orwell in the climactic scene of *Animal Farm*.

¹⁶ “Can Fictional Narratives Be True?” *Analecta Husserliana* 14 (1983): 16.

answers to the question: “Why?” History entails the faithful narration of that which is, “most worthy of being kept in our memories...the *values* that ruled the individual actions, the life of institutions, and the social struggles of the past.”¹⁷ The historian identifies the successive “nows” that his souvenirs permit him to name and narrates the way their underlying ideologies and utopias interact among them for good or for ill. History consists, then, in the attempt to “cure the illness of utopia by what is wholesome in ideology” and to “cure the rigidity, the petrification, of ideologies by the utopian element” so that a fuller range of possibilities can be opened to human experience in the present.¹⁸ Ricoeur is not content to merely let the dialectic stand as a vicious circle, however. From a pre-critical understanding of history as immediate explanation and through the critical display of ideology and utopia, the work of history finally terminates in a self-conscious and post-critical appropriation. In this final move, one must consent to being interpreted at the same time one interprets the world of the text.¹⁹

History as Wager

The accountability which the historian has to his souvenirs represents an important shield against a hackneyed propagandizing of history. Attentiveness to the critique of ideology by utopia and vice versa likewise guards the historian from the subtler dangers of propaganda and hagiography. That said, however, the historian can never fully escape his own self-implication in the state of the question. Nor *should* he (or she).²⁰ The question of history is one that is interested, though not purely *self*-interested. History necessitates certain value judgements wherein the historian selects particular events, texts, persons, periods, etc. over others as being of greater significance. The fact that the historian connects *these* successive “nows” and not others entails acts of selection and suppression that establish a claim to the memorable. Ricoeur embraces this point, admitting that there is in fact no original “given history” to which one may appeal or compare to the historian’s narrative.²¹

Far from dooming the task altogether, however, Ricoeur is merely restoring history to its proper place within the social game. Enlightenment historiography flourished under the pretense that it worked in a position above the fray – somehow above the “slings and arrows” of ideological and utopian discourse. This basic error gave exploitative histories a perfect cover story and conveniently exempted them from critique. For Ricoeur, the enduring achievement of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche was to expose the powers at work with history. Like St. Antony of the Desert, these “masters of suspicion” name the demons and thereby mitigate their furtive power. In the wake of this critical

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ *Ideology and Utopia*, 312.

¹⁹ “Philosophy and Religious Language,” in *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination* (trans. David Pellauer; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 46.

²⁰ Use of the masculine here is deliberate. These reflections represent a venture toward my own self- understanding.

²¹ *Reality of the Historical Past*, 32.

age, however, historians face an important choice in moving forward: the way of nihilism or the way of faith. Here, Ricoeur stands in sharp contrast to a Michel Foucault. Foucault seized upon Nietzsche's hermeneutical skepticism and followed the way of nihilism all the way down. Suspicious of the powers that lurk behind all social constructions, even supposedly noble concepts of "justice" and "truth," he argued that history must content itself with the purely critical task of "conquering power." Rather than seeking a way out of the vicious circle of ideology and utopia, Foucault believed that the goal of history was to keep the dialectic running.²²

Ricoeur, on the other hand is not content with a mere perpetuation of the circularity and advocates a way forward – one that he consents to being described as a way of "fideism" or faith.²³

History, then, is a wager of faithful appropriation. It is a considered, post-critical wager – one that has passed through the desert of criticism – but which remains a wager nonetheless. We venture the telling of stories and we risk the dramatic appropriation of the worlds they imply, believing that in the mediation of historical ideologies and utopias certain values may pass thorough and remain worthy of remembering and reminding as common memory. Sometimes our wagers will falter and combust as chaff beneath the desert sun. On these occasions we must return again to the "endless rectification" and "touch-up the painting" or trash it altogether in favor of a new one. The hope is, however, that others will pay off in a greater power of reflection, in the element of coherent discourse, and in the opening up of better possible worlds which humanity may yet inhabit.²⁴ Such histories will survive the heat because of their thicker and broader narration of the complexities that souvenirs of the past present. More importantly, they will survive because their values are better embodied by the communities (dare we say the historians?) that produce and embody them. They will survive, as did Tolkein's Tom Bombadil, because "[Their] songs are stronger songs, and [their] feet are faster."²⁵

²² Important in this regard was that when Foucault helped to form the *Groupe d'information sur les prisons* in December 1971, the stated purpose was explicitly limited to the gathering and disseminating information about the prison system. The goal of the GIP was not prison *reform*, but prison exposure.

²³ Ricoeur writes:

My more ultimate answer is that we must let ourselves be drawn into the circle and then try to make the circle a spiral. We cannot eliminate from a social ethics the element of risk. We wager on a certain set of values and then try to be consistent with them; verification is therefore a question of our whole life. No one can escape this. Anyone who claims to proceed in a value-free way will find nothing. As Manheim himself asserted [in his *Ideology and Utopia*], anyone who has no projects or no goals has nothing to describe and not science to which he or she can appeal. In a certain sense my answer is fideist, but for me it is only an avowal of honesty to admit that. *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, 312.

²⁴ *The Symbolism of Evil* (trans. Emerson Buchanan; New York: Harper and Row, 1967), 355.

²⁵ *The Fellowship of the Ring* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), 142.

Resurrection and Pentecost: An Embodied, Living Christ

Having this appropriately situated, appropriately humbled history before us, it remains to say something of the value it may have to the historian of theology. Here we may return briefly to George Caird as he advocates the turn to history. He writes, “Anyone who believes that in the life and teaching of Christ God has given a unique revelation of his character and purpose is committed by this belief, whether he likes it or not, whether he admits it or not, to the quest of the historical Jesus.”²⁶ This, of course, is an understandable comment coming, as it does, from the pen of a scholar engaged in the specific disciplinary discourse of Jesus studies, but it is more than that. What I will venture, as a kind of theological footnote to Caird, is that the quest of the historical Jesus does not end with the life and death of the Nazarene, but continues in the form of the quest of the historical Body of Christ as discerned from the perspective of Resurrection and Pentecost.

In the Acts of the Apostles, St. Luke begins by writing, “In the first narration (λόγον), O Theophilus, I have set forth (ἐποιήσαμην) all that Jesus began (ἤρξατο) to do and teach” (1:1). By this he implies that this second narration will consist of a *continuing* chronicle of what the now resurrected Jesus continues to do and teach in his *ecclesial* Body via the Spirit of Resurrection. Luke’s conception of resurrection, made present in Pentecost, commits him to narrate the church’s story as a kind of continuing quest of the Resurrected Jesus. Particularly useful to our present discussion is the fact that his history is quite critical in its mediation of the various ideologies and utopias of the first century. At times he appeals to the ideology of Israel, rooted as it was in the foundational stories of its primordial past, to demonstrate how the community lives in continuity with the past and embodies its ideals.²⁷ Here the use of ideology appropriately serves as authoritative summons to associate with the ecclesial body of the resurrection and appropriate its values. Alternatively, Luke is quite willing to appeal to the utopian implications of the resurrection when ideology drifts into distortion.²⁸ Significantly, the apocalyptic vision of the open heaven and the voice of the resurrected Jesus together serve as a utopian tool of self-criticism when the ecclesial body itself succumbs to ideological distortion (Acts 10:9-16).

The implications of this are instructive to the historical theologian: the resurrection of Jesus mediates ideology and utopia. Ricoeur was deeply committed to the integrity of his own vocation as a philosopher working within the bounds of reason alone. His project never ventures into theology, though he does gesture toward *something* summoning us forward: “Beyond the desert of criticism, we wish to be called again.”²⁹ He limits himself to naming *values* as

²⁶ *Jesus and the Jewish Nation* (London: Althone, 1965), 3.

²⁷ Note here the appeal to the early church as a reversal the story of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9) as early as Acts 2. Shockingly, he is even willing to appeal to the ideology of the Stoics to validate the faith in his narration of Paul’s address at the Aeropagus (Acts. 17).

²⁸ Note here how the resurrection of Jesus proves to be the foil, first before the “men of Israel” at Pentecost (Acts 2:29-36, cf. 4:1-2) and later before the above noted Greeks (Acts 17:18,32).

²⁹ *The Symbolism of Evil* (trans. Emerson Buchanan; Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 349.

they are disclosed in narrative, but the historical *theologian*, remaining unbound by the philosopher's self-censoring oath, is more free to acknowledge the calling as calling and to narrate values as *Voice*, embodied and/or distorted historically as the case may be. This would be my best approximation of the proper task of historical theology.

In making this assertion, I am not suggesting that our history should retreat again to the bare narration of Providence or to an exercise in hagiography. Such pre-critical histories can only swim in the seas of their own age. We can no more presume to reproduce the methodology of St. Luke than we can aspire to author Holy Scripture; and the attempt to do so in our own time would yield a narrative virtually unintelligible to our own culture. If the goal is to remember and remind – to commend our particular narrations as common memory – we must mediate according to the discourse of our times. More importantly, a robust affirmation of the embodiment of the resurrection suggests that God is at work with the world and through the events, persons, texts, and periods that our souvenirs present. A broadened and thickened account of the discrete, subtle relations between the souvenirs can therefore be properly recognized as both historical and theological. This is true even from the perspective of the most ancient Christian confessional affirmation.

In the end, the historical theologian is a servant of the church and thus remains firmly inside the social and ecclesiological game. While his ventured narration of the resurrection in history may fail in many or even in all points, we may still appropriately continue to wager on the hope that the Spirit of the resurrected Christ remains with his ecclesial Body. Given that the Spirit's work is properly understood in terms of centuries and millennia, not in hours and days, we may tell our stories, strive to embody their best values, and continue to touch-up our paintings. We do so in the lived hope that the resurrection of Jesus entails a history that is always-already graced and that we are being summoned beyond the desert of criticism and into all truth.

**The Oxford Movement's Influence upon German American Protestantism:
Newman and Nevin**

Noël Pretila

The Mercersburg Movement came into existence nearly a decade after the birth of the Oxford Movement (1835). It began in 1844, when a Swiss-born, German-educated theologian by the name of Philip Schaff (1819-93) accepted a teaching position at the struggling Mercersburg Seminary in Pennsylvania at the suggestion of his mentor at the University of Berlin, Augustus Neander (1789-1850). After taking the post, Schaff teamed up with an American theologian on the Mercersburg faculty by the name of John Williamson Nevin (1803-86). Before Schaff's arrival, Nevin had already been laying the groundwork for this high-church movement. After hearing Nevin preach a sermon entitled "Catholic Unity," Schaff knew he shared a kindred spirit in Nevin: "I feared I might not find sympathy in him for my views of the church; but I discover that he occupies me in my position. He is filled with ideas of German theology."³⁰

It was specifically the German theological notion of organic development shared by Schaff and Nevin which proved to be the key element differentiating the mission of the Mercersburg Movement from that of the Oxford Movement, "Oxford and Mercersburg were concurrent [high-church] movements on different sides of the Atlantic with similar, though hardly identical agendas."³¹ Schaff and Nevin voiced their appreciation, "of the deep intelligent conviction at work in the Oxford Movement."³² Yet, it was the

³⁰ David S. Schaff, *The Life of Philip Schaff: In Part Autobiographical* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), 103.

³¹ Richard E. Wentz, *John Williamson Nevin: American Theologian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 90. In essence, both movements sought to formulate a response to the religious subjectivism that plagued their contexts in different ways. The manifestation of "religious subjectivism" in the Oxford context was more political in nature. The Tractarians sought to assert the objective uniqueness of the Church of England amongst an emerging secularism which was allowing Roman Catholics to assume government positions. The Anglicans sought to do this via a principle of continuity with early Christianity. On the other hand, the Mercersburg school was responding to religious problems in America: sectarianism (which was fueled by revivalism) and rationalism (which was fueled by the Enlightenment). Both sectarianism and rationalism, according to Schaff, elevated the prerogative of the individual at the expense of the historical prerogatives of the church.

³² John Williamson Nevin, *My Own Life: The Early Years (1870)*, Papers of the Eastern Chapter, Historical Society of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, no. 1 (Lancaster, PA.: Historical Society of the Reformed Church, 1964), 149. Nevin describes his early thoughts regarding the Oxford Movement prior to his "five years of dizziness" thus: "And yet my first glimpse, perhaps, of what the church spirit really means, came to me unexpectedly from looking into a volume of the Oxford Tracts; which a friend had bought, found to be dry and tiresome reading, and then passed as a psychological curiosity into my hands. I was not converted in any sense to the views of the book. But I saw (what I had not believed before) that there was deep intelligent conviction at work in

Tractarians' lack of a doctrine of organic development which kept the Mercersburg theologians (especially Schaff) at a distance: "So far we go with young Oxford hand in hand, at the hazard even of being called reformed Catholic, or catholic Protestant. So soon however as it comes to the choice of the means, by which the object in view is to be reached, we are constrained to part with it, as unsound and unsafe."³³

The "means" specifically employed by the Tractarians which Schaff believed to be "unsound and unsafe" consisted of their over-reliance upon the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. He cautioned that this argument for authority was, in essence, borrowed capital from Rome: "As the Puseyites, in this question of government and order, which they invest with undue religious importance both doctrinal and practical, stand upon essentially Roman Catholic ground... The points in which they still declare their system to be different from popery, are comparatively subordinate and unimportant."³⁴ Because the Oxford Movement's argument for authority basically mirrored that of Rome, Schaff would prophetically suggest in *The Principle of Protestantism* that the movement had all the ingredients to backfire: the means employed to establish authority, when taken to its ultimate conclusion could dangerously lead its followers to the very thing the movement sought to defend itself against: Roman Catholicism.³⁵ While some scholars have suggested that the argument for Apostolic Succession was a "Trojan Horse" put forth by crypto-Catholics within the Tractarian camp³⁶, Schaff believed that it was actually the sincere Puseyites who had inadvertently created it to the peril of their own movement!

For most 19th century Protestant Americans, the Oxford Movement in England was either uncritically dismissed as just another form of despised Catholicism or was looked upon as a theological curiosity which seemed to have no relevance here in America. The purpose of this paper is to suggest the contrary. I argue that the difficult "Church question" posed by the Oxford Movement would come to especially torment the latter Mercersburg gentleman, John Williamson Nevin, who himself experienced a Newman-like "five years of

the Oxford movement; that the men concerned in it were neither fools, not visionaries, nor hypocrites; and there flashed upon me, at the same time, some sense of profoundly earnest religious problem, which they were wrestling with, and in their way endeavoring to solve" (149). Schaff voiced his appreciation for the work of the Oxford Movement (which he labeled as Puseyism) in his *Principle of Protestantism*: "I look upon Puseyism as an entirely legitimate and necessary reaction against rationalistic and sectarian pseudo-protestantism, as well as the religious subjectivism of the so called Low Church Party; with which the significance of the Church has been forgotten, or at least practically undervalued, in favor of personal individual piety, the sacraments in favor of faith, sanctification in favor of justification, and tradition in its right sense in favor of the holy scriptures." (q.v., Philip Schaff, *The Principle of Protestantism*, trans. John W. Nevin [Chambersburg, PA: "Publication Office" of the German Reformed Church, 1845], 122-23).

³³ Philip Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, 124.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, *Principle of Protestantism*, 126-27.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 127-28. I say "prophetically" because Schaff wrote *Principle of Protestantism* five years before the massive defection of Oxford Movement converts to Rome that occurred due to the infamous Gorham trial of 1850.

³⁶ Emma Mason, "Tractarian Poetry: Introduction," *Victorian Poetry* 44 (Spring 2006): 4.

dizziness,” in which he struggled over whether to convert to Rome. Fittingly, it was Nevin’s exposure to the arguments put forth by John Henry Newman in *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* that would serve as a major catalyst behind Nevin’s theological crisis. Although Newman had converted to Rome by the time he wrote this essay in 1845, his theory of development possessed a modified Tractarianism that would come to mesmerize Nevin. It was in Nevin’s theological crisis where Schaff found the opportunity to fruitfully engage Newman’s notion of doctrinal development in an extended fashion. It is in his response to Nevin’s usage of Newman that we find a working comparison between the varying theories of doctrinal development of both Schaff and Newman.

The Dynamism of Schaff’s Theory of Organic Development

Before exploring Schaff’s response to Newman’s theory of doctrinal development either directly or indirectly, a brief description of organic development as understood by Schaff is in order. For Schaff, organic development was actually the careful balancing of two seemingly disparate notions: (1) organic union with the past and (2) dialectical advancement towards the future. One had to embrace these two poles in tension to properly belong to the Mercersburg School of historical development.³⁷

This paradox was modeled for Schaff primarily by the Apostolic Typology of Church History laid down by Freidrich Schelling in his lectures delivered at the University of Berlin between 1841 and 1845 entitled “The Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation.” Schelling labeled the component of organic union with the past as the Catholic or Petrine principle. This was the tendency within Christianity to abide by established law or tradition otherwise known as the *Objective*. Schelling labeled the component of dialectical advancement towards the future as the Protestant or Pauline principle. This was an opposite tendency within Christianity to seek out freedom and liberty otherwise known as the *Subjective*. Schelling viewed the situation of the Apostles as an instructive foreshadowing of how these two countervailing tendencies present in his day should move forward: Peter, the antitype to Roman Catholicism, and Paul, the antitype to Protestantism, co-existed together in a dialectical relationship which lead to the synthesis of the ideal church of the future (i.e., evangelical Catholicism) typified by John, the Apostle of Love.³⁸

Schaff would point out that to overemphasize one of the poles at the expense of the other inevitably led to abuses which he called Romanism (i.e., the improper use of the Catholic Principle) and pseudo-Protestantism (i.e., the improper use of the Protestant Principle).³⁹ Schaff described the Oxford Movement as an exercise in Romanism due to its obsession with “mechanical

³⁷ Payne, “The Church Question,” 171-72.

³⁸ David W. Lotz, “Philip Schaff and the Idea of Church History,” in *The Legacy of Philip Schaff*, ed. Henry W. Bowden (Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 16-17.

³⁹ Philip Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, 122-23.

succession” and its narrow focus upon the Church Fathers which purposely ignored subsequent developments in doctrine (e.g., Reformation), thus rendering the “Church as a system handed down under a given and complete form, that must remain perpetually the same.”⁴⁰ In Schaff’s estimation, the Oxford Movement indeed possessed a notion of organic union with the past, albeit a limited timeframe within church history, but was deficient of dialectical advancement towards the future. He wrote, “Puseyism looks backward; we look forward. It tends towards Rome.... We move toward Jerusalem, the new, the heavenly, the eternal.”⁴¹

Maintaining the equilibrium between these two disparate tendencies was challenging, even for the Mercersburgers. In David Schaff’s biography of his father, he recalled an incident that occurred on the Mercersburg campus which served as a humorous, yet stark reminder of how difficult it was to preserve the balance of organic development:

Some colored men...working on the seminary grounds, overheard the discussions of the students about historical development, one of the crucial questions in the new movement. Greatly perplexed, they had recourse to Brooks, as to what “this here devilment [sic] theory meant which them thar [sic] students war [sic] talking about so much on the hill.” Brooks was a leader among the colored population of the village and also a constant champion of Professors Nevin and Schaff. “Devilment,” said he, “devilment! I guess they’ve been in enough devilment already. If them students don’t look out, the old devil will get hold of some of them, sure.”⁴²

Although a funny anecdote, the event was somewhat of an omen. Nevin, Schaff’s partner at Mercersburg, eventually succumbed to the “devilment” by his not being able to properly balance the organic development equation. Although possessing a notion of dialectical advancement towards the future, Nevin became too infatuated with organic union with the past – a bias that would inevitably lead to his theological crisis. Schaff later admitted to Nevin’s biographer, Theodore Appel, that Nevin shared the tendencies of the Tractarians because he “looked backward and became Romanizing.”⁴³

⁴⁰ Ibid., *Principle of Protestantism*, 124. George Richards provides a good explanation for why Schaff pejoratively called an overdependence upon Apostolic Succession, *Mechanical Succession*: “[Mercersburg] differed from the Anglican and Roman churches in emphasizing the Church as an organism of which Christ is the head and heart, instead of an institution mediating externally and mechanically between God in heaven and men on earth. In their theological thinking they were guided by analogies from the organic and the ethical order, not from the mechanical and forensic.” (q.v., George Warren Richards, “The Mercersburg Theology – Its Purpose and Principles,” *Church History* 20 [Sept. 1951]: 48).

⁴¹ Philip Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, 165.

⁴² David Schaff, *Life of Philip Schaff*, 127.

⁴³ Letter of Philip Schaff to “Dear Friend” (probably Theodore Appel), 13 February 1889, Philip Schaff Papers, Evangelical and Reformed Historical Society, Philip Schaff

Although Schaff would play a large role in conducting Nevin out of his “five years of dizziness” and back into the Mercersburg fold, he sought to avoid being too closely associated with Nevin later in his life. Writing to Appel, Schaff expressly requested that Nevin’s biographer not identify him with Nevin’s position, because “I was never Romanizing and tried to check that tendency [in Nevin] without producing a split.”⁴⁴ The leaven of the Oxford Movement had spread beyond Europe and affected the American Protestant scene.

Encounters with Victims of The “Trojan Horse” From Afar: Schaff’s Six Weeks in England during the Summer of 1844

In 1841, John Henry Newman published the controversial *Tract 90*, in which he identified the ecclesial identity of the Anglican church as more Roman Catholic than Protestant. He was excoriated for making this assertion and the *Tracts for the Times* was soon shut down. Newman was so shaken by the feedback he received for *Tract 90* that he retired to his country parish of Littlemore and began to contemplate his future in the Anglican Church.⁴⁵

Philip Schaff must have heard about this controversy while he was studying and teaching at the University of Berlin between 1840 and 1842.⁴⁶ In 1843, he was persuaded by both Nevin and Neander to come teach at Mercersburg Seminary. But, before going, Schaff decided to spend six weeks in England to track down the main thinkers of this high-church movement whose *Tracts for the Times* had shaken the world.⁴⁷ In *The Principle of Protestantism*, Schaff reflected a year later on how significant it was for him to meet with the leaders of the Oxford movement during this six-week visit in April and May of 1844.⁴⁸

Already thus it appears clothed with a world-historical importance. I have myself hardly ever before had such an impression of the objective power of the “idea,” as during the

Library, Lancaster Theological Seminary. Lancaster, PA., quoted in Stephen Ray Graham, *Cosmos in the Chaos: Philip Schaff's Interpretation of Nineteenth-Century American Religion* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995), 65.

⁴⁴ Letter of Philip Schaff to “Dear Dr. Apple [sic],” 18 June 1889, Philip Schaff papers, ERHS, quoted in Graham, *Cosmos in the Chaos*, 65.

⁴⁵ Ben O’Connor, *Oxford Movement Proper* (Theo 693 Class Paper, Saint Louis University, 2007), 16.

⁴⁶ Graham, *Cosmos in the Chaos*, 56, “Schaff’s willingness to risk censure in order to find out more about the fear and despised Tractarians is his insatiable curiosity and desire to learn firsthand about every religious movement. At a time when few German thinkers deemed events and movements in the church outside their homeland worth their attention, Schaff was amazingly perceptive alert to anything, anywhere that might be influential to the church” (56).

⁴⁷ Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 77.

⁴⁸ George H. Shriver, *Philip Schaff: Christian Scholar and Ecumenical Prophet: Centennial Biography for the American Society of Church History* (Macon, GA.: Mercer, 1987), xi. Shriver’s timeline of the life of Schaff was quite helpful in determining the months Schaff was in England during the year of 1844.

course of my late travel, through Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, England, and North America; encountering as I did everywhere, in the persons of distinguished ministers and laymen, if not precisely Puseyism itself, at least aspirations and endeavors of a more or less kindred spirit.⁴⁹

Although Schaff recognized Pusey as the ring-leader of the Oxford Movement, he first sought out John Henry Newman when he arrived in England. The controversy that swirled around *Tract 90* just three years prior still piqued the interest of the young Schaff and he desired to hear directly from Newman all the particulars that led to his premature retirement. Unfortunately for the inquisitive Schaff, he encountered a pensive Newman who was not willing to freely converse. The awkward meeting left an indelible impression on Schaff for the rest of his life; he recalled his uncomfortable encounter with Newman at his farewell address to the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church on October 24, 1892: “[Newman] was remarkably reserved when I saw him, for half an hour, at Littlemore, as if he was seriously contemplating that decisive step which marks an epoch in modern church history.”⁵⁰ A year after Schaff’s short visit at Littlemore, Newman converted to Rome.⁵¹

It is unclear whether Schaff’s visit left much of an impression upon Newman. He made no mention of the encounter in his writings.⁵² It is possible that Newman never took Schaff seriously, due to his background as a German historical theologian. Schaff would protest two years later that Newman was both uncritical and unfair in his sweeping rejection of German historical theology: “Even Newman shows a wretched want of acquaintance with the better productions of modern German historical inquiry, when he allows himself as he does to involve the whole in a summary charge of unbelief.”⁵³ There were at least three schools of German historical thought, which Newman lumped into one category.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Philip Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, 122.

⁵⁰ Philip Schaff, “Introduction: Retrospect and Farewell,” in *Philip Schaff: Historian of the Universal Church*, ed. by Klaus Penzel (Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1991), 4.

⁵¹ David Schaff, *Life of Philip Schaff*, 87.

⁵² John Henry Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, ed. Birmingham Oratory, Vol. 10 (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1961).

⁵³ Philip Schaff, *What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1846), 6.

⁵⁴ Shriver, *Schaff: Christian Scholar and Ecumenical Prophet*, 3: “These three [views] were (1) New Lutheranism, which was interested in taking the church back to the confessions and orthodoxy of the sixteenth century and seventeenth centuries, (2) rationalism, or radicalism, which was challenging supernaturalism and applying critical methods to the beginnings of Christianity; and between these two – (3) the school of conciliation and mediation, with its evangelical, romantic, edifying approach to theology and history” (3).

After his appointment with Newman, Schaff decided to seek out Edward Pusey at Oxford.⁵⁵ This interaction proved to be worthwhile, as Schaff gained a willing, if grumpy, audience. Schaff found Pusey to be an ascetic scholar with a rigid personality. He found Pusey's devotion to a "static unhistorical orthodoxy, compiled out of selected fathers and councils" to be equally rigid.⁵⁶ Yet it was in their dialogue that humorless Pusey provided Schaff with an outline of the three interrelated principles of the Oxford Movement: (1) Apostolic Succession, (2) a narrow devotion to the Church Fathers, and (3) contempt for the Reformation.

Pusey was aware of Schaff's eventual destination in America and complained to Schaff how disconcerted he had become by the sect divisions there. His complaint quickly turned into an opportunity to convince Schaff that the imposition of Apostolic Succession was the only cure. Schaff recalled how Pusey longed for a situation where "the bishops of the Anglican Church and the Roman Catholic Church alone had the ground."⁵⁷

Schaff challenged Pusey regarding the foundational merits of Apostolic Succession. Schaff asked how a distinction between presbyter and bishop could be made when Scripture did not appear to do the same. Pusey accused Schaff of attempting to employ a faulty etymological argument. Schaff then moved the discussion to the Apostolic Fathers by asking about Clement of Rome, who in his *Epistle to the Corinthians* he appeared to be one of several presbyters (i.e., members of a college) who led the Church of Rome. Pusey countered that this leadership arrangement in Rome was most likely a provisional one: the bishop could have died and the seat still been vacant at the time Clement wrote *Epistle to the Corinthians* or the church could simply have belonged to another diocese.⁵⁸

Pusey then used the second tenet of the Oxford Movement to trump Schaff's challenges regarding the foundational merits of Apostolic Succession. Feeling he was not able to convince Schaff with the answers provided, Pusey fell back upon the overall testimony of the Church Fathers as his authority: "Where a thing cannot be proved from Scriptures, then the testimony of the church is final for me. We may rest with confidence upon its teaching during the

⁵⁵ Although Pusey is not considered to be a victim of the "Trojan Horse" phenomenon per se, his conversation with Schaff is highlighted because it provides the general contours of the Oxford Movement. Schaff would come to Oxford again eight years later (1853) to find a Pusey who "does not seem to be shaken in his ecclesiastical position by the defection of Newman" (q.v., David Schaff, *Life of Philip Schaff*, 175). It is common knowledge that Pusey was eventually exposed to German ideas, which may have served as a safeguard in keeping him from getting snagged in the "Trojan Horse." After Schaff's visit with Pusey in 1853, Pusey conveyed to Schaff a softer Tractarianism which seems to entertain a reluctant inclusiveness towards the Reformation: "I do believe that the Lutheran and other Dissenting bodies are under great loss. I do think that by virtue of their baptism pious individuals who are in ignorance, belong to the soul though not to the body of the church" (175).

⁵⁶ Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 79.

⁵⁷ David Schaff, *Life of Philip Schaff*, 88.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, *Life of Philip Schaff*, 88-89.

first six centuries.”⁵⁹ Although the origin of Apostolic Succession may have been a questionable issue, Pusey asserted that the testimony of the Church Fathers had cleanly settled the issue by the sixth century. This response was troubling for Schaff as he was not comfortable with the testimony of the Church Fathers being placed on par with the authority of Christ and the Apostles.

Pusey’s perceivably narrow appeal to the first six centuries of the church would lead Schaff to ask him about the significance of the Reformation. Schaff argued that because the Catholic Church was unwilling to relent from the Romanizing abuses which the Reformers had exposed, they had no other choice but to ordain themselves. Pusey answered back, “Why could not the Reformers have applied to England for ordination?” When Schaff tried to convince Pusey that Luther was simply trying to recover lost Augustinian thought, Pusey dismissed the work of the Reformer as more akin to a revolution than a reformation, not recovering true Christianity but actually corrupting it: “Whatever of truth there is in the doctrine of justification by faith, is found much better stated in Augustine and the other Fathers. It is just that which Luther is said to have made more clear, that which is to him peculiar, which passes beyond the boundaries of the truth and leads to the most serious errors. Luther had no right to pronounce new doctrines. We dare not go outside the first six centuries.”⁶⁰

Schaff continued to press Pusey regarding his narrow reliance on the Church Fathers by asking him why he could not view the work of the Reformers as a sign of growth for the Church. “Why should we remain in the child period? Does not the church represent the continuance of the life of Christ, and must she not go on developing to the full maturity of Christ’s life?” This attempt to introduce organic development was to no avail. Just like Newman, Pusey displayed an immediate abhorrence to German ideas. Schaff spent the remainder of the discussion back-peddling to defend German thought by citing the evangelically-minded Neander and Tholuck as its best representatives.⁶¹

At the close of their conversation, Pusey expressed his wish to Schaff that he would eventually join the Oxford Movement. “When I arose to go, he expressed the hope that God, having led me thus far, would lead me still further.” Schaff retorted, “I hoped so too, but only not in the direction of Rome, but of the truth, and expressed the hope that God would use the Tractarian movement for the good of the Church Universal and bring the leaders to an appreciation of the services of the Reformation.”⁶² A year later, Schaff would provide his verdict on the Oxford Movement which was perhaps based in large part to the conversation he had with Pusey: “Its mission must be regarded as preparatory only to that more full and perfect dispensation, by which in the end the captivity of Jacob is to be restored. It has done much, and may do still more, to bring the great problem of the age home to the consciousness of the Protestant

⁵⁹ Ibid., 89.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ I.e., the school of conciliation and mediation. Ibid., 90.

⁶² Ibid.

world. But for the solution of the problem itself, it is found to be utterly incompetent.”⁶³

From Near: Engaging Newman's Influence on Nevin

Robert Baird, a European commentator of the American religious scene in the mid-nineteenth century, was all but sure that the “semi-Popish doctrines” of the Oxford Movement would have little, if any, influence across the Atlantic.⁶⁴ Schaff was himself embarrassed by the lack of meaningful engagement his American Protestant counterparts displayed, usually boorish or indifferent, regarding the Oxford Movement. He dealt them a harsh rebuke in *Principle of Protestantism*:

Of what avail against such a life question, the true burden of the age itself, can be the hue and cry of *Popery! Romanism!* Nonsensically kept up by our intelligence and anti-intelligence prints? Grapple with the subject in earnest. Bring the fire engines. Extinguish the flame. If ye do but idly stare at it, or stand before it lamenting and railing with folded hands, assuredly it will soon burst triumphantly through the roof, and leave you at last houseless and bare. Nothing can well be more shallow and miserable, and full of senseless pretention withal, than the style in which the controversy with Popery and Puseyism, is to a great extent conducted in our religious periodicals.⁶⁵

This dearth in America Protestantism of scholarly interaction with the Oxford Movement came to an end in the person of John Williamson Nevin. His “five years of dizziness” (1850-1855) consisted in large part of grappling with the hard questions posed by the Oxford Movement, as well as the answers provided by its subsequent converts to Rome, including John Henry Newman. The infamous Gorham Trial of 1850 was a trigger of both the mass defection of Oxford Movement leaders to Rome and of Nevin's theological crisis.⁶⁶ Nevin's

⁶³ Philip Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, 128.

⁶⁴ Robert Baird, *Religion in the United States of America* (Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1844; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, 1969), 506, quoted in Graham, *Cosmos in the Chaos*, 57.

⁶⁵ Philip Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, 122.

⁶⁶ Darryl G. Hart, *John Williamson Nevin: High-Church Calvinist* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 2005), 148. This controversy centered upon George C. Gorham, a vicar in the Anglican Church, who was prohibited from becoming a priest by his bishop, Henry Phillpotts, for not adhering to baptismal regeneration. Gorham took the case to the civil courts who ruled in his favor, stating that his position fell within the parameters of the Thirty-Nine Articles. The significance of this trial is that the English government had made a theological ruling that trumped the prerogatives of the Anglican Church. For many in the Oxford Movement, this was a major blow because the Anglican

preoccupation with the outcome of this event, so far removed from his American situation, has puzzled his biographer, James Hasting Nichols.⁶⁷

Two preliminary explanations for his obsession with the Gorham trial may be offered here: (1) Nevin's appreciation for Anglican sacramental theology and (2) his view of the Oxford Movement as a partner to combat the abuse of religious subjectivity (i.e., pseudo-Protestantism). First, Nevin admitted later in his life that he had always favored the practical outworkings of Anglican sacramental theology over the inward emphasis characteristically placed on the sacraments by German theologians.

...these [German] studies seem too often to stop short of what is involved for faith in the full apprehension of the Christian mystery, as a continuous presence in the world, they are found to be at certain points more or less unsatisfactory in the end to our religious feelings. Here it is that, with all our respect for German divinity, we consciously come to break with it in our thoughts, and feel the necessity of supplementing it with the more practical way of looking at Christianity which we find embodied in the ancient creeds. In this respect we freely admit our theology is more Anglican than German.⁶⁸

If Nevin's admission is true regarding his indebtedness to Anglican sacramental theology, it is not too difficult to imagine that he would have been interested in the proceedings and the outcome of the Gorham trial which dealt with the High-Church doctrine of baptismal regeneration!

Second, Nevin initially shared Schaff's view that the Oxford Movement was an "unsound and unsafe" system; but just like Schaff, he considered the movement to be a fellow partner in countering pseudo-Protestantism. As Mercersburg sought to deal with the abuse of religious subjectivism in the forms of revivalism, sectarianism, and rationalism in America, the Oxford Movement sought to deal with its manifestation in England in the form of a secularizing government which chipped away at the prerogatives of the Anglican church. As the "Anxious Bench" for Nevin had

claim to Apostolic Succession had clearly failed. Schaff seemed to anticipate this controversy when in January 1847 he expressed his concern for the lack of separation of church and state in the European countries, "Protestantism in Germany, Switzerland, and England certainly made a mistake in binding itself so closely to the worldly power and in transferring its episcopal rights to princes and kings. The church is called upon to bear no other yoke than the easy yoke of its bridegroom" (q.v., David Schaff, *The Life of Philip Schaff*, 140).

⁶⁷ This question is posed by James Hasting Nichols who observes that there does not seem to be a clear connection for why this event in England so greatly affected Nevin from afar "The Anglican Crisis' shows Nevin engaged with surprising intensity in the affairs of the Church of England, with no evidence of any local incident to explain his shift of views in the preceding spring" (q.v., Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 195).

⁶⁸ Nevin, *Mercersburg Review* 14 (Oct 1867): 632, quoted in Richards, "The Mercersburg Theology," 50.

become the embodiment of pseudo-Protestantism in America, the Gorham Trial had become to him the embodiment of this same abuse of religious subjectivity, only this time in the English setting.⁶⁹ Because of this, Nevin would consider the outcome of the Gorham trial as not only a loss for the Tractarians, but a blow for all of Protestantism because a major partnering movement to correct pseudo-Protestantism across the Atlantic had to him, miserably failed.⁷⁰

Although these factors certainly contributed to Nevin's emotional and intellectual investment in the Gorham trial, the main cause of Nevin's "five years of dizziness" would be his exposure to John Henry Newman's ideas in *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* a little more than four years prior to the Gorham trial. As a recent convert to Catholicism, Newman coincidentally published this essay on historical development the same year (1845) that Schaff wrote his own treatise on historical development (i.e., *The Principle of Protestantism*). Nevin would openly announce his admiration for Newman's work during his theological crisis in the third article of *Early Christianity* (1852), "Few theological tracts, in the English language are more worthy of being read, or more likely to reward a diligent perusal with lasting benefit and fruit."⁷¹

Why was Nevin so attracted to Newman's doctrine of development? Taking a look at Schaff's assessment of Newman's doctrine of development may shed some light on this question. After reviewing *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, Schaff pronounced the main difference between Newman's doctrine of development and the Mercersburg doctrine of development, "[Newman's doctrine of development] differs very materially from ours. For in the first place, he allows this development to hold only in the Roman Catholic direction; so that Protestantism is regarded as a falling away from history, and of course an abiding progressive corruption."⁷²

Despite being a recent convert to Catholicism, Newman seemed to still possess the Tractarian appeal to antiquity, with its consequent disdain for the Reformation. as the basis for his doctrine of development. Every subsequent development in the history of the church had to be organically connected somehow to a narrow span of time in the past, i.e., the overall testimony of the Church Fathers from the second to the sixth century. There was no dialectical

⁶⁹ Hart, *Nevin: High-Church Calvinist*, 149.

⁷⁰ Wentz, *Nevin: American Theologian*, 91. The "Anxious Bench" was one of the New Measures that revivalist preachers such as Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875) would use to bring people to faith. Typically, an unbeliever who was thinking about becoming a Christian was invited to come to the "Anxious Bench" which was located towards the front of the congregation; the "searcher" would sit there until they were moved to make a decision. Although the measure was very successful in bringing in professed converts, Nevin in his pamphlet, *The Anxious Bench*, was critical of it because such revivalist measures placed all the emphasis on subjective feelings and emotions and provided no room for engaging important elements of church life such as the sacraments and catechesis.

⁷¹ Nevin, "Early Christianity," third article, *Mercersburg Review* 4 (1852): 33.

⁷² Philip Schaff, *What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development*, 46-48 n. 1.

advancement towards the future in Newman's model.⁷³ Schaff bewailed how dubious this method could be as one was relegated to making strained connections to the past in order to explain how a later development was deemed as legitimate, "the slightest and most indistinct hints of Christian antiquity, are taken as sufficient proofs by themselves for the existence at the time of doctrines and practices that belong to a much later period."⁷⁴

So how did Newman's Tractarianism, re-tooled for a Catholic model of historical development, become so attractive for Nevin? Because, as Schaff always sensed, Nevin was more backward looking than forward looking in his doctrine of organic development, he was already sympathetic to the Oxford Movement's appeal to antiquity. When Newman blended historical development with his Tractarian-turned-Catholic ideas, his model contained all the necessary ingredients Nevin desired: an appeal to antiquity combined with a doctrine of development. Just as the Tractarians created their own "Trojan Horse," John Henry Newman's essay on historical development served as a trap that would eventually spring upon Nevin. It had lain dormant in his mind for several years but was then suddenly triggered by the outcome of the Gorham trial. When he saw that the Gorham trial yielding not the dialectical advancement towards the future that he expected, but rather a retrogression back into further pseudo-Protestantism, Nevin began to ponder the abandonment of the Mercersburg project in favor of the historical method laid down by Newman. This decision process affected him so greatly that Nevin did something very Newman-esque: he began dropping his academic responsibilities at Mercersburg to solely grapple the Church question. He left his teaching post in 1851, then his editor-in-chief position at *Mercersburg Review* in 1852, and finally his role as president of the college in 1853.⁷⁵ Although he left Schaff as the lone

⁷³ Stephen Graham provides an excellent example of how the Mercersburg school would hold the tension between organic union with the past and dialectical advancement towards the future in their creation of liturgy, "In addition, their dynamic view of historical development allowed them to insist that the liturgy should be not only historical, but at the same time modern and American." (q.v., Graham, "Nevin and Schaff," in *Reformed Confessionalism in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Sam Hamstra, Jr. and Arie J. Griffioen [New Lanham, MD.: Scarecrow Press, 1995], 82).

⁷⁴ Philip Schaff, *What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development*, 46-48 n. 1.

⁷⁵ Payne, "Schaff and Nevin: The Church Question," 182. The similarities of Newman and Nevin are uncanny: both men were argumentative; both were prone to convalesce during theological crisis; both men were trained in "Puritan" forms of Christianity; both came to think in more "churchly" terms; both men experienced a sort of conversion when they began taking seriously the idea of historical development; both were sorrowful that they had said and written harsh things about Roman Catholicism; both men wrote articles showing their approval of Catholicism which greatly concerned their religious peers; both men had a period of seclusion where they considered becoming Catholic (q.v., Paul Patterson, *Nevin on Early Christianity* [Class Paper, Saint Louis University, 2004], 16). Two key differences between Newman and Nevin are highlighted by Nichols: (1) Whereas historical development was the key concept which allowed Newman to convert to Rome, this same concept ultimately prevented Nevin from doing the same; (2) the Anglican church abandoned Newman after his controversial *Tract 90*; after questioning Nevin about his eight controversial articles that he published in the *Mercersburg Review*,

theological teaching professor at Mercersburg, Schaff would defend his partner's resignation knowing that Nevin had become plagued with "conscientious doubt whether he was, just now, the man suited to educate theological youth for the service of a Protestant denomination, while the whole Church question was undergoing a radical revision in his mind."⁷⁶

During his "five years of dizziness," Nevin would write eight articles for the *Mercersburg Review* consisting of over 300 pages of work: "The Anglican Crisis" (1851), three articles on "Early Christianity" (1851-52), and four articles on "Cyprian" (1852). In each article, one can observe Nevin's estimation of the Roman Catholic Church gradually increasing, hitting its zenith in the last piece on Cyprian. "Almost all his theological writing for a year and half was devoted to the study of the ancient church, toward which he adopted much of the Roman view."⁷⁷ Nevin's articles drew the ire of his American Protestant counterparts while Roman Catholic scholars waited in glee, anticipating what seemed to be his impending conversion to Rome.⁷⁸ In recollection of the period, Schaff would admit to Theodore Appel, Nevin's biographer, that despite his support of Nevin during this turbulent time, Nevin adversely affected the Mercersburg project in penning these articles. "In any case I would like to see the chapter on Mercersburg Theology. It really began with my 'Principle of Protestantism,' but took a wrong and reactionary turn with Nevin's 'Anglican Crisis' and articles on Cyprian, etc."⁷⁹ This "wrong and reactionary turn" was Nevin's overemphasis on organic union with the past at the expense of dialectical advancement towards the future.

The sum and substance of Nevin's turn in "Anglican Crisis" and "Early Christianity" was to refute both the Anglican and Protestant historical models that defended their respective traditions as repristinations of early Christianity.⁸⁰ In the articles on Cyprian, Nevin investigated the writings of this ancient African father to further expose how modern Protestantism was a far cry from the earliest Christian forms of faith; rather, modern Roman Catholicism better

the German Reformed Synod gave him latitude and support for the duration of his theological crisis (q.v., Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 198; 207-8).

⁷⁶ Letter of Philip Schaff to the editor of *Reformierte Kirchenzeitung*, quoted in *Christian Intelligencer*, 16 December 1852, quoted in Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 194-95.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 192.

⁷⁸ Charles Hodge warned Schaff to openly disassociate himself from Nevin if he wanted the Mercersburg project to survive (q.v., Charles Hodge, *Review of History of the Apostolic Church*, by Philip Schaff, *Princeton Review* 26 [1854]: 148-192, quoted in David Schaff, *Life of Philip Schaff*, 200). Orestes Brownson and James McMaster were two Catholic scholars in America who openly admitted that they prayed for the conversion of Nevin during his theological crisis (q.v., Wentz, *Nevin: American Theologian*, 26-27).

⁷⁹ Letter of Philip Schaff to "Dear Friend", 13 February 1889, quoted in Graham, "Nevin and Schaff," 79.

⁸⁰ Hart, *Nevin: High-Church Calvinist*, 149, "The basic idea was that Christianity began unadulterated as a religion solely of the Bible and individual interpretation. Worship resembled that of New England or Scotland. No papacy, priesthood, liturgy, or superstitious ceremonies encumbered genuine Christianity" (149).

resembled Christianity at the time of Cyprian.⁸¹ It is in this central argument that Nevin imbibed of Newman's *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. Nevin certainly gleaned ideas from other thinkers such as Richard Rothe, Henrich Thiersch, Johann Adam Möhler, and Isaac Taylor, whose thought stands apparent throughout the eight articles⁸², but it was Newman and his model of historical development which Nevin principally utilized.⁸³

Furthermore, Payne makes the keen observation of how Newman's theory of historical development gradually increased in Nevin's estimation during the span of his composition of the eight articles. When Nevin wrote the first article in 1851, he ended "Anglican Crisis" by providing four possible theories of historical development that were available to Protestants and Anglicans in light of the fallout of the Gorham trial. Among the four theories, Schaff's theory of organic development was his preferred choice.⁸⁴ When he wrote his third article a year later on "Early Christianity," he would again state the possible theories of historical development but this time would not grant the preferred status to Schaff's theory of organic development as he had previously. At this point, according to Payne, Newman's theory of historical development had now found equal footing to Schaff's organic development theory in the mind of Nevin who "refused at this point to decide among them, but it is fairly clear from the course of his argument in the two essays ['Early Christianity' and 'Cyprian'] that the choice was between Schaff's view and the last one described [i.e., Newman's]."⁸⁵

A classic example of Nevin's use of Newman's *Essay on the Development on Christian Doctrine* can be seen in his first article on "Early Christianity," where he echoed one of the main arguments employed by Newman against Protestantism: "The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were not Protestants of either the Anglican or the Puritan school. They would have felt themselves lost, and away from home altogether, in the arms of English Episcopalianism, as well as the more bony and stern embrace of Scotch Presbyterianism."⁸⁶ This argument loomed so large for Nevin that when pressed

⁸¹ Ibid., *Nevin: High-Church Calvinist*, 155.

⁸² Payne, "The Church Question," 179.

⁸³ Nichols points out that Nevin was basically re-stating the central principles of Newman's model of historical development in the eight articles he wrote, "His articles in this series were intended to substantiate for American Protestants the thesis of Newman's *Essay on Development*, that the type and genius of the ancient church was reproduced far more accurately by modern Roman Catholicism than by any Protestant body." (q.v., Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 200).

⁸⁴ Payne, "The Church Question," 178. The four historical models were: (1) a traditional supercessionist Protestant model, (2) a new dispensation model of revelation such as the one proposed by the Mormons, (3) a secession back to Rome based on Newman's model of historical development, and (4) Schaff's organic development model.

⁸⁵ Ibid., "The Church Question," 182.

⁸⁶ Nevin, "Early Christianity," first article, *Mercersburg Review* (1851): 489. Nevin would not only attribute this thought to Newman by giving him credit in the footnote, but he would also supply Newman's famous quote in its entirety regarding what type of church (i.e., either Protestant or Catholic) St. Athanasius and St. Ambrose would feel more at home if they were somehow brought back to life at the present time.

by Orestes Brownson to make a defense for Protestantism's connection to the Church Fathers, Nevin admitted to the Catholic scholar that he "does not see how it can be done in a fully satisfactory way."⁸⁷

Schaff grew concerned for the welfare of his partner at Mercersburg and decided to respond to Nevin's rising assessment of Newman's thought by writing an article in German in 1852, entitled "Die deutsche Theologie und die Kirchenfrage," which would be translated into English and published in the *Mercersburg Review* the following year.⁸⁸ In a surprising move, Schaff began the article by immediately conceding to Newman's argument that the early fathers would have identified more closely with modern day Roman Catholicism than with modern day Protestantism.

We must inevitably receive the impression that the Church of antiquity was in its predominant spirit and tendency, far more Catholic than Protestant, and that the Middle Ages are only a natural continuation of the Nicene Christianity. Could Ambrosius, Athanasius, Cyprian, Irenaeus, Ignatius, Clemens and Polycarp suddenly arise from their graves, and be transferred to Puritan New England, they would scarcely recognize the Christianity of those venerable Martyrs and Confessors, for which they lived and suffered.⁸⁹

Schaff went on to highlight that the doctrinal emphasis between that of the ancient Church and Protestantism differed vastly: "Even of the material principle of Protestantism, the doctrine of Justification by Faith *alone*, in Luther's sense, the Fathers know nothing, not even Augustine; and instead of making this the article of the standing and falling [of the] Church, they assign rather to the Christology, to the mystery of the Incarnation and to the Holy Trinity, the central position in the Christian system."⁹⁰

Conceding all this, Schaff would pose to the reader of the essay the question of paramount importance: "How can one remain a Protestant any longer, with a good conscience, if he makes such significant concessions to the Catholic Church, regarding her as the only true Church? How can Christianity be first Catholic, then Protestant, without contradicting itself?"⁹¹ Schaff would respond to this question by firmly restating his theory of organic development, with special emphasis placed upon the German notion of dialectical

⁸⁷ Nevin, Letter to Orestes Brownson, 18 August 1852, Brownson Archives, Notre Dame University Press, quoted in Nichols, *Romanticism in American Theology*, 212.

⁸⁸ Payne, "The Church Question," 184. Although Schaff does not appear to be writing this essay directly to Nevin but rather to an audience aware of Nevin's struggles, Payne argues that Schaff did write "German Theology and the Church Question," the English version of the essay, with Nevin in mind and that he wrote in the third person in order that he might not publicly embarrass Nevin.

⁸⁹ Philip Schaff, "German Theology and the Church Question," *Mercersburg Review* 5 (1853): 129.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, "German Theology and the Church Question," 129.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 137.

advancement towards the future. Schaff would issue an indirect challenge to Nevin:

This is then the last but safe anchor for a Protestant divine of the German historical school. To this position has, for example, Dr. Nevin been forced, who is thoroughly acquainted with all the forms of English and German Protestantism. The Puritan, Presbyterian and Anglican historical hypotheses, have proved wholly untenable to him, and in his late articles on "Early Christianity" and "Cyprian" in the *Mercersburg Review*, he has produced arguments against them, which none of his many dissatisfied opponents have attempted to refute, and which indeed, in a historical view, so far as the main facts are concerned, can be scarcely refuted. Consequently there remains nothing for him except the German theory of Development, which, in the mean time, is held in reproach by almost all English theologians. As long as he adheres to this theory, an exodus to Rome will be impossible, as it would be a retrogression, and consequently a nullification of the fundamental law of historical development.⁹²

Schaff would use the example of human development as an analogy to substantiate the dynamism of Mercersburg's theory of organic development, in contradistinction to what he believed to be the one-dimensional nature of Newman's theory of historical development entertained by Nevin. In regard to organic union with the past, Schaff wrote, "For, in the course of her development, the Church must yet continually remain identical in her nature, and dare not advance beyond herself, without falling into heresy, and thus make the promise of Christ to her of none effect."⁹³ This biological analogy would certainly fit into Newman's scheme of historical development.⁹⁴ But Schaff would nuance this understanding by providing another aspect of human development that supported the Mercersburg notion of dialectical advancement towards the future: "Thus the man from childhood to old age still remains man, and each successive step is but a higher evolution of the idea contained already in the infant."⁹⁵ For Schaff, the rise of the Reformation had already been prefigured in the Apostolic Church through the ministry of the Apostle Paul. Just as Paul's ministry of freedom and subjective expression of the Gospel served as ballast to Peter's tendency to overemphasize law and authority, so did

⁹² *Ibid.*, 140.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ Schaff and Newman's notions of what constituted "identity" were different. For instance, Schaff would challenge Newman's view that the Reformation represented an utter corruption from the historic Church, "Hence it is of immense importance, that the Reformers without exception retained the Catholic Canon of Scriptures, the ancient oecumenical creeds, and especially the Apostle's Creed, and incorporated them in their own confessions, and that they stood in direct opposition to the ultra Protestant sects of their times" (q.v., *Ibid.*).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

the Reformation serve as a necessary historical corrective to Rome's similar abuse of the Petrine tendency. Schaff was trying to get across to Nevin that a conversion to Catholicism via Newman's theory of doctrinal development would not be a development but a retrogression.

Nevin never publicly responded to Schaff's article, but Payne notes that it was after the publication of Schaff's article in 1853 that Nevin began to show a more positive assessment of Protestantism.⁹⁶ In 1844, Nevin had written two essays championing the Mercersburg theory of organic development: "The Dutch Crusade" and then a review of R.I. Wilberforce's *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*. By 1855, Nevin emerged out of his "five years of dizziness" firmly established in the Mercersburg fold. Payne weighs in on the possible impact of Schaff's article: "Whether Schaff's pleas and appeal to the logic of his former position grounded as it was in German philosophical and historical understanding, had a decisive impact upon Nevin or not, we cannot be certain, but, without much question, Schaff's theory, which Nevin himself had called the most persuasive argument on the behalf of Protestantism, must in the end have been on the theoretical side an important basis for his remaining Protestant."⁹⁷ Nevin would live the rest of his life in relative obscurity. He would not re-surface on the academic scene until 1866, when he resumed the presidency of the college in response to Schaff's departure from Mercersburg in 1865. In this second run at academia, as Wentz describes him, Nevin had been thoroughly exorcized of his demons from the "five years of dizziness." "There is little doubt that he had mellowed during the last twenty years of his life. Although he spoke to many of the same issues in address, sermons, and essays, he was more irenic, less concerned to vanquish his foes and refute their ideas."⁹⁸ Nevin would serve the college for ten more years before retiring in 1876. He died on June 6, 1886, at the age of 84.

Conclusion

It is common knowledge within American Reformed circles that John Williamson Nevin entertained a conversion to Roman Catholicism during his theological crisis between 1850 and 1855. What is less known are the particular theological ideas with which Nevin grappled during his "five years of dizziness"; Nevin was not merely deciding between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, but rather wrestling with a dilemma between the model of historical development as propounded by the Oxford Movement convert to Rome, John Henry Newman, and the model of organic development put forth by his partner at Mercersburg, Philip Schaff. In the end, Schaff's argument would win the day for Nevin.

Nevin should not be looked down upon for struggling over the "Church Question." In fact, we should commend his willingness to honestly weigh out the two models at the risk of being ostracized by his tradition. Nevin's

⁹⁶ Payne, "The Church Question," 187.

⁹⁷ Ibid., "The Church Question," 189.

⁹⁸ Wentz, *Nevin: American Theologian*, 29.

biographer, Theodore Appel, describes the toll that such authentic engagement placed upon Nevin's mind and body: "[the struggle] engage[d] his waking and perhaps his sleeping hours...never before, perhaps, did philosopher, scientist or theologian bestow more study or prayerful attention than be to any deep problem that called for solution."⁹⁹

It is a common misperception that the Oxford Movement never influenced the American Protestantism. This may be true of the Oxford Movement in its beginnings. But when Newman re-tooled his Tractarian ideas as a Catholic convert, adding to them a dimension of historical development, the modified Oxford Movement arguments engaged one of the great minds of American Protestantism, John Williamson Nevin.

⁹⁹ Theodore Appel, *The Life and Work of John Williamson Nevin* (Philadelphia: The Reformed Church Publishing House, 1889), 300, as quoted by Graham, "Nevin and Schaff," 72.

Reconciling Condemnation and Heteronomy in Athanasius
Chris Schroeder, S.J.

Contemporary religious thinking contains a variety of elements that are inimical to the idea of divine judgment and the condemnation of humanity because of sin. Given this conflict, Christian apologetics must find some way to mediate between its own teachings and contemporary values. Dialectic between Christian theology and conflicting cultural values can occur in one of two manners: Either Christianity can critique the cultural ethos and offer an alternative valuation, or Christianity can attempt to show that its teachings and values, when properly understood, are not in conflict with the broader culture. The modern emphasis on autonomy as a component of moral dignity poses a strong enough challenge to Christian ideas of divine judgment to require this second method of apologetic. How can God make rules about something as arbitrary as eating from a tree and implement punishment for their trespass without this being anything but a heteronomous imposition onto individual human freedom? A sufficiently sophisticated formulation of these teachings about divine condemnation is necessary in order to show that they do not deprive humanity of the dignity proper to a legitimate autonomy. Toward this end, this paper will identify the mechanisms of condemnation present in Athanasius' *On the Incarnation* and demonstrate that his position on condemnation because of trespass of divine law need not be understood as an example of heteronomy.¹⁰⁰

Athanasius and the Penalty of Death

Athanasius was, by all accounts, a dramatic and influential figure in the history of the early Church.¹⁰¹ He wrote extensively against Arianism in works

¹⁰⁰ Heteronomy is here understood as the imposition of a moral or ethical standard from a source other than an individual's own self.

¹⁰¹ Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, (Westminster: Newman Press, 1950), vol. 3: 20.

such as *History of the Arians*, his correspondence, and his greatest work of dogmatic theology: *Against the Arians*.¹⁰² Not only his writings, but also his life framed the terms of the Arian controversies following the Council of Nicaea—five times he was exiled from his episcopal see in Alexandria because of his unflagging defense of Nicene Christology.¹⁰³ But before all these forays into controversial theology, Athanasius cut his teeth on a two-volume work of apologetics. *Against the Pagans* and *On the Incarnation*, among the first writings of his career, are notable for containing Athanasius' most positive assessment of Greek philosophy and for lacking any reference to Arianism.¹⁰⁴

Johannes Quasten identifies *On the Incarnation* as the “classical exposition of the doctrine of redemption and the patristic counterpart to St. Anselm’s *Cur Deus Homo*.”¹⁰⁵ The doctrinal formulations of *On the Incarnation* occur within the genre of an apology.¹⁰⁶ Edward Rochie Hardy notes that this dual characteristic of the work situates it as a transition point between the apologetic literature of the previous two centuries and the doctrinal interests of the councils to come.¹⁰⁷ While there exists general consensus that this is an early writing of Athanasius (i.e., pre-dating his first exile),¹⁰⁸ scholars dispute whether it was written before the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) and the Arian controversy. Moreschini and Norelli favor a later dating (332-335 A.D.) based on linguistic similarities with other Athanasian works around the time of the first exile and a possible reliance on Eusebius’ *Divine Manifestations*, dated around 335.¹⁰⁹ The complete lack of any mention of the Arians or polemic against their teachings counts against such a finding, however. Hardy and Meijering both prefer pre-Nicene dates, giving ranges of 316-318 and 318-323 A.D., respectively.¹¹⁰ An early dating seems preferable, both because of the lack of Arian references and also because of the relatively irenic,¹¹¹ even triumphal¹¹² tone Athanasius takes in the work. Such an attitude would be unlikely to persevere in the face of a fracture in the Church as serious as the Arian controversy.

Athanasius’ main concern in *On the Incarnation* is to show that the incarnation, with the attendant suffering and resurrection of Jesus, is uniquely

¹⁰² Claudio Moreschini and Enrico Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin literature : a literary history*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), vol. 2: 41, 36, 33.

¹⁰³ Quasten, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Moreschini, *op. cit.*, 34-35.

¹⁰⁵ *Op. cit.*, 24.

¹⁰⁶ E. P. Meijering, *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis?*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill: 1968), 107.

¹⁰⁷ *Christology of the Later Fathers*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 44.

¹⁰⁸ Hardy, *op. cit.*, 44; Meijering, *op. cit.*, 109; Moreschini, *op. cit.*, 35; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 25.

¹⁰⁹ *Op. cit.*, 35.

¹¹⁰ Hardy, *ibid.*; Meijering, *ibid.*

¹¹¹ Meijering, *op. cit.*, 106.

¹¹² Hardy, *ibid.*

suited to the purpose of salvation.¹¹³ Athanasius defends both the general concept of God becoming human and the specifics of the passion and resurrection against typical Greek and Jewish objections that these events would be unseemly for God. He does this by showing that salvation via the incarnation is a continuation or renewal of God's previous creative activity.¹¹⁴ The Λόγος or Word of God created all things, leaving its mark upon them. With the entry of sin into the world, humanity lost its full participation in the Λόγος, therefore the Word had to become incarnate in order to refashion humanity in its image again.¹¹⁵ Because the Word became human, a new degree of participation in the divine beyond that of the original creation was made possible. God no longer is just the author of humanity, but now serves as the very form and model of the new humanity established in Christ.¹¹⁶

Within this general schema, Athanasius formulates a problematic referred to as the "Divine Dilemma." The dilemma comes from two seemingly conflicting commitments on the part of God. On the one hand, Athanasius describes death and corruption as necessary consequences of humanity's decision to sin. Athanasius sets out this commitment in this passage:

For [God] brought them into his own Garden, and he gave them a law: so that if they kept the grace and remained good, they might still keep the life in paradise without sorrow or pain or care...; but that if they transgressed and turned back, and became evil, they might know that they were incurring that corruption in death which was theirs by nature, no longer to live in paradise, but cast out of it from that time forth to die and abide in death and in corruption.¹¹⁷

The other horn of the dilemma comes from God's good intention in creating the world. Creation came about because of God's generous choice, and if the freedom of humans leads this creation into death and corruption, then the will of God seems to have been thwarted. Athanasius concludes that it would have been better for God never to have created than for corruption to overcome what God did create.¹¹⁸ For Athanasius, either of these alternatives would be "at once monstrous and unseemly."¹¹⁹ Only the assumption of human flesh by the Word enables God to meet fruitfully both these demands.

Throughout *On the Incarnation*, Athanasius characterizes the condemnation that constitutes the first horn of the Divine Dilemma in two

¹¹³ Moreschini, op. cit., 35.

¹¹⁴ *On the Incarnation* 1:4.

¹¹⁵ Carolyn Schneider, "The intimate connection between Christ and Christians in Athanasius," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58:1 (2005): 6-8.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹¹⁷ *On the Incarnation* 3:4; in *Christology of the Later Fathers*, ed. Edward R. Hardy (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954). 58.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 6:7; Hardy, 61.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 6:2; Hardy, 60.

manners, as condemnation resulting (1 from ontological or (2 from juridical causes. The motifs of corruption (φθορά) and of death (θάνατος), respectively, roughly correspond to these two types of condemnation. Athanasius makes the distinction clearest when discussing the different types of salvation wrought by the incarnation. “And so it was that two marvels came to pass at once,” Athanasius writes, “that the death of all was accomplished in the Lord’s body, and that death and corruption were wholly done away by reason of the Word that was united with it.”¹²⁰ Athanasius views the incarnation as solving two distinct problems. The first condition remedied by Christ is the death owed by all, which we will see is the death owed as a result of legal trespass. The second condition remedied is that of the corruption and death¹²¹ intrinsic to the mutable nature of humanity, an ontological fate that humanity had been abandoned to after its sin.

While Athanasius himself regards this ontological corruption as the more basic form of the condemnation,¹²² the Platonic and other metaphysical commitments of his reasoning make it less useful for contemporary apologetic theology. Therefore, I will only give a brief overview here. Because humanity was created out of nothing, its being has a natural tendency toward corruption.¹²³ Only the image of God present in humanity prevented such degeneration,¹²⁴ and when by sin humanity turned its mind from knowledge of God, losing this image, humanity immediately became subject to the innate corruptibility of its nature.¹²⁵ Thus, the image of God in humanity needed to be restored through the incarnation of the Word.¹²⁶

A better candidate for constructive engagement with modern culture is Athanasius’ account of how humanity is under a liability of death. This liability is sometimes discussed as a legal liability (as a penalty for breaking a law, νόμος) and in other locations referred to as a financial liability (debt, οφειλόμενον). Athanasius traces the legal liability back to Genesis’ story of an originary trespass against divine law. In the creation account of Genesis, God established a law to preserve human freedom from going astray and attached the penalty of death to the infraction of this law. When the first humans

¹²⁰ Ibid., 20: 5; Hardy, 74.

¹²¹ In various cases, Athanasius will use θάνατος in the vicinity of φθορά in a manner that is consistent with an ontological condemnation rather than a juridical one. The significance of the term, then, must be determined from the context. However, the terms may still be considered representative of the two types of condemnation both since the substitution is never reversed (e.g., φθορά serving to indicate juridical condemnation) and also because of the instances when Athanasius clearly contrasts the two words (e.g., 44:8, where Athanasius asserts that a salvific act that remedied only θάνατος would not serve as a remedy for φθορά).

¹²² C.f. *On the Incarnation* 44, where he identifies corruption as intrinsic to the human body and more problematic for redemption than death itself.

¹²³ Ibid., 4:6; Hardy, 59.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 3:3; Hardy, 58.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 7:4; Hardy, 61-62.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 13:7; Hardy, 67.

transgressed this law, the law (and God's commitment to it) demanded that they die. Athanasius writes, "For death, as I said above, gained from that time forward a legal hold over us, and it was impossible to evade the law, since it had been laid down by God because of the transgression."¹²⁷ For Athanasius, the necessity of the penalty derives from God's own truthfulness. Once God has made such a commitment, it cannot be abrogated without making God a liar—a sheer impossibility for Athanasius. This is the basis of the first horn of the divine dilemma.¹²⁸ The incarnation serves to diffuse this penalty by offering Christ's own death on our behalf, thereby acting to "put an end to the law which was against us..."¹²⁹

Within the image of financial liability, death is understood as the payment required by the debt that has been incurred. The language of debt communicates for Athanasius both the necessity of the payment¹³⁰ (which reinforces the necessity observed previously in the legal liability) and the possibility of Christ making such a payment vicariously.¹³¹ Athanasius identifies both these in the following passage:

But since it was necessary also that the debt [οφειλόμενον] owing from all should be paid again, for, as I have already said, it was owing [οφείλετο] that all should die ... to this intent ... he next offered up his sacrifice also on behalf of all....¹³²

Death is a price that has been incurred in a non-negotiable manner, and as a price, it may be paid by anyone with the currency, most exemplarily God.

Athanasius' use of the image of debt remains underdeveloped, however. Unlike with both the ontological necessity of corruption (all created beings tend toward nothingness) and with the legal liability of death (the trespass of God's law requires the juridical administration of the penalty attached to the law), Athanasius gives no account of how the debt was incurred. Without this component, any assertion that a debt is owed would be unjust, for a debt is just precisely when it is reimbursement for a previously incurred cost on the part of the lender.

In the end, the image of financial liability must be considered parasitic upon the more developed image of the legal liability. Because of free trespass, a penalty was incurred, and this penalty Athanasius at times labels debt. Aside from rhetorical variety, the only advantage of this different image is that it offers a more intuitive account of why the Word can vicariously suffer the penalty. Financial liability can be defrayed by a third party without raising eyebrows, but

¹²⁷ Ibid., 6: 2; Hardy, 60.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 6: 3; Hardy, 61.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 10, 5; Hardy, 64.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 20:5; Hardy, 74.

¹³¹ Ibid., 9:2; Hardy, 63.

¹³² Ibid., 20:2; Hardy, 74.

administering legal punishment to someone who did not commit a crime requires a commitment to a substantial (and, to the contemporary mind, unpalatable) account of retributive justice that would justify such an action. While in some locations Athanasius seems to rely on just such an account,¹³³ other times he brings in the image of financial debt because it allows for vicarious satisfaction with less theoretical commitments and therefore fewer occasions for objection.

The Penalty of Death and Heteronomy

Heteronomy, the imposition of a moral or ethical standard from a source other than an individual's own self, has a significant negative value in contemporary social life. Heteronomy is contrasted with autonomy, the ability for one's self to act as the source of moral obligation. The distinctly modern idea of autonomy reaches its strongest formulation in the thought of Immanuel Kant, who describes it as follows: "Autonomy of the will is the property that the will has of being a law to itself (independently of any property of the objects of volition)."¹³⁴ For Kant, the moral law is provided by the structure of the will itself, regardless of which "objects of volition" are present. No other content besides that of the will itself can validly influence the establishment or content of morality.¹³⁵ Kant points out, "If the will seeks the law that is to determine it anywhere but in the fitness of its maxims for its own legislation of universal laws, and if it thus goes outside of itself and seeks this law in the character of any of its objects, then heteronomy always results."¹³⁶ Such heteronomy is to be avoided.

Kant himself views heteronomy as deleterious because it threatens the universally binding nature of the moral law; however, heteronomy's impact on human dignity is far more important for apologetic outreach to contemporary culture. Kant argues that autonomy is the basis for human dignity.¹³⁷ This means that any heteronomous impingement of human autonomy would simultaneously impinge on the dignity of the human beings involved. Contemporary intuitions about moral justice and the nature of oppression agree with this analysis. Situations in which one social group determines the laws according to which another group lives are broadly viewed as oppressive. This

¹³³ C.f. 10:5, where he regards the sacrifice of Jesus' body as bringing the legal liability to an end.

¹³⁴ *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. James W. Ellington (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1993), §440, 44.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, §439, 44.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, §441, 45.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, §436, 41. While Kant's equation of human dignity with human autonomy is far too reductive, the author agrees that a significant portion of that dignity derives from the ability of the individual human being to know and internalize the moral law. Granting this, any instance of heteronomy would still entail a curtailment of human dignity, even if not in the absolute fashion Kant describes.

is true even when the directly negative effects of such a rule are largely mitigated, as in the case of the caring slave owner or an imperial power that takes seriously the “white man’s burden” of improving the lives of those colonized. The mere fact of living according to the rule of another denies an adult human being her full dignity, no matter how benevolent that rule may be.

Prima facie, this analysis poses a significant threat to Athanasius’ account of human condemnation deriving from trespass of a divine law. As presented above, Athanasius believed that death had a legal hold over all of humanity because of the infraction of divine law in the Garden of Eden. Yet the law that had been broken derived from a source external to the first parents of the human race. Athanasius informs us that *God* “gave them a law.”¹³⁸ If the binding nature of the law derives from the simple fact that it came from God, this is an example of heteronomy. Humanity, despite its inherent dignity, would be being ruled by an authority other than its own. It may be objected that, given the absolutely good nature of God, the rule of God would be good as well, even the most perfect of governances. This objection misses the significance of autonomy, however. Autonomous, free beings cannot be viewed simply as instruments to another, greater good, no matter how perfect that good may be. Free beings must have an intrinsic connection to the good, acknowledging the good and themselves accepting that good as the law by which they will live. If God were to act by fiat in the life of humanity, this would do violence to humanity’s freedom, and hence its dignity, regardless of how high minded that fiat might be. It appears that God’s legislation of the moral law, as described by Genesis and affirmed by Athanasius, violates legitimate human autonomy.

Fortunately, a closer examination reveals that Athanasius has resources to answer such a challenge. He himself recognizes the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic condemnation. This may be observed when he investigates whether God had the option of saving humanity by a simple command rather than through the incarnation. Addressing this question, Athanasius distinguishes between the death that could hypothetically be forestalled by an extrinsic command and the corruption that would have remained intrinsic to human nature.¹³⁹ He writes, “...[I]f death [θάνατος] had been kept from the body by a mere command on his part, it would none the less have been mortal and corruptible [φθαρτον], according to the nature of bodies [φθαרתον], according to the nature of bodies [κατα τον των σωματων λογον]...”¹⁴⁰ Athanasius clearly regards ontological corruption as endemic to the being of humanity, and not as an external imposition, and this leads him to conclude that salvation must occur according to that being as well.¹⁴¹

Contemporary readers of Athanasius do not need to be satisfied with just a defense of the intrinsic nature of ontological corruption, however. As noted previously, ontological analysis has limited apologetic utility in modern

¹³⁸ *On the Incarnation*, 3:4; Hardy, 58.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 44:5; Hardy, 99.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 44:8; Hardy, 99.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 44:2; Hardy, 98.

culture. Yet Athanasius never explicitly indicates that a similar intrinsic (and thus non-heteronomous) necessity applies to the legal liability of death. Indeed, if he genuinely believed that death could be defeated by a simple command of God, this would imply that the penalty of death had only an extrinsic and imposed necessity. But even if Athanasius himself never developed this line of reasoning, this author believes that he does provide adequate theological resources for a contemporary apologist to develop just such an argument. A non-heteronomous account of humanity's condemnation on legal grounds would then offer a simple and elegant basis upon which to enter into dialogue with contemporary values. To build such an account, I will follow the example Athanasius set by identifying the conditions for human condemnation within human nature itself.

While Athanasius relied upon the ontological composition of humanity to serve as the intrinsic basis of corruption, the legal liability of humanity must have a different but similarly intrinsic origin: the *rationality* of the human being. When Athanasius describes the creation of humanity, he remarks that humans were made “λογικοι”—rational.¹⁴² The reason present in humanity not only comes *from* God, however; it is *of* God as well. Athanasius asserts that God made humanity after the divine image, “giving them a portion even of the power of his own Word.”¹⁴³ The same capacity to reason is present in humanity and in God, although humanity receives it as an image, while in God the Λόγος (capable of being translated both as “reason” or as “word”¹⁴⁴) is present as an uncreated and personal reality.

If the same reason is present in humanity as is in God, this may serve as the basis of an understanding of the divinely imposed moral law that protects legitimate human autonomy. After all, given God's perfection, any moral law established by God would have to derive from God's reason and be intelligible to that reason. Insofar as God's reason has been shared with humanity, then, the moral law must also in an analogous sense derive from and be intelligible to humanity. Of course, just as a real difference exists between humanity's manner of possessing reason and God's, so would a difference exist in the manner in which humanity and God could appreciate the moral law and will its establishment. God remains the source of the moral law (and therefore of condemnation according to it) in a more basic and complete manner than humanity does, but humanity's bestowed participation in divine reason is sufficiently robust to deny that any law established by God could be foreign to humanity's own nature. Humanity's own rational nature is so patterned that the very law that derives from its nature is the same law established in a more originary sense by God.

This means that the condemnation of humanity because of sin is not heteronomous, either. In fact, it may appropriately be described as self-

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 3:3; Hardy, 58.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ *A Greek English Lexicon*, ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), 1058-1059.

condemnation. So long as the pattern of the divine Word exists within humanity, that pattern will will the moral good and desire justice for those who trespass against it, even if that transgressor is humanity itself. The divinity in humanity willingly accuses the sin in humanity, ensuring that the condemnation incurred will not be heteronomous. Intriguingly, this self-accusation is an analogue to contemporary psychological accounts of sin as self-alienation from God, others, and the self. It is on the basis of continuing internal recognition of the good that a sinner intuits the presence of that good in God, others, and the self. The sinner implicitly recognizes that she does not live up to this standard and flees from God, others, and the self in order to insulate herself from that pain, and thus self-imposing the penalty of absolute isolation and alienation. If Christianity is to make sense of condemnation for sin to contemporary culture, it will have to continue to find expressions of that idea that respect legitimate human autonomy. As shown from the writings of Athanasius, this does not preclude developing more traditional models of condemnation like that of a legal penalty.

MAGISTERIUM: TEACHER AND GUARDIAN OF THE FAITH.
 By Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J. *Introductions to Catholic Doctrine*.
 Naples, FL.: Sapientia Press, 2007. Pp. x + 209. \$21.95

Avery Dulles's *Magisterium* is perhaps the most clear, concise, and comprehensive introductory book to date on the teaching authority and function of the Catholic Church. Written primarily for Catholics, it covers various aspects of the Magisterium with the theologies of Pope John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in mind. So important are these sources for a new theology of the Magisterium that older works that do not include them "would be in serious need of updating" (viii). Nine appendices provide the most pertinent sections of the most recent papal documents on the Church's teaching authority.

Although Dulles's book is not apologetical in focus (6), his explanation and description of the Magisterium unknowingly, if not indirectly, defends the Catholic claim throughout his book. "It is logical," he declares, "to suppose that if God deems it important to give a revelation, he will make provision to assure its conservation" (4). Utilizing New Testament data and Church history, Dulles forcefully argues that the Magisterium is both biblically sound and well established throughout church history. This is most welcome given the scarcity of published works on the historical development of the papacy. He then outlines the role of the members of the Magisterium. This section spells out the distinction between the Church's official teachers and how their authority is related to Church Fathers, Doctors of the Church, saints, and theologians. He then explains how and when there can be disagreements between bishops. For example, the entire college of bishops can teach, govern, and sanctify in union with the pope, but the pope does not have to perform these functions with the approval of his brother bishops (51, 52). An important point to remember is that the multifaceted, authoritative teachings of the Church are not always infallible. Encyclicals are not examples of infallible teaching (70).

Elucidating the competence of pastoral authorities, Dulles conveys the circumstances in which the pope teaches infallibly (70, 71). With this he draws attention to questions on whether infallible pronouncements are ever defective and therefore in need of correction or updating. Despite the opposition of some theologians on the subject, Dulles is clear that Vatican II did not diminish the role of Vatican I's definition of papal primacy and infallibility. The biggest difficulty for today, it seems to me, is not whether the church can err in matters of belief, but how the pope can exercise infallible teaching without consulting his brother bishops or the faithful in the process. Dulles's exposition on this issue is wholly faithful to Catholic theology, but it would have been interesting to see his justification for it. Dulles also covers the issue of the obligatory force of the different levels and types of magisterial teaching. Considering the immediate confusion after Vatican II "as to what doctrines were binding, on what grounds, and in what measure," this was essential to include in a book like this given the previous delineation he makes between infallible and authoritative teaching (84). For it is well known that not every teaching in the Catholic Church is equally binding. After this he goes over the delicate subject on whether it is ever acceptable to dissent from Magisterial teaching and remain in

good standing within the Church. This is a perfect way to introduce the reader to these sensitive issues.

For all of the book's strengths, there are still notable weaknesses. In a text that only briefly skims the surface of major aspects of teaching authority, it would have been profitable for Dulles to offer more bibliographic resources at the end of each chapter for the reader to pursue if he or she wishes to research the topic more in detail. The chapter on infallibility, the "much debated issue," is perhaps the best example of a topic that deserved much more detail and attention (vi). Lastly, there is hardly a shred of ecumenical theology informing *Magisterium*. Even though his work is primarily written for Catholics, it is troubling that Dulles does not clarify the Catholic position in light of the difficulties that Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, and Protestant Christianities pose to the infallibility of the Church.

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA
GLENN B. SINISCALCHI

Call for Papers and Reviews

The Saint Louis Theological Bulletin is a multi-denominational journal that is intentionally diverse, so as to represent the different academic and ecclesial communities within the Department of Theological Studies community at Saint Louis University.

We are calling for papers and reviews that fit within this general ethos. The deadline for submission is September 1 for each year's issue.

Submissions from persons affiliated with other institutions are welcome.

Articles:

- Broad-based focus spanning all eras of church history; i.e., early church, medieval or modern.
- More historical or more theological in nature. We only ask that the paper exhibit both dimensions.
- Interdisciplinary, embracing the contributions of philosophy literature, cultural theory, women's studies and any other discipline relevant to theology.

Reviews:

- On any book relevant to theology published no later than 2004.
- Between 700-2500 words in length.

ALL SUBMISSIONS MUST BE E-MAILED TO:

gfaithfu@slu.edu

**Department of Theological Studies
Saint Louis University
2008-2009 • VOLUME 2**

Notes on Contributors:

Reverend Michael Pahls is a fourth-year Ph.D. student at Saint Louis University. He is co-editor of the recent volume, *Pluralism and Tradition: Essays in Honor of William Shea. Religion and the Social Order Series*. University Press of America, 2008, and the forthcoming book *Authority, Dogma, History: Oxford Movement Converts and the Infallibility Debates of the Nineteenth Century*, Academica Press, anticipated in Spring 2009.

Noël Pretila is a third-year Ph.D. student at Saint Louis University. He has plans to pursue research in patristic theology, particularly in the thought of Justin Martyr.

Chris Schroeder is a Jesuit from the Missouri Province who completed his M.A. in philosophy at Saint Louis University. He is currently a regent teaching theology at Arrupe Jesuite High School in Denver, Colorado.

Glenn Siniscalchi is a second-year Ph.D. student at Duquesne University in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. He hopes to write a dissertation on the relationship between Faith and Reason
