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When modernity challenges religious faith, it necessarily calls people of faith into question. The status of the saints is then in doubt. John Henry Newman takes the importance of saints for granted, not because he is unaware that their influence is under suspicion, but because their existence is undeniable. There are people who live their lives in imitation of Christ, undergoing conversion to Christ-like obedience to the Father’s will. Newman’s task is to shed light on the anthropological underpinnings of these people’s actions, to explain a form of saintly obedience that is not a dangerous capitulation to an abusive power structure. In so doing, Newman offers the saint as a valuable source for reflection upon the divine and human mystery that ultimately entails a love beyond the strictures of rationalist proof. Hans Urs von Balthasar’s extension of Newman’s approach—envisioning the saint as icon—agrees with Newman that the greatest crisis for sainthood would be the extinction of the saint. Only contemporary people of faith can prevent saints from dying out in today’s world.

MODERNITY’S SAINTHOOD IN CRISIS

In his essay, “Saint Versus Hero: Girard’s Undoing of Romantic Hagiology,” Grant Kaplan provides helpful background to modernity’s answer to the question of sainthood.¹ He explains the modern prominence of the Kantian perspective of “pure religion, which consists in rational, ethical activity and does not rely on superstition, the supernatural, or even the historical, save for didactic purposes.”² Displacing the supernatural and the historical, Kant’s categorical imperative ignores the lives of the saints in favor of general moral
sensibility. Likewise, reacting against Kant, Romanticism replaces the saint with “the Romantic hero, who abandons society’s norms and lives freely, naturally, unencumbered and uninfluenced by culture’s fallenness.” Kaplan’s observations illustrate how modernity causes a crisis for sainthood by challenging: (1) the saint’s dedication to God (the supernatural) and (2) the saint’s immersion in the Christian narrative of salvation (the historical).

Moderns of the Kantian variety are suspicious of the saint because she does not act according to a universal moral intuition. Instead, she allows her “being” and her “doing” to be guided by God at every moment of her unrepeatable, historical journey. The Romantics disavow the saint because she denies her “creativity, imagination and originality” that are the “markers of salvation” that make her a “naturally blameless hero.” Rather, within her unique historical and cultural contexts, each saint recognizes her sinfulness, and gives thanks for the unmerited grace of justification bestowed upon her through Christ’s compassionate death and miraculous resurrection. She co-writes her life’s story within the overarching narrative of salvation history whose principal author is the Triune God.

NEWMAN’S ALTERNATIVE: SAINTS OFFER ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSIGHT

John Henry Newman responds to a sainthood in crisis by appealing to real, historical persons whose lives were and are sanctified. The proof of sanctity’s validity is in the transformed histories of persons who are simultaneously sinners and saints. These are the struggling ones who cannot attain liberation from the dark side of human existence without being brought into the light by the One who is its source: “No sinner so great, but he may, through God’s grace, become a saint ever so great. . . . We cannot argue from what a saint is at his close what he was at his beginning.” A number of Newman’s sermons—including many of the Parochial and Plain Sermons during his Anglican period and some of those preached before the Catholic University of Ireland—present an aspect of the saint’s life whose feast day the congregation is there to commemorate. While honoring the saint, Newman and his parishioners are learning from this person what it means to be human; they are discovering who they are by entering the divine-human story that they share with their predecessors.

As Cyril O’Regan convincingly demonstrates, the difference between Newman and the moderns whom he addresses is their contrasting anthropologies. The moderns (whether Kantian or Romantic) view the human person as morally intuitive and successful in applying these instincts. Newman looks at...
the human person as a “work in progress.” One is morally aware when listening to conscience. However, one’s conscience requires constant formation by God’s grace through prayer, the study of scripture and tradition, and one’s participation in liturgy and sacrament.

Saintly Insight into Obedience as Covenantal Love

How does Newman know that one requires the aid of another (in this case, the Divine Other and the worshipping community) to fully actualize one’s potential for doing the good? He understands this to be the case because he has contemplated his life and the saints’ lives, thereby acknowledging a self who “is a tension between a maximum and a minimum, between spirit and animality, between angel and monster, of forward and backward motion.” This “forward and backward motion” is part of the process of sanctification known as “conversion,” and it includes confessing one’s sins, repenting, and beginning again through the grace of God’s forgiveness in Christ. The persistent struggle by which one becomes one’s true self requires the paradoxical action of letting go of oneself into the hands of the redeeming God. Seemingly contradictory to the person of faith and the modern sceptic alike, submitting oneself to another appears to be a negation of self, rather than an opportunity for the fullest self-realization. Newman perceives that this is a misunderstanding of the self’s origin and essence. One does not come into being on one’s own; nor, is it one’s nature to be alone in the world. From the first instance, every human life is dependent upon relationships in community. Ultimately, the health of those relationships is dependent upon the primal relationship with God, the Spirit, who continues the Son’s work to unite persons together into a loving community with a common purpose.

For Newman, the act of “letting go” is the movement of love, observable in the most liberating of human relationships, and supremely recognizable in the Father-Son relationship revealed in the Incarnation:

If there was one among the sons of men, who might allowably have taken His pleasure, and have done His own will here below, surely it was He who came down on earth from the bosom of the Father, and who was so pure and spotless in that human nature which He put on Him, that He could have no human purpose or aim inconsistent with the will of His Father. Yet He, the Son of God, the Eternal Word, came, not to do His own will, but His who sent Him, as you know very well is told us again and again in Scripture.

Newman trusts the gospels as reliable accounts of who Jesus was based on what He said and did. Every gospel portrays Jesus of Nazareth as submitting to the Father’s will in all things. This historical fact has theological significance.
Obedience is an indispensable aspect of Christ’s personality and an equally necessary quality belonging to saintly imitators of Christ. If the Word made flesh who is “like us in all things except sin” gives Himself over to the Father, how much more so should sinners desiring to be made holy, obey the Father’s will? Newman is well aware that his modern interlocutors would not share this question. They would have a completely different query in mind, namely: why would an enlightened individual give up one’s freedom to be enslaved by the will of another, especially a divine Other who demands the death of the self?

The modern reader of Mark 8:35, “For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake and that of the gospel will save it,” is correct. Jesus is claiming that authentic freedom is found by losing one’s life in imitation of Him, the One who gave His life over to the Father’s will by dying on the cross. However, it is essential to remember that the Son freely chose to lose His life by sharing the Father’s desire for the salvation of humankind. In this context, obeying the Father’s will means deciding to work with Him in order to liberate people from the self-absorption and isolation of sin that sets them against each other and that sabotages the unity of right relationship with others and with God. Newman argues that to obey God is to partner with Him, much like Abraham entered into a covenantal relationship with God.

Upholding a correspondence between faith and obedience as “different characteristics of one and the same state of mind,” Newman explains:

Abraham was accepted (not by ceremonial observances, but) by faith, yet St. James says he was accepted by works of obedience. The meaning is clear, that Abraham found favour in God’s sight, because he gave himself up to Him: this is faith or obedience, whichever we please to call it. No matter whether we say, Abraham was favoured because his faith embraced God’s promises, or because his obedience cherished God’s commands, and His promises commands to a heart devoted to Him; so that, there is no substantial difference between command and promise, so there is likewise none between obedience and faith.

Faith and obedience are different aspects of a single state of mind focused on relationship with God. These are qualities possessed by individuals who are committed to the covenantal relationship between God and human beings, exemplified by Abraham and perfected in Christ. Notice the words that Newman uses to express the bond of love between Abraham and God—the language of “giving himself up to Him,” “embracing,” “cherishing,” and “a heart devoted to Him.” To have faith in God and to obey God are characteristics of the mind or spirit “in love” with God. One loves the God who has already loved the individual into being and who has repaired the break
in their relationship caused by sin and selfishness. Abraham and Jesus give themselves over to the Father out of love for Him. In this covenantal relationship, they are the opposite of slaves; they are freely choosing to return love for love. Yes, love requires sacrifice—a kind of death to self. Can one who has not loved truly be free?

**Saintly Insight into Faith’s Communal Nature**

The scriptural model of covenantal love on which Newman relies presupposes the correspondence between faith and obedience, because love is both a knowing or trusting (faith) and an acting or doing (obedience). Disputing the role of obedience, Newman’s modern opponents also reject the supernatural and religious faith in its existence. For his part, Newman is fascinated with the unseen—the realm of divine reality that reveals itself in scripture, in liturgy and sacrament, in prayer, and in the lives of the saints. Introducing his portrayal of the hermit, St. Gundleus (500 CE), Newman opines:

> The Christian lives in the past and in the future, and in the unseen; in a word, he lives in no small measure in the unknown. And it is one of his duties, and a part of his work, to make the unknown known; to create within him an image of what is absent, and to realise by faith what he does not see. For this purpose he is granted certain rudiments and outlines of the truth, and from thence he learns to draw it out into its full proportions and its substantial form—to expand and complete it; whether it be the absolute and perfect truth, or truth under a human dress, or truth in such a shape as is most profitable for him. And the process by which the word which has been given him, “returns not void,” but brings forth and buds and is accomplished and prospers, is Meditation.

Newman and his fellow Christians meditate on the lives of the saints in order to ascertain how the saints have glimpsed the unseen by leaving themselves open to hear, see, and experience God through the events of their daily lives. Though a saint’s personal history may only be available in “rudiments and outlines of the truth,” it is possible for the interpreter to “draw it out into its full proportions and its substantial form.” Newman believes that the process of meditation will result in at least a partial grasp of the truth about the saint, which is yet another fragmentary glance at the presence of God in the experiences and stories of those who have drawn closer to Him. The person of faith, following Newman’s lead, is comfortable residing in the depths of divine and human mystery, depending on other believers to light one’s way. Each person’s reflection on another saintly life (whether in stories handed down or in sermons preached on feast days) enhances the community’s awareness of who they are meant to be as fellow members of the Communion of Saints.
Newman’s *Oxford University Sermons, Grammar of Assent, and Development of Doctrine* all point to the inherent connection between faith in God and trust in the community of the faithful. These are the generations of believers who have preserved the accounts of Jesus’s life and who have generated and refined theological interpretations of them. To have faith in God is to be part of a believing community whose language of prayer, worship, and Creed helps guide the individual’s understanding, aids the maturation of conscience, and strengthens the person’s contributions to building God’s kingdom in the world. Covenantal love is the ground for a communal love that bespeaks God’s continued presence and that calls for constant conversion to saintly imitation of Christ that is uniquely instantiated within various historical and cultural contexts.

**Further Saintly Insight into Obedience as “Disinterested Love”**

Conversion never ceases to be an essential part of each person’s story and of the community’s history, because: “In proportion as a man believes, so he obeys; they come together and grow together, and last through life. Neither are perfect; both are on the same level of imperfection; they keep pace with each other; in proportion to the imperfection of one, so is the imperfection of the other; and, as the one advances, so does the other also.”22 Newman would agree that one must reckon with the modern caution against obedience. A person or a community’s obedient actions (or doing of God’s will) can be imperfect in two ways. On the one hand, obedience is never perfect or complete, because love has no limits. One can never love enough. On the other hand, obedience can be misguided if one is mistaking an idol for God. Idolatry exists inside and outside of faith communities. Authority figures can attempt to take God’s place. One cannot assume that one’s own will is synonymous with God’s, and therefore can act in ways that are selfish and divisive. People and the potentially alienating ideologies that they hold can direct their and others’ attention away from God toward self-validation and self-promotion.

The test of whether obedience is upbuilding or destructive is whether or not it promotes a “disinterested love” of God and all others. The biblical witness identifies Abraham as someone who epitomizes “disinterested love” in Genesis 22. Obeying God’s command to sacrifice Isaac requires loving God purely for God’s sake, rather than loving God for the sake of the fulfilled promises that Isaac represents.23 A pure love is “disinterested,” because it is not interested in personal gain or self-promotion. It is loving for love’s sake, which produces an equal concern for all those within and outside of one’s community. Christ’s life, death, and resurrection instantiates the purest form of agapic love that lives, dies, and lives again, out of ultimate concern for all
of humanity. Newman understands that it is not easy for Christ’s followers to love in a disinterested fashion. Personal experience has taught him that this is why conversion is an indispensable occurrence for persons and communities who commit themselves to loving well.24

Turning away from idolatry to disinterested love of God and others involves nurturing the covenantal relationship. Loving relationships take work; this is where prayer, acts of self-denial (such as fasting and almsgiving), and participation in the liturgy come into play. Newman is clear that these spiritual practices are not religious superstitions designed to forcibly obtain something from God. He dedicates himself to developing these habits, because they are the means of conversing with God on personal terms (in prayer), offering oneself in service to God (through acts of self-denial), and rejoicing in God’s presence (given in the liturgy and sacraments). One prays, fasts and worships, because one is already loved by God and one wishes to nurture one’s ability to love in return. These are individual and communal practices that foster attentiveness to personal transformation for the sake of communal restoration and preservation. One’s private prayer, acts of self-denial, and participation in communal ritual, build one’s spiritual and moral character for ethical action in the broader world community.

**NEWMAN’S ALTERNATIVE: THE SAINT AS OPPORTUNITY**

Newman maintains the relevance of Christian prayer and liturgical practice because he believes that the human person cannot be religious or ethical on one’s own. One is neither instinctively moral (contra Kant) nor naturally heroic if untouched by tarnished society (contra the Romantics). Instead, one becomes moral by participating in caring relationships that shape one’s actions according to the disinterested love that defines a thriving community covenanted to the Triune God. Newman’s stress on the personal aspect of religious formation simultaneously underscores the communal foundation of spiritual and moral growth. There is no prayer without the communion of persons with God; there are no acts of self-denial without the giving up of something for the sake of another; there can be no reception of the sacraments without a community called Church; there are no ethical actions that spring from one’s spiritual center without the strengthening of right relationships with others in the world.

These are the lessons that Newman learns from the saints, with Christ as the supreme model whom the saints imitate. Newman does not suppose that the saints or meditations on the saints are an irrefutable proof of God’s existence;
nor does he assume that they indisputably verify the veracity of the Christian narrative of salvation history. However, he does hope that they are opportunities for reflection on the divine and human mystery that ultimately entails a love beyond the strictures of rationalist proof.

A BALTHASARIAN EXPANSION OF NEWMAN’S ALTERNATIVE

The twentieth century Swiss, Catholic theologian, Hans Urs von Balthasar expands upon Newman’s alternative of seeing the saint as an opportunity for entering into the divine and human mystery of covenantal love. Without directly referencing Newman, Balthasar also meditates on the saints to gain anthropological insight. For example, he observes saints such as the Rhineland mystics, Catherine of Siena, Francis of Assisi, and Ignatius of Loyola, noting their various embodiments of Gelassenheit, or indifference. They are all prone to self-abandonment, throwing themselves into the arms of God regardless of the social and cultural criticism they might receive for their humility and obedience. Like Newman, Balthasar finds the meaning of obedience in the saint’s giving of herself over to the covenantal relationship. Ignatius of Loyola’s “indifference” is another way of articulating the “disinterested love” that prevents idolatry’s misapplication of obedience.

For Balthasar, since every saint has the goal of imitating Christ, when one looks at the saint, one sees beyond her to the Christ whom she emulates. Therefore, the saint functions as an icon of Christ. Balthasar follows Newman in recognizing the compatibility between the saint’s obedience and the obedience of the Word made flesh. Newman writes: “Yet He, the Son of God, the Eternal Word, came, not to do His own will, but His who sent Him, as you know very well is told us again and again in Scripture.” At this juncture, Balthasar expands upon Newman by explicitly articulating a trinitarian theology in which the Incarnation reveals the eternal nature of God.

If the Word made flesh obeys the Father’s will, then the Son is analogously obedient to the Father by forever giving Himself to the Father who eternally begets Him. The Father perpetually gives Himself to the Son, and the Son eternally gives Himself over to the Father, manifesting a mutual love who is the Holy Spirit. This extension of Newman into the realm of inter-trinitarian relations is significant, because it also goes deeper into the mystery of the saint’s iconicity. The saint is an icon of Christ, a window into the Incarnate Word’s obedience to the Father, thereby making the Son’s eternal self-abandonment to the Father visible to those who look closely enough. The saint’s obedience as disinterested love—an icon of Christ, the Son of God—demonstrates that God
is the dynamism of disinterested love between Father, Son, and Spirit. One who loves in a disinterested fashion images the Triune God. Both Newman and Balthasar would agree with the Athanasian teaching that Christ’s salvific death and resurrection has restored this image in human beings, bestowing upon them the grace of participation in triune life. Though the saint may not prove God, the saint can be an icon of the divine and human mystery, beckoning and inviting others to explore its height and depth.

**IS SAINTHOOD IN CRISIS?**

For Newman and Balthasar, sainthood is only in crisis if there are no saints in today’s world. Catholic Christianity celebrates the ongoing presence of saintly living with its canonization of Paul VI and Oscar Romero on October 14, 2018. As Paul VI and Oscar Romero witness, the Triune God of disinterested love can still be seen if there are individuals practicing that love in imitation of Christ. Therefore, Newman and Balthasar’s interpreters learn the lessons that they impart if they take Jaak Seynaeve’s words to heart:

> Never before in the history of mankind have we had such a technical and technological, such a mechanical and even computerized world. . . . Never before have we had better equipped hospitals and clinics and health centers, more skilled doctors and nurses. And yet sick people in our hospitals and clinics feel aloof, lonesome, lonely as if they were numbers in an anonymous world. In Newman’s writings and teaching on holiness, we have an urgent call to keep and foster the personal relationships (cor ad cor loquitur), to warm up and hearten our cold society. In Newman’s line of thought, in our individual and collective process of holiness, Christians should stress the “I-you,” “Ich-Du,” “moi-toi” relationships.30

The task is simple, yet difficult. How can individuals create authentic community in a distracted and fast-paced world? Newman offers sound advice. Return to the communal practices that inculcate the virtue of disinterested love. Let those who pray, those who fast and give alms, those who celebrate the liturgy, bring their proclivities for personal connection, self-gift, and celebration of life into every relationship, every moment, every crisis, every opportunity that arises.

Consider how Dorothy Day’s (1897–1980) saintly life is a poignant example of the way loving communities are born through the coalescing of one’s liturgical and social worlds. The Catholic Worker Movement is about forging relationships with the downtrodden through the miracle of mutual self-gift. These interactions take place in the direst circumstances of extreme poverty,
mental illness, broken families, and the like. Patrick Jordan writes, “There was but one means of being able to live in such a challenging environment, year in and year out, fully and humanly.”31 Quoting Day’s own words, he continues, “Without the sacraments of the Church, primarily the Eucharist, the Lord’s Supper as it is sometimes called, I certainly do not think that I could go on.”32 Dorothy Day—one who prayed the psalms every day with her morning cup of coffee—is a saint after Newman’s own heart. Her life demonstrates that everyone can build community by greeting the next person they see with Christ-like words and Christ-like hands of welcome and hope.33

NOTES

2. Ibid., 154.
3. Ibid., 155.
4. Kaplan indicates how Wyschogrod’s postmodern retrieval of the saint is still reliant upon modernity in that her ethical focus also eliminates talk of the supernatural and the Christian narrative of salvation history. Ibid., 154. See also, Edith Wyschogrod, Saints and Postmodernism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).
5. Ibid., 155.
10. Ibid., 64.


12. In this regard, Newman’s thought is akin to that of Thomas Merton who explicitly names the process of coming to one’s “true self” in New Seeds of Contemplation: “Therefore there is only one problem on which all my existence, my peace and my happiness depend: to discover myself in discovering God. If I find Him, I will find myself, and if I find my true self I will find him.” See Thomas Merton, New Seeds of Contemplation (New York: New Directions, 1961), 36.

13. “. . . when He came again in the Person of His Spirit, He made them all in a real sense one, not in name only. For they were no longer arranged merely in the form of unity, as the limbs of the dead may be, but they were parts and organs of one unseen power; they really depended upon, and were offshoots of that which was One . . . the Spirit came to make us one in Him who had died and was alive, that is, to form the Church.” John Henry Newman, “The Communion of Saints,” in Parochial and Plain Sermons 4:11. http://www.newmanreader.org/works/parochial/volume4/sermon11.html. Accessed 8 August 2018. Also, quoted in Ian Ker, Healing the Wound of Humanity: The Spirituality of John Henry Newman (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1993), 69.


15. Concerning Newman’s appreciation of the literal or historical and theological meanings of the biblical text, Jaak Seynaeve writes, “Not only Tradition and Church authority must be taken fully into account, but strenuous and never-failing search and research, moral dispositions, and above all, supernatural grace and faith—“the eyes of faith”—are required. If this happens to be the case, all those objective and subjective means will inevitably lead to a “real,” not a mere “notional,” knowledge of the Bible, so that its truths and realities will not only be apprehended on a purely intellectual level but will lead us and move us on and on to a deeply religious practice of life.” Jaak Seynaeve, “Holy Scripture as ‘First Principle’ in Newman’s Teaching on Christian Holiness,” in Christliche Heiligkeit als Lehre und Praxis nach John Henry Newman: Newman’s Teaching on Christian Holiness, ed. Günter Biemer and Heinrich Fries (Sigmaringendorf: Regio Verlag Glock und Lutz, 1988), 37–38.


17. Ibid. The emphasis is Newman’s.

20. Ibid.
23. The Israelite audience of Genesis 22 and their modern counterparts differ drastically on the main point of the narrative. The modern interpreter often asks whether sacrificing Isaac is a moral or immoral act. The ancient reader would have asked what Abraham was supposed to learn when tested in this way, presupposing that God was not asking for child sacrifice.
24. See Walter E. Conn, *Conscience and Conversion in Newman: A Developmental Study of Self in John Henry Newman* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2010). Conn’s first three chapters are entitled, “Young Man Newman: The First Conversion,” “Newman’s Cognitive Conversion to Anglo-Catholicism,” and “From Oxford Tractarian to Roman Convert.” Whether it is his conversion as a young man or his later conversion to Roman Catholicism, each instance is more than an intellectual about-face for Newman. These are pivotal moments of self-realization that inculcate a deeper participation in a loving relationship with his God.
33. Ibid.
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